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ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION AND TELEVISION CENTRALITY

by

Monica Patricia Gerarda Schouten

A model is offered to explain the interaction between involvement with television and communication apprehension. To test the model, 116 community college students were asked to respond to a survey comprised of demographic/behavioural variables, the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, Writing Apprehension Test, Social Desirability Scale and Television Centrality Index. The Television Centrality Index was especially constructed for this study to measure the degree of importance that television plays in respondents' lives.

A moderate positive relationship was found between oral and written communication apprehension, and television centrality. A discriminant function analysis indicated that high scorers on the Television Centrality Index tended to watch more hours of television, to be apprehensive about both oral and written communication, and tended to spend less time reading than low scorers on the Television Centrality Index. Results also indicated that high TCI scorers were more likely to be female and
to perceive themselves as less socially desirable than low TCI scorers. Other statistical evidence is reported and also supports the positive relationship between television centrality and communication apprehension. Suggestions for further research to clarify this relationship are also offered.
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CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

"Those who find the physical and social environments too demanding, too messy, sometimes seek to live, as far as possible, within media environments."

Edmund Carpenter, Oh, What a Blow That Phantom Gave Me! (1973)

1. THE PROBLEM

William Rivers and Wilbur Schramm (1968) offer an equation which describes the process of selective perception as a defence measure against the many messages which bombard human senses daily. Their "fraction of selection" is represented as:

\[
\text{expectation of reward} = \text{likelihood of selection} \times \text{effort thought to be required}
\]

Certain forms of media require more "effort" than others. Shy people may prefer to remain silent, rather than risk exposing their shyness; confident people may envision rewards from contact with a stranger and therefore make friends easily.
Chance, the central character in the film "Being There", was unaware of the rewards of human contact, and preferred to derive his knowledge of the world from his garden and his television set. The Carpenter quotation which began this chapter may apply equally to those who choose to watch rather than to act because they fear failure of their personally controlled communication activities. As Rivers and Schramm stated on page 1, an individual will compare the expectation of reward which might result from attending to a particular medium/message, to the attention effort thought to be required by that particular medium/message, before choosing to attend to any information medium. The likelihood that a receiver will attend to a message is enhanced when the reward is perceived to be greater and the effort smaller. Chance perceived the communication from his television and his garden to be more rewarding than interpersonal communication from human contact.

As Schramm and Rivers (1968) note, their "fraction of selection" helps to explain why:

1. television has made such a dent in movie attendance (less effort is required to enjoy programs at home), why jamming does not entirely stop the listening to foreign short-wave broadcasts (some listeners want very badly to hear them) and why the use of public libraries falls off so sharply after the teen years (the effort becomes much greater).
Schramm and Rivers recognize that much of media selection is not rationally chosen but may result from impulse or accident. They do maintain, however, that an individual tends to seek communication in places (or media) that have been found rewarding through that individual's past experience. Beyond that, and other things being equal, information media are selected from those which are close and easy to find among the information glut.

Watching usually requires less effort than acting. Writing and speaking require users to act; television offers viewers an opportunity to watch. Television may therefore be perceived as requiring less effort than speaking or writing. Persons who feel anxious about a situation may choose to avoid it (Mischel, 1971). Those persons who feel anxious about oral and written communication may choose to avoid speaking and writing, and may prefer to involve themselves with television instead, because it would require less effort than the two communications media they chose to avoid.

This study addresses the relationship between anxiety or fear about writing and speaking (communication apprehension) and involvement with television (television centrality).
2. COMMUNICATION APPEHENSION: DEFINITIONS

From Lomas (1934) to McCroskey (1970, 1975, 1976), researchers "have consistently observed that some people are more apprehensive orally than are other people and that this apprehension has a negative impact on their communication behavior as well as on other important aspects of their lives" (McCroskey, 1977).

McCroskey (1977) defines communication apprehension (or CA) as "an individual's level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons." This fear of communication outweighs an apprehensive individual's perceptions of any possible gain that might result from the communication experience and hence results in avoidance of communication to avoid experiencing the fear and anxiety the individual has learned to associate with communication encounters.

Situational or state CA (also known as stage fright), the fear or anxiety a person experiences when communicating orally in a situation where other people observe and/or evaluate the communication attempt, is a normal response experienced by most people in public oral communication situations. Trait communication apprehension, however, is not characteristic of normal, well-adjusted individuals, but is instead fear of many different oral communication encounters from
talking to a small group, to giving a speech before a large crowd of people (McCroskey, 1977). Studies of American college student populations suggest that one student in five at major universities may have high trait CA (McCroskey, 1970). Similarly, a .20 percent frequency of high trait communication apprehension has been observed in public school settings (K-12) and among adult populations (McCroskey, 1976; Scott, McCroskey & Sheahan, 1978).

Communication apprehension can exist in response to both oral and written communication. One measure with clearly established reliability and validity as an indicator of oral trait CA is the PRCA (Personal report of Communication Apprehension) (McCroskey, 1970, 1975; Daly, 1978; Kelly, 1982). The WAT (Writing Apprehension Test) has been developed and validated to measure anxiety about written communication (Daly & Miller, 1975). The moderate positive correlation that has been shown in previous research (between .30 and .40) between the PRCA and WAT indicates that persons having high CA for oral communication are also likely to have high CA for written communication, but that the two tests do measure different forms of anxiety (McCroskey, 1977).

3. CORRELATES OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION

As McCroskey, Sorenson & Daly (1976) have noted, empirical investigations of the CA construct have indicated that persons with high levels of
communication apprehension choose occupations which require less communication (Daly & McCroskey, 1975), choose seats in small groups and classrooms which require less communication (McCroskey & Leppard, 1975; McCroskey & Sheahan, 1976), have lowered interaction levels (Wells & Lashbrook, 1970), lower levels of self-esteem (McCroskey & Richmond, 1975) and disclose less (Hamilton, 1972) than those with low CA. Those persons who are highly communication apprehensive tend to avoid competitive situations (Giffin & Gilham, 1971), lack trust in others' communication (Law, 1950); (Giffin & Heider, 1967), have difficulty discussing personal problems (Heston & Anderson, 1972) and feel isolated and ineffective in social relationships (Low & Sheets, 1951). Other people see high CA's as less attractive than non-apprehensive individuals (Quiggins, 1972; McCroskey, Daly, Richmond & Cox, 1975). Although no relationship has been found between CA and intelligence, the highly apprehensive individual tends to do less well in school (McCroskey & Andersen, 1976), write lower quality messages and teachers tend to expect less from them (Daly, 1979). Scott, McCroskey and Sheahan (1978) found that high CA individuals in an organizational setting had less desire for advancement, were less likely to expect advancement, were more likely to see themselves in positions with low communication requirements, and
were more likely to prefer jobs with low communication requirements than were those who had low scores on communication apprehension.

In their study of the personality correlates of high CA college students, McCroskey, Daly & Sorensen (1976) found CA to have a moderately high positive correlation with general anxiety and moderately high negative correlations with tolerance for ambiguity, self-control, adventurousness, surgency, and emotional maturity. Since no dimension on the personality scales used could be relabeled a communication apprehension dimension, the researcher concluded that CA appears to be a variable that is associated with an individual's total personality rather than a specific personality dimension.

McCroskey, Daly & Sorensen (1976) draw a very negative picture of the high CA individual as:

Aloof, prefers working alone, rigid, has hard time expressing self, quiet, reserved, stiff, changeable, dissatisfied, easily annoyed, strongly influenced by emotions, lacks leadership, a follower, submissive, conforming, obedient, serious, reflective, slow, cautious, silent, seeks low interaction occupation, undependable, irresolute, lacks internal standards, low task orientation, withdrawn, has feelings of inferiority, rule bound, restrained, avoids people, free of jealousy, concerned with others, good team worker, pliant, permissive, worrier, moody, avoids participation in groups, lacks self control, inconsiderate, unconscientious, indecisive, tense, restless, impatient, frustrated, low morale, closed minded, amoral orientation to life, manipulative, low tolerance for ambiguous or uncertain situations, low need to achieve, and sees external forces as controlling his or her life.
The apparent contradictions in the above profile may indicate situation-specific characteristics and underline the complexity of the CA individual. Persons with low CA might be characterized in a generally more positive light as typically adventurous, extroverted, confident, emotionally mature individuals with high self-esteem, tolerant of ambiguity, and willing or even eager to accept change in their environment (McCroskey, 1977).

Although no single person will exhibit all of the above high or low CA characteristic profiles, it is clear that the highly communication apprehensive is a withdrawn, socially maladaptive individual who has little chance for success in contemporary society, and that the low CA individual is viewed much more positively with strong chances for success (McCroskey, Daly & Sorensen, 1976). The negative impression that the high CA individual gives and receives will affect many parts of his/her life.

Teachers must communicate successfully with their students if student learning is to occur. To teach subjects within the classroom environment, teachers must rely on questions for feedback on student acquisition of the material being taught. Without feedback a teacher has difficulty gauging the appropriate pace of instruction for optimum student learning. This feedback can be verbal or nonverbal, and many instructors use a class participation mark to
evaluate the quantity and quality of a student's communication within a class. Employers rely on similar feedback to assess the confidence and competence of their employees.

For the communication apprehensive student or employee, providing this feedback can be an intimidating, anxiety-ridden experience. Thus, the high CA individual is severely handicapped in social, academic and professional situations. How then does the affliction communication apprehension occur?

4. CAUSES OF COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION

The specific causes of communication apprehension are not yet known. Because of the difficulty in gathering data about the origins of a personality-like trait such as CA, the cause may never be known. There have been, however, case studies (Phillips & Butt, 1966) and surveys (Wheeleless, 1971) which suggest that communication apprehension begins in early childhood. Many children entering kindergarten have been found to have already established high levels of CA.

McCroskey (1977) notes that there is little evidence that CA could be hereditary, and supports the belief that CA is a learned trait, conditioned through reinforcement of the child's communication behaviours. The behaviourist school of psychology has established that behaviours that are rewarded will be continued;
those behaviours that are not reinforced will be gradually extinguished (Mischel, 1971).

A child who is reinforced for being "quiet" and not encouraged to communicate, will likely continue to be a quiet child. If, in addition to not being rewarded for communication, the child is subject to aversive experiences when attempting to communicate, (e.g. parents shouting for quiet, or siblings fighting) it is likely that the quiet habit will continue.

As McCroskey (1977) discusses:

Such a child is likely to enter the school environment with a well-established, high level of CA. The child also is likely to have developed communication skills at a lower level than other children, since the avoidance of communication conditioned into the child early will have limited the child's communication experiences. As a consequence, the school is very likely to strengthen the CA response. While the school environment demands the child communicate, the lower skill level of the child likely will result in less reinforcement for communication than that given to other children (by both teachers and peers). In addition, the school demands silence much of the time. The child with high CA will find it easy to conform to this requirement, and will be reinforced for it, but also will observe the aversive stimuli given to the normal children who are not silent when the school expects quiet. This will provide additional reinforcement for the child's withdrawal behavior. From this point on, the high level of CA is most likely to sustain itself through similar interactions with the environment. 3

Educational and psychological research provides strong support for McCroskey's explanation of how CA is established, and research has also been done on the environmental correlates of CA.
Phillips and Butt (1966) found that a disproportionately large percentage of high CA college students were children of first and second generation ethnic families. Because of the mixture of languages to which they were exposed, such children may have had more difficulty in language acquisition and might have received less reinforcement from parents and teachers for communication. Phillips and Butt also suggested that these parents might have lower language skill levels and therefore provide inadequate reinforcement to their children who attempt to acquire a new language and a new culture. However, De Villiers and De Villiers (1978) did not report significant interference in acquisition of English as a second language among the children of non-English speakers, and this may preclude the possibility of a relationship between ethnicity and CA.

Parents who use communication as a weapon against each other and/or their offspring may also induce communication apprehension in their children by reinforcing avoidance of the punishment expected from communication behaviour. These children may never learn that communication can be a rewarding experience and fail to successfully manipulate their communications to gain social rewards (Phillips, 1968).
College students who grew up in rural environments (i.e. those living in towns of less than 5,000 people, or on farms) are also more likely to have high CA than their urban counterparts. This may be due to a decreased opportunity for interaction with adults and peers because of the distances between rural homes (Richmond and Robertson, 1977).

McCroskey & Richmond (1980) concluded that CA is a learned condition of anxiety associated with inadequate language or communication skills (Kelly, 1982). Such individuals receive less reinforcement, which then leads to heightened CA (McCroskey, 1977).

The above correlates may explain differences across families for variations in CA levels, but there is no current, empirically supported, theoretical explanation of why there is variation in CA levels within one family. More research on the causes of CA is required. One variable which has not yet been considered with CA is involvement with television. It may be that the silent activity of passive television watching is related to communication apprehension.
5. TELEVISION AND COMMUNICATION DEVELOPMENT

Television plays a significant role in the lives of North Americans. According to T.V. Basics 1981-82, a report published by the Television Bureau of Canada, the average Canadian household currently spends 5 hours and 26 minutes daily in viewing television. Television viewing is highest in homes where the head of the household has a grade school education, least in homes with university education family heads.

Criticism and praise has been directed at the medium since it was introduced. Rossi & Biddle (1967) lauded the "new media" for their educational potential. In 1956, Eugene David Glynne wrote an article which expounded on the function television performed for viewers.

Glynne (1973) claimed that TV satisfied needs centering around the wish for someone to care, to nurse, to give comfort and solace. For adults, these "infantile longings" could be satisfied only symbolically. Television could provide "warmth, sound, constancy, availability, a steady giving
without ever a demand for return, the encouragement to complete passive surrender and envelopment — all this and fantasy besides. Glynne saw TV as a manifestation of Freud's oral stage of development, it inspired intense needs, poor tolerance for frustration and delay, and demand for immediate satisfaction.

A 1978 study of University of Windsor undergraduate students who responded to personality scales and questions about their TV viewing, confirmed Glynne's suppositions of over twenty years earlier. High TV watchers were found to score lower on Achievement, Autonomy, Endurance, Sentience, and Understanding, and higher on Dependence, Impulsivity, Play and Social Recognition than low TV viewers or high readers (Albert & Schouten, 1978).

Although Albert & Schouten (1978) used different personality scales than McCroskey, Daly & Sorensen (1976) used in their study of the personality correlates of communication apprehension, the significant constructs are very similar and the personality profiles are highly alike.

Because of the pervasiveness of television in North American households and because children tend to spend more time with television than with the school system, Neil Postman calls TV, the "First Curriculum," school offers the "Second Curriculum." Postman's (1979) description of the TV curriculum is consistent with Marshall McLuhan's (1978) description
of the simultaneous, resonating character of television. Postman notes that the TV curriculum is:

attention-centered
non-punitive
affect-centered
present-centered
image-centered
narration-centered
moralistic
non-analytical
non-hierarchical
authoritarian
contemptuous of authority
continuous in time
isolating in space
discontinuous in content
immediately and intrinsically gratifying

This typology of television appears to be consistent with Glynne's (1973) and Albert and Schouten's (1978) personality profiles of TV viewers. For example, Postman calls TV immediately and intrinsically gratifying, Glynne concurs that TV inspires a need for immediate satisfaction, and Albert and Schouten found heavy TV viewers to be "impulsive" and "pleasure seeking".
The complex symbolic transformations required to read and write are also bent in the simultaneous resonance of television watching. Reading demands intense concentration: the electronic media ask only open receptiveness. According to Marie Winn (1977), a predisposition to "openness" (the opposite of focal concentration) acquired through years of TV viewing, has likely harmed viewers' ability to concentrate, to read, to write clearly -- in short, to demonstrate any of the verbal skills a literate society requires.

Educational research on television watching and academic achievement has been conducted since television first became available. The findings from these studies are weak and contradictory but later studies seemed to support an inverse relationship. Greenstein (1954) reported that children in TV homes had higher oral composition grades than children in homes which did not have TV. He does not mention the respective socio-economic status of the TV and non-TV homes. Ridder (1963) could find no significant difference between academic achievement and the amount of television watched, but Thompson (1964) reported that less intelligent, lower achieving children tended to watch more television. More recently, Perney (1976) reported that the total amount of television watched correlated negatively (−.13, −.20) with quantitative scores and positively (0.12, 0.20) with verbal scores for male and female kindergarten children.
Gadberry (1977) reported that "increased television viewing caused lower school grades" and that effort grades (the degree to which academic grades represented student ability) were generally decreased by total viewing regardless of content. The relationship between children's academic achievement and television watching does not appear to be clear and strong; this may be partially due to the emphasis placed on program content, instead of the process of television watching. Research on adult communication abilities and television watching is non-existent. Television is, nonetheless, blamed for many societal ills.

Jerzy Kosinski describes a nation of videoots -- groups of solitary individuals watching their private, remote-controlled TV sets and not engaged in any human interaction (Sohn, 1975). Kosinski is convinced "that human contact is primarily determined by human intercourse -- by the relationship of one being with another being. So anything which is detrimental to that interaction; anything which delays it, makes it more uneasy, or creates a state of apprehension, is detrimental to the growing of society." (emphasis added).

As Edmunds & Strick (1977) have shown, television is an oligopolistic, vertically integrated industry. The oligopolistic nature of television has affected the program content which is offered on this medium, and
has resulted in a lack of diversity in program types, homogeneity in network program scheduling, and relative programming stability across seasons.

These factors of television serve to reinforce the cultural status quo and thereby discourage cultural growth and change. Reading, writing and conversation can stimulate growth because these media allow readers, writers and speakers a degree of control over communication. The only choice a television viewer can make is the choice to turn the television "on" or "off." Because of the similarity of television content across stations, "turning the channel" is not a real choice.

Marie Winn, in her book, *The Plug-in Drug* (1977), blamed television for the decline in literacy and the resulting decline in math and English college board scores. She stated that parents' need for quiet caused them to use the television as an amusing babysitter for their children. Recent Canadian research (Fouts, 1977) indicated that 79% of parents in the study "occasionally" or "often" encourage their children to watch television.

Until the advent of television, the pre-literate child seldom had access to the symbolic representations of reality (fantasy) without the aid of an adult who was willing to read or tell stories to the youngster. When pre-television children did enter fantasy worlds, they typically had grown-up escorts to interpret, explain
and occasionally, comfort them. Through TV, very young children enter into a secondary world of incorporeal people and intangible things, often unaccompanied by adult guardians.

Children need the opportunity for trying out "successive approximations" for language development (Britton, 1972; Moffett, 1968; Martin, 1976). A child will attempt a sound or a word orally, test it out to see if it brings the desired response, and continue to revise until the desired effect has been achieved. To successfully develop verbal skills, children must have feedback on their successive approximations. That necessary feedback is not forthcoming in homes where children are left to watch television in isolation.

A parent who tells a child to 'go away, watch television and be quiet' may be reinforcing that child to foster communication apprehension. Harried parents, instead of responding to a child's demands for learning, frequently use the TV set as a babysitter, and thereby force the child to become the passive recipient of TV-controlled electronic messages. By watching instead of practising the control of information and language expression, a child's natural curiosity about symbol manipulation may be stilled.

As Rivers and Schramm (1968) stated on p.1, a child
may employ the "fraction of selection" and choose to watch rather than to act.

Winn (1977) writes of "lazy readers" who have shifted their style of reading to a superficial, impatient, vague scanning of a page and discusses the rising popularity of "non-books." Non-books are arranged to parallel the lazy readers' reading style—they have no story or carefully developed argument; they provide just enough information or visually pleasing material for scanning and avoid the old sequential style of reading with its demand for focused thinking, concentration and inner visualization. Non-books such as the Guinness Book of World Records, The Book of Lists and A Hundred and One Uses of a Dead Cat, have demonstrated their popularity in the best-seller lists and library circulations. Such books seem to parallel TV's role as the provider of the instant answer for people with limited attention spans.

Children who live in "constant television households" where the TV is on during dinner as well as in the afternoon and evening, watch more television, do less well in school, and are more likely to read below their grade level than children from non-constant television households (Medrich, 1979). Since reading and writing are typically acquired concurrently, the children in Medrich's study may also have written less
well than their non-constant television viewing classmates.

Because heavy television viewing children tend to communicate less well than children who have not watched television heavily, the former might have received very negative feedback from their teachers on their reading, writing and analytical abilities (Martin, 1976). The negativity might then cause these students to lose confidence in their own competence as communicators. The loss of confidence might inspire fear about further communication attempts and this resultant communication apprehension might reduce the chances of a student attempting subsequent successive approximations to polish his or her communication skills. Communication apprehension could therefore trap a student with poor communication skills into not trying to improve these skills and hence suffer continued negative feedback from parents, teachers, peers and employers. High communication apprehensives might therefore prefer to interact with electronic others (TV) who will not offer negative feedback, rather than risk communication failure.

Research which could indicate causality between communication apprehension and television centrality would be difficult to do. An ethnological study with the researcher constantly present with a family to observe and record communication behaviours might begin
to yield such data. But even ethnological studies can be criticized for the inherent disruption of the family's 'normal' life by the presence of a scientific observer. The evidence which has been reviewed suggests a model of the CA/television centrality interaction which could be tested on a population of young adults.

6. MODEL: CONNECTIONS BETWEEN TELEVISION CENTRALITY AND COMMUNICATION APPREHENSION

The preceding literature review, leads to the development of a model which may illustrate the interaction between a central involvement with television watching (television centrality) and communication apprehension.

Adults, who as children, spent a significant proportion of their time as passive recipients of one-way electronic message transmission may have had little opportunity to successively approximate effective communication behaviour. The lack of opportunity for attempted communication, subsequent revision, and communication skill mastery may have resulted in lower quality communication abilities (both written and oral) for persons who are highly involved with watching television (television centrality).

The lower communication skill levels that these persons might have acquired could have resulted in negative feedback about their communication behaviour
from parents, peers, teachers, and later, employers. The negative feedback these individuals received might inhibit further attempts at improving communication skills since written and oral communication would be perceived as opportunities for punishment and not reward. This perception of communication as punishment might be generalized to become written and oral communication apprehension.

Although cause and effect have not been conclusively established, the suggested connections between CA and television centrality are illustrated in the model below:

```
HIGH
TELEVISION CENTRALITY

HIGH
COMMUNICATION
APPREHENSION

LOW
COMMUNICATION
SKILLS

NEGATIVE OR
INADEQUATE
FEEDBACK
```

The Cycle of Television Centrality and Communication Apprehension

The relationship between high television involvement and low reading skills has been documented in popular and academic writings (Winn, 1977). "There is
no question in the minds of educators that a student who cannot read with true comprehension will never learn to write well." The communication skills of reading and writing are inextricably connected. Robinson (1980), Barzun (1978) and Medrich (1979) have shown that reading has declined as television watching has increased. Unfortunately, little effective research has been done to compare oral and written communication abilities and television watching. Martin (1976), Warters (1981), and Van de Weghe (1981) all discuss the negative feedback which students with poor communication skills receive. McCroskey (1977) has indicated that communication apprehension may be caused by inadequate feedback from significant others when communication skills are initially being tested.

The relationship which still needs to be tested is that between communication apprehension and television involvement (centrality). This leads to a testable hypothesis:

**Hypothesis:** There will be a positive relationship between apprehension (as indicated by scores on the PRCA and WAT) and television involvement (as indicated by the score on the Television Centrality Index (to be developed).

Chapter 2 will discuss the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA), the Writing Apprehension Test (WAT), the construction of the Television
Centrality Index, and the method which was used to test the above Hypothesis.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

1. PARTICIPANTS

One hundred and sixteen undergraduate community college students of St. Clair College, Thames Campus, Chatham, Ontario participated in this study. The students were in the first and second years of two year Business, Secretarial and Mental Retardation Counsellor programs.

The students had all had some written and oral communication skills training as part of their college academic programs, and were recruited as volunteers during regular communication classes. Individual feedback on the results of the questionnaire used to gather information for this study was given to all participants who requested it. Those who did not wish to receive feedback on their performance were told they could remain anonymous. Students who did wish to receive feedback were asked to indicate their names on the questionnaires. All students who were invited to participate in this study did so.
Students took fifteen to twenty minutes to respond to the communications survey questionnaire, and after all members of the class had finished their responses, I discussed the purpose of the study and the hypothesis which was being tested.

2. INSTRUMENTS

A questionnaire was prepared which consisted of 95 statements to which respondents were asked to indicate agreement or disagreement on a five point scale. These 95 statements consisted of 25 items from the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, 20 items from the Writing Apprehension Test, 16 items from the Social Desirability scale from Jackson's PRF-E (Jackson, 1970, 1974) and 34 items designed to measure the degree of involvement with TV, or "television centrality."

Students were also asked to provide information on nine additional variables (age, sex, years of formal schooling, program, year of program, grade point average, and hours spent watching television, reading, and interacting with others. The total questionnaire, therefore had 104 items. The various scales were combined and the individual items re-organized to avoid a response set of true responses (see Appendix A).
2 (a) PRCA--Personal Report of Communication Apprehension

The PRCA was developed by McCroskey (1970) and has been revealed to be a consistently valid and reliable measure of communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1977, 1978). The sample means have consistently ranged between 73 and 75 (possible score range, 25-125; hypothetical midpoint = 75). The standard deviation has ranged between 13 and 15. Subjects who score above 88 (one standard deviation above the mean) are considered to have high CA. Those scoring below 58 (one standard deviation below the typical mean) are said to have low CA. Internal reliability estimates for the scale have ranged from .92 to .96; test-retest reliability over a seven week period was .82 (McCroskey, 1978). Daly (1978) assessed the PRCA as the most encompassing instrument of the 14 self-reports of social-communicative anxiety he studied.

The PRCA was used to test oral communication apprehension and is shown in Figure 1 below. [The scoring instructions were not included in the Communication Survey questionnaire used in this study.]
Figure 1:

Personal Report of Communication Apprehension

DIRECTIONS: This instrument is composed of twenty-five statements concerning feelings about communicating with other people. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Are Undecided, (4) Disagree, or (5) Strongly Disagree with each statement. There are no right or wrong answers. Work quickly, just record your first impression.

SA A UN S SD

1. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance I feel very nervous. 1 2 3 4 5

2. I have no fear of facing an audience. 1 2 3 4 5

3. I talk less because I'm shy. 1 2 3 4 5

4. I look forward to expressing my opinions at meetings. 1 2 3 4 5

5. I am afraid to express myself in a group. 1 2 3 4 5

6. I look forward to an opportunity to speak in public. 1 2 3 4 5

7. I find the prospect of speaking mildly pleasant. 1 2 3 4 5

8. When communicating, my posture feels strained and unnatural. 1 2 3 4 5

9. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions. 1 2 3 4 5

10. Although I talk fluently with friends I am at a loss for words on a platform. 1 2 3 4 5
11. I have no fear about expressing myself in a group.

12. My hands tremble when I try to handle objects on the platform.

13. I always avoid speaking in public if possible.

14. I feel that I am more fluent when talking to people than most other people are.

15. I am fearful and tense all the while I am speaking before a group of people.

16. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I speak before an audience.

17. I like to get involved in group discussions.

18. Although I am nervous just before getting up, I soon forget my fears and enjoy the experience.

19. Conversing with people who hold positions of authority causes me to be fearful and tense.

20. I dislike to use my body and voice expressively.

21. I feel relaxed and comfortable while speaking.

22. I feel self-conscious when I am called upon to answer a question or give an opinion in class.

23. I face the prospect of making a speech with complete confidence.

24. I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.

25. I would enjoy presenting a speech on a local television show.
SCORING

To compute your PRCA score, follow these 3 steps.

1. Add up your scores for items 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22 and 24.

2. Add up your scores for items 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 14, 17, 18, 21, 23, and 25.

3. Complete the following formula:

   \[ \text{PRCA Score} = 84 - (\text{total from step 1}) + (\text{total from step 2}) \]
2. (b). WAT—Writing Apprehension Test

The 20-item WAT was developed by Daly and Miller (1975) and is also a reliable and valid measurement of writing apprehension. Because of the difficulty encountered by researchers who attempt to consistently measure writing quality, not as much research has been done with this instrument.

McCroskey, Daly; Richmond & Falcione (1977) reported estimated internal reliability of .94 to .96 when they administered the WAT to teachers and federal employees. They observed correlations between the PRCA and WAT of .34 to .39. Powers, Cook & Meyer (1979) reported a mean on the WAT of 72.83 for a college student population. They used a 26-item WAT, however.

The WAT was used to test writing apprehension and is shown in Figure 2 below. (The scoring instructions were not included in the Communication Survey Questionnaire used in this research.)
Figure 2:
Writing Apprehension Test

DIRECTIONS: Below are a series of statements about writing. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applied to you by marking whether you (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Are Uncertain, (4) Disagree, or (5) Strongly Disagree with the statement. While some of these statements may seem repetitious, take your time and try to be as honest as possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>UN</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I avoid writing.
2. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated.
3. I look forward to writing down my ideas.
4. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition.
5. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time.
6. I would enjoy submitting my writing to magazines for evaluation and publication.
7. I like to write my ideas down.
8. I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing.
9. I like to have my friends read what I have written.
10. I'm nervous about writing.
11. People seem to enjoy what I write.
12. I enjoy writing.
13. I never seem to be able to clearly write down my ideas.
14. Writing is a lot of fun.
15. I like seeing my thoughts on paper. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience. 1 2 3 4 5
17. It's easy for me to write good compositions. 1 2 3 4 5
18. I don't think I write as well as most other people. 1 2 3 4 5
19. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated. 1 2 3 4 5
20. I'm no good at writing. 1 2 3 4 5

SCORING
To compute your WAT score, follow these 3 steps.
1. Add up your scores for items 1, 4, 5, 10, 13, 18, 19, and 20.
2. Add up your scores for items 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, and 17.
3. Complete the following formula:
   WAT Score = 48 - (total from step 1) + (total from step 2)
2 (c) Social Desirability

The 16-item Social Desirability scale from Jackson's Personality Research Form-E was included as the scale for comparison with the Television Centrality Index, to be developed. This scale was developed by Jackson (1974) and is one of 24 scales designed to comprehensively sample the entire domain of normal personality.

High scorers on the Social Desirability scale would describe themselves in terms judged as desirable, consciously or unconsciously, accurately or inaccurately, and would present a favourable picture of themselves in responses to personality statements. Jackson has previously tested this scale on college students and found it to be reliable at the .68 level (Jackson, 1974). This scale can, therefore, also be used as a check to insure that a subject is not just responding to all items in the most socially desirable, but perhaps untruthful way. This is the reason it was included in this study.

The Social Desirability Scale is shown in Figure 3 below. (The keyed directions were not included in the Communications Survey questionnaire.)
Figure 3:

PERSONALITY RESEARCH FORM 'E'

Jackson 1974 Social Desirability Scale*

1. I am quite able to make correct decisions on difficult questions. T F
2. I am never able to do things as well as I should. T F
3. My life is full of interesting activities. T F
4. I believe people tell lies any time it is to their advantage. T F
5. If someone gave me too much change I would tell him. T F
6. I would be willing to do something a little unfair to get something that was important to me. T F
7. I get along with people at parties quite well. T F
8. I did many very bad things as a child. T F
9. I am glad I grew up the way I did. T F
10. I often question whether life is worthwhile. T F
11. I am always prepared to do what is expected of me. T F
12. My daily life includes many activities I dislike. T F
13. I am one of the lucky people who could talk with my parents about my problems. T F
14. Many things make me feel uneasy. T F
15. I am careful to plan for my distant goals. T F
16. I find it very difficult to concentrate. T F

*Underlined responses indicate keyed direction to indicate Social Desirability.
2 (d) Television Centrality Index

Comstock (1975) and Gerbner and Gross (1976) have indicated their sensitivity to the problem of subjects under-reporting their television watching when asked to supply TV exposure times. The author therefore decided to construct an index of television involvement which would offer a more clear and complete picture of the centrality of television in a person's life. Persons who have high scores on the Televisión Centrality Index would be very involved with television. That is, television would play an important or central role in their lives.

Gerbner and Gross (1976) refer to TV as the established religion of the industrial order and the degree of involvement with religion is often central to a person's personality and world view. They found that high television watchers typically gave disproportionately higher "television answers" to questions about the percentage of people employed in law enforcement, the chances of being involved in violence, and the trustworthiness of others.

High TV watchers may be generally more fearful and that fear may include communication apprehension.

Following the rational empirical method of test construction suggested by Jackson (1974) and Martin Morf (1977), the author wrote 34 items in statement format which would indicate high television involvement.
These items were written to reflect the descriptions of high TV watchers which were offered by Glynne (1956), Kosinski (Sohn, 1975), Winn 1977) and Postman (1979). The statements were then edited to yield 21 agree-keyed items and 13 disagree-keyed items, for a scale total of 34 items.

This preliminary scale was embedded in the "Communications Survey" which also included the PRCA, WAT and PRF FORM-E Social Desirability scales. Data were then obtained from 116 community college students and analyzed to reveal information on scale and item properties.

After the data were collected, the TV Centrality Index was analyzed to discover the co-efficient alpha, or reliability, of the test. Co-efficient alpha measures the degree to which this scale measures television centrality consistently. The higher the alpha score, the more statistically reliable the test.

As Jackson (1974) recommends, the endorsement proportions of the individual items were then evaluated to eliminate those items whose endorsement proportions were too extreme. Items which inspire an overly high proportion of agreement or disagreement do not discriminate well between respondents and are, therefore, unsuitable for inclusion in a valid and reliable scale. A very liberal endorsement proportion was used to screen variables. Items which were endorsed by more than 95% or less than 5% of the
respondents, were considered unacceptable.

The individual scale items of the Television Centrality Index were then analyzed to reveal their correlations with the Television Centrality Index itself, and with the other scales—Social Desirability, Writing Apprehension Test and Personal Report of Communication Apprehension. To be considered acceptable, an item must have correlated more highly with the Television Centrality Index than with the other scales (SD, WAT and PRCA).

Using these procedures, the original 34 item scale was reduced to 25 items which effectively reflected Television Centrality. The original 34 scale items are shown in Table 1 below. For the results of the above-mentioned statistical procedures, please see Table 1 in Chapter 3, Results.
Figure 4:

Television Centrality Index

1. I like to watch a lot of television.  
2. Watching TV is my favourite way to learn about people.  
3. I like to have the TV on even when I'm not watching it.  
4. I wish I could get more stations on my TV.  
5. I never did my homework in front of the TV.  
6. I'll watch almost any program on television.  
7. I never fall asleep in front of the television.  
8. My parents often used to watch TV programs with me.  
9. I never eat meals in front of the TV.  
10. I like to watch TV even when I'm doing other things.  
11. I often talked to my family about issues in the programs I watched.  
12. I try to block out all other noise so I can concentrate on watching TV.  
13. There is a remote control switch on the TV I watch.  
14. I was never told to watch TV so I wouldn't disturb others.  
15. I would rather talk to people than watch TV.  
16. I never look at the TV listings.  
17. I never watched TV with my friends.  
18. There was more than one TV in my house when I was growing up.  
19. When I was a child, I would almost always rather read than watch TV.
20. I like to read about my favourite TV stars. A
21. I used to decorate my room with pictures of TV stars. A
22. Television is not important in my household. D
23. My parents used to restrict my TV watching. D
24. I like to have the TV on when I have visitors. A
25. I like everyone to be quiet while we all watch TV. A
26. I often used to rush home from school to watch my favourite TV programs. A
27. Our family never watched TV when I was a child. D
28. I have often learned to solve my own problems from solutions I've seen on TV. A
29. Instead of watching television, my parents often read to me when I was a child. D
30. There are many programs on TV that I try not to miss. A
31. Sometimes, my friends and I imitate people on TV. A
32. I never pretend that I'm the one on TV. D
33. My friends and I often discussed the TV programs we watched. A
34. Watching TV is my favourite way of relaxing. A

*Indicators of high Television Centrality—
A = Agree; D = Disagree. As shown in Appendix I, a five-point internal scale was used to measure Television Centrality.
CHAPTER III

RESULTS

1. SCALE CONSTRUCTION: Television Centrality Index

The 34 items of the Television Centrality Index were subjected to the analyses suggested by Jackson (1974) as discussed in Chapter II, METHOD. These results are shown in Table 1 below. All items in all scales were recoded to reflect the keyed direction and missing data were recoded to the scale mean.

1 (a) Endorsement Proportion

A liberal criterion of only excluding items which were endorsed by more than 95%, or less than 5% of respondents, was used. This resulted in none of the 34 items being excluded on the basis of their endorsement proportion. Endorsement proportions did vary from .05 to .92 but all were within the acceptable limits.

1 (b) Corrected Total Item Correlation

The comparison of the correlations between the individual items of the Television Centrality Index and the scales: Social Desirability, Writing Apprehension Test and Personal Report of Communication
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>$p^2$</th>
<th>$ris^3$</th>
<th>$rdy^4$</th>
<th>$twat^5$</th>
<th>$prca^6$</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I like to watch a lot of television.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Watching TV is my favourite way to learn about people.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I like to have the TV on even when I'm not watching it.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I wish I could get more stations on my TV.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I never did my homework in front of the TV.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I'll watch almost any program on television.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I never fall asleep in front of the television.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My parents, often used to watch TV programs with me.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I never eat meals in front of the TV.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I like to watch TV even when I'm doing other things.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Key1</td>
<td>p2</td>
<td>r.tp</td>
<td>r.dy</td>
<td>r.wat</td>
<td>r.pca</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I often talked to my family about issues in the programs I watched.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I try to block out all other noise so I can concentrate on watching TV.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. There is a remote control switch on the TV I watch.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I was never told to watch TV so I wouldn't disturb others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would rather talk to people than watch TV.</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I never look at the TV listings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I never watched TV with my friends.</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. There was more than one TV in my house when I was growing up.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When I was a child, I would almost always rather read than watch TV.</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I like to read about my favourite TV stars.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I used to decorate my room with pictures of TV stars.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Television is not important in my household.</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>r1</td>
<td>r2</td>
<td>r3</td>
<td>r4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>My parents used to restrict my TV watching.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I like to have the TV on when I have visitors.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I like everyone to be quiet while we all watch TV.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I often used to rush home from school to watch my favourite TV programs.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Our family never watched TV when I was a child.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I have often learned to solve my own problems from solutions I've seen on TV.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Instead of watching television, my parents often read to me when I was a child.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>There are many programs on TV that I try not to miss.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sometimes, my friends and I imitate people on TV.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I never pretend that I'm the one on TV.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>My friends and I often discussed the TV programs we watched.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>r_{is}^{3}</td>
<td>r_{dy}^{5}</td>
<td>r_{wat}^{5}</td>
<td>r_{prca}^{6}</td>
<td>Status^{7}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Watching TV is my favourite way of relaxing.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. A = Agree, D = Disagree
2. P = endorsement proportion
3. r_{is} = correlation with own scale (corrected item total correlation)
4. r_{dy} = correlation with Social Desirability
5. r_{wat} = correlation with Writing Apprehension Test
6. r_{prca} = correlation with Personal Report of Communication Apprehension
7. a = accepted
   r = rejected
Apprehension, did result in the elimination of nine items from the preliminary 34-item scale.

To be considered a good predictor of the variable which is being measured, (in this case Television Centrality), an item must be correlated more highly with its own scale than with the other scales. Assessment of the corrected item total correlation generated by SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) (Nie, et al., 1975), in comparison with correlations with the three other scales, revealed five items which should be eliminated. Items 30, 32, 51, 56, 91 all had lower correlations with the Television Centrality Index than with Social Desirability (30); Social Desirability, WAT and PRCA (32); WAT (51); Social Desirability and WAT (56); and PRCA (91).

Four more items had corrected item total correlations of less than .30 and these were also eliminated to increase the overall reliability of the scale. Items 22, 30, 34, 47 having r_{is} of .27, .22, .14 and .27 were therefore dropped from the Television Centrality Index. This resulted in a 25 item scale to measure television centrality.

1 (c) Reliability

Co-efficient alpha is an index of the reliability of a test. An alpha score measures the degree to
which a scale measures something consistently. The 34-item Television Centrality Index had a reliability score calculated through co-efficient alpha, of .87530. After the nine items which had low correlations with their own scale were dropped from the Television Centrality Index, the co-efficient alpha (or reliability) score increased to .89188. This is an indicator of high reliability for a 25-item scale.

1(d) Descriptive Statistics

As Morf (1977) points out, "a useful scale is one on which the mean scale score is close to the midpoint of the range of possible scale scores." This is important because it can lead to the expectation that a normal curve exists to describe the respondents' scores. This assumption implies that the majority of individuals in a population will obtain scores close to the midpoint and that the scale discriminates between individual respondents scores to the greatest possible extent.

The possible range of scores on the revised Television Centrality Index is 25-125. The mean score for all 116 respondents is 69.33. The minimum score was 32.00; the maximum score was 103.00; the standard deviation was 14.86. This wide standard deviation also implies that the Television Centrality Index discriminates well between individual respondents.
1 (e) TVC Index Factor Analysis

A varimax rotated factor analysis was performed on the 34-item Television Centrality Index to see if other information could be gleaned about TVC. The Principal Components Solution offered in SPSS resulted in extraction of 11 factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. As shown in Table 2, the first factor (eigenvalue = 7.70) accounts for 22.6 percent of the variance in responses to TVC. The items which loaded on this factor seem to indicate a focal concentration on television, to the exclusion of environmental influences. It has therefore been labelled "cynosure".

There is a very marked drop-off in the importance of the next factors. Factor 2 has an eigenvalue of only 2.06 and accounts for 6.1 percent of the variance. The items which loaded on this particular factor also illustrate the importance of TV in respondents' lives. These items seem to illustrate a "dependence" on television content for relaxation, a dependence which spills over from interest in the program content, to interest in the actors themselves.

The third factor (eigenvalue = 1.99, percent of variance = 5.8) seems to illustrate the "ambient" use of television as an environmental companion.

The fourth factor (eigenvalue = 1.80, percent of variance = 5.3) may illustrate a "social monitoring" use for television content.
Table 2

VARIMAX ROTATED PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS SOLUTION:
Television Centrality Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1 (Cynosure)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (Dependence)</th>
<th>Factor 3 (Ambience)</th>
<th>Factor 4 (Social Monitor)</th>
<th>Factor 5 (Non-Controlled Substance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I try to block out all other noise so I can concentrate on watching TV.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like everyone to be quiet while we all watch TV.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching TV is my favourite way to learn about people.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'll watch almost any program on TV.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to watch a lot of television.</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish I could get more stations on my TV.</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to read about my favourite TV stars.</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 cont'd-2

<p>| | Factors |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 (Cynosure) | 2 (Dependence) | 3 (Ambience) | 4 (Social Monitor) | 5 (Non-Controlled Substance) |
| There are many programs on TV I try not to miss. | .41 | .54 | -.10 | .26 | .12 |
| Watching TV is my favourite way of relaxing. | .38 | .52 | .29 | .29 | -.02 |
| I like to have the TV on even when I'm not watching it. | .08 | .12 | .77 | .07 | .10 |
| I like to watch TV even when I'm doing other things. | .14 | .25 | .66 | .20 | .08 |
| I like to have the TV on when I have visitors. | .23 | .07 | .64 | .03 | .26 |
| I never watched TV with my friends. | .07 | .20 | .06 | .75 | .08 |
| I never look at the TV listings. | .22 | .20 | -.01 | .72 | -.02 |
| I never fall asleep in front of the television. | -.14 | .20 | .17 | .57 | -.02 |
| My friends and I often discussed the TV programs we watched. | .19 | .10 | .10 | .50 | .19 |
| Instead of watching television, my parents often read to me as a child. | .12 | -.02 | .18 | -.08 | .72 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (Cynosure)</th>
<th>2 (Dependence)</th>
<th>3 (Ambience)</th>
<th>4 (Social Monitor)</th>
<th>5 (Non-Controlled Substance)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our family never watched TV when I was a child.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My parents used to restrict my TV watching.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative percent of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The items which loaded on Factor 5 seem to illustrate the use of television as a "Non-controlled substance" (eigenvalue=1.64, per cent of variance=4.8).

It is interesting to note that extraction of the first eleven factors still accounted for only 66.3 per cent of the variance in television centrality. This shows that TVC is a multi-dimensional concept. Further discussion of these results is offered in Chapter IV, Discussion.
2. OTHER INSTRUMENT STATISTICS

In this study of 116 community college students, the WAT scale had a coefficient alpha of .93427. The mean score (out of a possible range of 20-100) was 54.55. The minimum score was 20; the maximum score was 92; and there was a standard deviation of 14.79.

The mean PRCA score was 75.14 with a range from 37.00 to 120.00 out of a possible score of 25-125. The standard deviation PRCA was 19.25. The PRCA had a coefficient alpha score of .904760 for this particular study.

These PRCA and WAT statistics are consistent with those discussed in Chapter 1 and reported in McCroskey (1978).

Scores on the Social Desirability scale ranged from 32.00 to 76.00 out of a possible 16-80. The mean was 59.00 and the standard deviation was 7.73.

3. HYPOTHESIS CONFIRMATION

In Chapter I, a hypothesis was proposed that there would be a positive relationship between written and oral communication apprehension and television centrality. This hypothesis has been confirmed.
As shown in Table 3 below, a moderate positive relationship exists between respondents' scores on the PRCA, the WAT and the Television Centrality Index. This moderate positive relationship is highly statistically significant and could not have happened by chance.

The Pearson product-moment correlational procedure, available in SPSS, was used to analyze the relationships between these variables. The PRCA was found to have a .38 correlation with television centrality, significant at the p=.001 level. This shows that respondents involved with television did indeed tend to be apprehensive about oral communication.

The relationship between writing apprehension and television is slightly less pronounced, but also presents a highly statistically significant moderate positive correlational relationship of .34, p=.001.

As expected, the WAT and PRCA were found to have an inter-correlational relationship of .48, p=.001. Although this correlation coefficient is higher than those between the PRCA, WAT and Television Centrality Index, it is nonetheless still evident that the PRCA and WAT measure different forms of communication anxiety.

The correlations between Social Desirability, oral and written communication-apprehension, and television centrality were all found to be negative.
### Table 3

Correlation Matrix of PRCA\(^1\), WAT\(^2\), TVC\(^3\), and SDy\(^4\)  
(N=116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>WAT</th>
<th>PRCA</th>
<th>TVC</th>
<th>SDy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WAT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRCA</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVC</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDy</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher scores on the following scales indicate higher levels of oral communication apprehension, writing apprehension, television centrality and social desirability.

1. Personal Report of Communication Apprehension  
2. Writing Apprehension Test  
3. Television Centrality Index  
4. Social Desirability  

*p* level of statistical significance, one-tailed test
The strongest negative relationship was found between responses on the Social Desirability scale and those on the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension, namely -.43, p=.001. This indicates that respondents considered apprehension about oral communication to be more undesirable than either apprehension about writing or involvement with television. The second strongest negative relationship is between WAT and SDy: -.39, p=.001. Respondents therefore found apprehension about writing to be less undesirable than apprehension about oral communication. The relationship between SDy and television centrality was found to be correlated as -.24, p=.004. Having a heavy involvement with television was therefore considered to be less undesirable than feeling apprehensive about oral or written communication. Although this relationship is the weakest of the three, it is nonetheless highly statistically significant and also unlikely to have occurred by chance. Further evidence for the hypothesis confirmation is discussed in sections 4(a), 4(b), 5(a) and 5(b).
OTHER RESULTS

Aside from the confirmation of the Hypothesis proposed in Chapter 1, several other interesting patterns emerged from analysis of the data in this study. Distinct differences were found in scores on the Television Centrality Index, the Writing Apprehension Test and the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension when these scores were broken down by program, sex and year.

4 (a) WAT, PRCA, TVC -- Program Differences

As Table 4 below indicates, there are significant differences among the PRCA and TVC scores of respondents in the Business, Secretarial and Mental Retardation Counsellor programs. The Business students had the lowest scores on the PRCA, the indicator of oral communication apprehension, of the three groups. The Secretarial students had a mean score of almost 8 points higher than the Business students; the Mental Retardation Counsellor students had a mean score of almost 13.5 points higher than the Business students. The differences between these scores are highly statistically significant.

As Table 4 indicates, the Business students mean PRCA score was slightly below the mean for all 116
Table 4

Breakdown of WAT, PRCA, TVC Mean Scores By Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>WAT1</th>
<th>PRCA2</th>
<th>TVC3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Business</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56.36</td>
<td>71.00</td>
<td>67.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Secretarial</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.20</td>
<td>78.90</td>
<td>68.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mental Retardation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.42</td>
<td>84.46</td>
<td>75.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>75.15</td>
<td>69.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. $F = 2.45$ 2, 115df, $p = .09$ (not significant)
2. $F = 5.22$ 2, 115df, $p = .007$
3. $F = 3.10$ 2, 115df, $p = .05$
respondents; the mean scores for the Secretarial and Mental Retardation Counsellor students was above the mean, but not in the high CA category (all respondents scoring more than one standard deviation above the mean).

The Business students also had the lowest mean score on the Television Centrality Index in comparison with the other two groups (67.35), and the Mental Retardation Counsellor students had a mean score of (75.88), almost 7 points above the mean score for all 116 respondents. The difference between these scores was found to be significant at the p=.05 level.

An insignificant but interesting difference in WAT scores was found between the three groups. The Secretarial students reported the least apprehension about written communication with a mean WAT score of (48.20), over 5 points below the mean for all 116 respondents. The Mental Retardation Counsellor and the Business students showed mean scores at and slightly above the mean respectively.

4(b) WAT, PRCA, TVC -- Sex Differences

As shown in Table 5, interesting sex differences were also found regarding mean scores on the PRCA and
Table 5

Breakdown of WAT, PRCA and TVC Mean Scores by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>WAT³</th>
<th>PRCA¹</th>
<th>TVC²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.77</td>
<td>70.85</td>
<td>66.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55.03</td>
<td>79.25</td>
<td>71.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>75.15</td>
<td>69.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. $F = 9.25$, 1, 115df, $p = .003$

2. $F = 2.91$, 1, 115df, $p = .09$ (not significant)

3. $F = .20$, 1, 115df, $p = .66$ (not significant)
TVC. Males had a mean score of 66.34 and females, 71.15 on the Television Centrality Index. This difference was statistically significant only at the p=.09 level. A more marked distinction occurred between the mean score for males (70.85) and for females (79.25) on the PRCA. This difference of almost 9 points higher for females was significant at the p=.01 level. Males and females did not have significantly different scores on the Writing Apprehension Test.

4(c) WAT, PRCA, TVC -- Year Differences

Table 6 illustrates that Second Year Business and Secretarial students were generally less apprehensive about oral and written communication and less involved with television, than were the First Year students in Business, Secretarial and Mental Retardation Counsellor programs. These differences in mean scores were significant at the p=.05 level for the TVC scores and at the p=.01 level for the PRCA scores. Although WAT scores were not statistically significantly different, the mean score for Second Year respondents was lower than that for First Year respondents.
Table 6

Breakdown of WAT, PRCA and TVC Mean Scores by Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>WAT</th>
<th>PRCA</th>
<th>TVC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56.76</td>
<td>79.54</td>
<td>73.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>53.10</td>
<td>72.26</td>
<td>66.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>54.55</td>
<td>75.15</td>
<td>69.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. $F = 4.09$ 1, 115df, $p = .05$
2. $F = 5.17$ 1, 115df, $p = .02$
3. $F = 1.72$ 1, 115df, $p = .19$ (not significant)
5(a) WAT, PRCA, TVC and Demographic/Behavioural Variables: Correlations

A correlation matrix was produced using the Pearson CORR procedure available in SPSS to find the relationship between scores on the WAT, PRCA, Television Centrality Index (TVC) and the Social Desirability Scale and the information obtained on the demographic/behavioural variables (see Table 7).

Age was almost considered a constant in this study. Although ages of respondents ranged from 17 to 55, 91 of the 116 respondents were clustered in the 19-21 year age categories. It is interesting to see a moderate but highly statistically significant negative correlation between age and TVC. Older respondents tended to be less involved with television than younger respondents.
Table 7

Correlation Matrix of WAT, PRCA, TVC and SDy Mean Scores with Demographic/Behavioural Variables (N=116)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>WAT</th>
<th>PRCA</th>
<th>TVC</th>
<th>SDy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE1</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.17</td>
<td>p=.15</td>
<td>p=.001*</td>
<td>p=.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC2</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.06</td>
<td>p=.08</td>
<td>p=.12</td>
<td>p=.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA3</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.19</td>
<td>p=.36</td>
<td>p=.32</td>
<td>p=.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVHRS4</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.001*</td>
<td>p=.001*</td>
<td>p=.001*</td>
<td>p=.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READHRS5</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.05*</td>
<td>p=.33</td>
<td>p=.05*</td>
<td>p=.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERHRS6</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p=.31</td>
<td>p=.27</td>
<td>p=.28</td>
<td>p=.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Age in years
2. Years of Education
3. Grade Point Average (A=4, D=1)
4. Average number of hours spent watching TV, per day
5. Average number of hours spent reading, per day
6. Average number of hours spent interacting with people, per day.

* Statistically significant (t-test, one-tailed)
A highly statistically significant correlation of moderate strength exists between WAT and the PRCA, and the hours spent watching television per day. This further confirms the Hypothesis expressed in Chapter 1. Communication apprehensive respondents tend to spend more time watching television than those who do not have oral and written CA. The scores on the Television Centrality Index are strongly correlated with the hours of TV watched per day, in a statistically significant relationship. A slight negative relationship was shown between hours of television watched and the score on the Social Desirability scale.

A slight negative correlation exists between the hours spent reading per day and scores on WAT. Scores on TVC also have a statistically significant slight negative relationship with the hours spent reading per day.

The amount of time that respondents spent
interacting with other persons was not correlated with any of the criterion variables WAT, PRCA, TVC or SDy.

5 (b) **WAT, PRCA, TVC and Demographic/Behavioural Variables: Discriminant Function Analyses**

To more clearly illustrate the relationships between television centrality, communication apprehension (PRCA and WAT), social desirability, sex and the number of hours spent reading, watching television and interacting with others, discriminant function analyses were performed. Respondents were divided into high and low groups according to their WAT, PRCA and TVC scores. For each scale, respondents who scored more than one standard deviation above the mean were classed as 'high'; those scoring more than one standard deviation below the mean were classed as 'low', on that particular scale. The respondents who scored within one standard deviation above or below the mean on the WAT, PRCA and TVC were not included in these analyses.

A discriminant function analysis was performed to explain the contrast in scores between low oral communication apprehensives (PRCA=25-55, N=20) and high oral communication apprehensives (PRCA=94-125, N=20) on the behavioural/demographic variables TVHRS, READHRS, INTERHRS, Grade Point Average, Sex, WAT, SDy and TVC. Four variables met the stepwise criterion of an F-level
to stay at 1.0. An equation was generated which used WAT, Sex, SDy and TVC scores to predict membership in 'high' or 'low' PRCA groups. Using this equation, 80 per cent of the respondents were correctly classified as either 'high' or 'low' PRCA. High oral communication apprehensives were more likely to be apprehensive about writing, female, perceive themselves as less socially desirable, and have television play a more central role in their lives than those respondents who had low scores on PRCA. As shown in Table 8, high scorers on PRCA also report spending more hours watching television than those who have low PRCA scores.

It is interesting to note that there is no significant difference between the two groups in the amount of time spent reading or interacting with other people. The grade point averages were also considered in all the discriminant function analyses, but did not predict significant differences between high and low scorers on any of the three scales (PRCA, WAT, TVC).

Table 9 illustrates the differences in respondents' scores on the demographic/behavioural variables when the respondents are grouped according to low (20-41, N=23) and high (69-100, N=23) WAT scores. When the equation was used which considered PRCA, READHRS, SDy, TVHRS and Sex to predict high or low WAT scores, 73.91 per cent of respondents were correctly classified. Respondents who
### Table 8

**Discriminant Function Analysis on Respondents Grouped by PRCA Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TV HRS</th>
<th>READ HRS</th>
<th>INTER HRS</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>WAT</th>
<th>TVC</th>
<th>SD$_y$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low PRCA (25-55) N = 20</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>45.05</td>
<td>61.05</td>
<td>60.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High PRCA (94-125) N = 20</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>66.45</td>
<td>77.05</td>
<td>51.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance of Difference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>.003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Not Significant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9

Discriminant Function Analysis on Respondents Grouped by WAT Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TV HRS</th>
<th>READ HRS</th>
<th>INTER HRS</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>PRCA</th>
<th>TVC</th>
<th>SD_y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low WAT (0-41) N = 23</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>64.22</td>
<td>63.43</td>
<td>60.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High WAT (69-100) N = 23</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>8.91</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>88.13</td>
<td>77.43</td>
<td>51.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Difference .003
*Not Significant

* .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TV HRS</th>
<th>READ HRS</th>
<th>INTER HRS</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>WAT</th>
<th>PRCA</th>
<th>SD_y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low TVC (25-54) N = 17</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>62.76</td>
<td>58.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High TVC (82-170) N = 22</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>62.23</td>
<td>87.09</td>
<td>52.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance of Difference
*Not Significant
have high WAT scores also tend to have high PRCA scores, to spend less time reading, to perceive themselves as less socially desirable, to spend more time watching television, and to be female. As shown in Table 9, high WAT scorers also tend to score higher on TVC.

To discriminate between high and low TVC groups, an equation was generated which correctly classified 92.31 percent of respondents by considering TVHRS, PRCA, WAT and READHRS scores. As shown in Table 10, respondents with high scores on the Television Centrality Index tend to watch more hours of television, to be more apprehensive about both oral and written communication, and tend to spend less time reading than do those who have low TVC scores. As Table 10 illustrates, high TVC scorers also tend to be female and to perceive themselves as less socially desirable than low TVC scorers.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This study has been concerned with the interaction between television centrality (involvement with television) and oral and written communication apprehension. It was hypothesized in Chapter I that a positive relationship would be shown between television centrality and oral and written CA (as defined by scores on the WAT and PRCA). The results of the survey conducted with 116 first and second year community college students do, indeed, attest to a positive relationship between these variables.

1. TELEVISION CENTRALITY INDEX

Correlations of moderate strength were evident between TVC, WAT and PRCA and these relationships were clarified by the discriminant function analysis reported in Chapter III (Table 10). Respondents in whose lives television played a central role were more apprehensive about writing and speaking than respondents who were less involved with television. Although a cause-and-effect relationship between variables cannot be proven in a correlational study, these findings would seem to
confirm the writings of television "alarmists" such as Glynne (1973), Winn (1977) and Kosinski (Sohn, 1976). The Television Centrality Index which was constructed for this study, was shown to be an effective and reliable instrument to assess the importance of TV in respondents' lives. Further research must be done to assess its validity, however. The TCI represents a distinct contribution to the field of television research and should be used in further studies to explore the multi-dimensionality of the television centrality construct.

It is interesting to note the interaction between individual items on the TCI and the two measures of communication apprehension. Item 2 in Table 1, "Watching TV is my favourite way to learn about people", correlated with both the WAT and the PRCA at .30. This would seem to confirm that communication apprehensives prefer to engage with electronic others rather than risk the perceived punishment in writing or speaking to learn about people.

"There are many programs on TV that I try not to miss," was correlated with PRCA at .38. Again, the oral apprehensive is shown by this correlation and by the discriminant function analysis reported in Table 9, to be highly involved with television.
Items 15 and 19, which were 'disagree' keyed, had been recoded to reflect high television centrality answers. Item 15 should therefore be read as "I would rather watch TV than talk to people," and it is moderately strongly correlated with the indicators of apprehension, PRCA (.41) and WAT (.37). Similarly, 19 should be read to reflect a TV response (When I was a child I would almost always rather watch TV than read), and both items indicate strong past and present avoidance of personally controlled communication in favour of electronic media.

Items 20 and 21 (I like to read about my favourite TV stars; I used to decorate my room with pictures of TV stars) show the past and present extension from program content to involvement with the actors themselves. These two items also suggest rich fantasy lives among the oral communication apprehensives. This, again, would be consistent with avoidance of opportunities for interaction with real people because of the perceived punishing nature of oral communication.

The factor analysis which was performed on the 34-item Television Centrality Index clearly indicated the complex, multi-faceted role which television played in the lives of respondents. As shown in Table 2, Factor 1, labelled "cynosure", seems to indicate a focal concentration on TV in which all environmental noises are blocked.
out so that the respondent can better concentrate on video images. This is really the most important factor, accounting for 22.6 per cent of the variance. The other factors seem to reflect sub-categories of TVC.

Factor 2 was labelled "dependence" to refer to the viewers' dependence on television for entertainment. Factor 3 seemed to indicate the use of TV for ambient or environmental companionship even when visitors are present. The items which loaded on Factor 4, labelled "serial monitor" seem to express a use for television as a social entertainer which has content that must be closely monitored for a viewer and his/her friends. Factor 5 appears to reflect the use of television as a non-controlled substance, a family activity which was not subject to parental control.

Further research on the Television Centrality Index should be done using factor analytic techniques to more deeply explore the multi-dimensional nature of the television centrality construct. Further exploration could be done to discover the demographic/behavioral characteristics of TVC respondents and the specific factors on which their TVC responses loaded. Such research would clarify the function and significance of television centrality.
2. HYPOTHESIS CONFIRMATION

Table 3 illustrates the moderate strength

correlational relationship between WAT, PRCA and TVC

which confirms the hypothesis suggested in Chapter I.

It is indeed interesting that the correlation between

TVC and PRCA is slightly stronger than that between

TVC and WAT. Again this would seem to reflect a

communication preference for electronic others rather

than live people. The oral communication which would

likely be required in a human communicative interaction

might again be perceived as more-punishing than rewarding

by the individual with CA.

The importance of oral communication in our culture

is reflected in the negative correlation of moderate

strength (-.43) between the responses on the Social

Desirability Scale and those on the Personal Report of

Communication Apprehension. Fear of oral communication

was perceived as considerably more undesirable than

writing apprehension or television centrality. The

relatively weak negative correlation between TVC and

Social Desirability (-.24) suggests that involvement

with television is not perceived as socially undesirable

as oral or written communication apprehension. Television

has become so much a part of Canadian culture that heavy
involvement with TV is more easily tolerated than fear of writing or speaking. The lower correlation between WAT and SDy (-.39) than between PRCA and SDy seems to also express less intolerance for feeling apprehensive about writing than for feeling apprehensive about speaking. This would also be consistent with a greater reliance on oral communication in an increasingly oral culture where speaking competence is perceived as more important than writing competence.

Respondents were asked to report the number of hours they spend watching TV, reading, and interacting with other people (See Table 7). As shown with the correlation between TVC and TVHRS (.48), this is an inadequate method of discovering the importance of television, books or other people in the lives of respondents. Further research should be done which would employ indexes similar to the TVC index which could probe the quality and quantity of respondents' interaction with intrapersonal activities such as reading and interpersonal activities such as talking with friends and family. A deeper probe should be conducted which could assess the extent to which these activities compete for respondents' available time.

The amount of time spent with other people had no significant bearing on WAT, PRCA, TVC or SDy as indicated
in the correlation matrix (Table 7) and the discriminant function analyses (Tables 8-10). This would again underline the need for a more effective measure of human interaction since the CA literature definitely indicates that CA is related to reduced interaction with others.

The number of years of education and the grade point averages of respondents were also not significantly related to their scores on WAT, PRCA or TVC. This would be inconsistent with previously cited evidence which showed that apprehensives and heavy TV watchers do less well in school. This could be a reflection of the self-report nature of the questions and also requires further exploration.

A weak but statistically significant relationship was shown between GPA and SDy. Since academic achievement is usually considered to be very socially desirable, one would have expected a stronger correlation. This might also be a consideration for further research; it is outside the bounds of the central concerns in this study.

The discriminant function analyses reported in Tables 8-10 offer clear pictures of the differences between high and low scorers on WAT, PRCA and TVC. Table 8 illustrates that high oral communication apprehensives are also afraid of writing, are significantly more involved with TV (and operationalize this by spending
more time watching television) than low scorers on PRCA. This would also seem to confirm the writings of Glynne (1973), Winn (1977) and Kosinski (Sohn, 1976) who all described the power of TV to provide instant answers to viewers who would rather watch than do. High PRCA scorers are also more likely to be female and perceive themselves as significantly less socially desirable than low PRCA scorers. This may indicate that the old stereotype of the "shy, retiring" female is not entirely dead. In therapeutic terms, it may mean that women need more training in overcoming oral apprehension than men.

Table 9 indicates that high scorers on the WAT also feel apprehensive about public speaking, perceive themselves as less socially desirable, allow television to occupy a more central role in their lives, watch more television, and read fewer books than respondents who scored in the 'low' category for WAT.

Since these respondents were community college students, one would expect that they would report reading occupied a larger portion of their time than 1.56 hours per day. (The mean time for all 116 respondents was 2.27 hrs.) This low READHRS score may indicate a dislike of printed words in general as well as apprehension about having to write. This would also offer a good topic for further research into the correlates of writing apprehension: could it be associated with apprehension about reading, and if so, why?
It is interesting to note that there was no evident sex difference between high and low writing apprehensives. Community college men and women must be equally afraid (or unafraid) of writing.

Those respondents who scored in the high and low categories for TVC are compared in Table 10. This table offers further confirmation for the hypothesis suggested in Chapter 1 and further support for "alarmist" writers such as Glynne (1973), Winn (1977) and Kosinski (Sohn, 1976). High TVC scorers watch 2.61 times as much television as low TVC scorers. High TVC scorers also scored over 15 points higher on WAT and almost 25 points higher on PRCA!

Heavy involvement with television is clearly associated with considerable apprehension about speaking and writing. Association with electronic others is obviously linked to fear about written and oral communication. Better measurement tools to gauge reading and writing behaviour could clarify the behavioural results of written and oral apprehension by respondents in whose lives television plays a central role.

Again, the quotation from Edmund Carpenter's *Oh, What a Blow That Phantom Gave Me!* which began this thesis seems apropos: "Those who find the physical and special environments too demanding, too messy, sometimes seek to live, as far as possible, within media environments." Further research could determine if those in
whose lives television plays a central role also involve themselves with other mass media such as radio, magazines, movies and newspapers. Such research should also go beyond measurement merely of time spent with the medium to an index of media centrality—the importance of particular media to respondents' lives. Index(es) of media centrality could be compared with measures of communication apprehension (such as PRCA and WAT) and the behavioural/demographic characteristics of respondent populations to more clearly explain the connections between these variables.

In the present study, respondents who had high TVC scores were more likely to be female and this is consistent with data published in TV Basics 1981-82(1982). TVB reported that women in the 18-24 year-old age category (a similar age-range to the population studied here) tended to watch three hours more television per week than men of the same age. By occupation, however, female students watched almost one hour less television per week than male students. The sex difference which was found to occur between high and low PRCA and TVC scorers should obviously be further explored.

Low TVC scorers also perceived themselves as more socially desirable than high TVC scorers. High TVC scorers perceived themselves as less socially desirable than the mean for all 116 respondents (57.12). Further
research on the relative social desirability/undesirability of television centrality would offer clarification on the acceptability of heavy television involvement and could lead to conclusions about whether or not Canadians consider television centrality a problem to be solved, or a solution to be encouraged.

3. OTHER RESULTS

Table 4 illustrates the differences in WAT, PRCA and TVC scores by respondents' academic program. Although the mental Retardation Counsellor and Business respondents had similar scores, there was a marked drop to the Secretarial score on WAT. Secretarial students may not yet feel a need to write and therefore may not fear writing as much as the Business and MRC students who are required to write frequent essays and reports.

Most of the Business students in this study had had several opportunities to do oral presentations before their classes and had watched videotaped replays of their performances. Business students may also expect to do more public speaking. These two factors may explain their lower scores. The higher MRC score may be due to a lack of experience with public speaking in their programs; these students are trained to relate to each other and to clients on an individual basis.
The higher TVC score for MRC may illustrate the difference between students in a more social, empathetic program (MRC) and a more mechanistic program like Business and Secretarial. Alternatively, MRC students may have more reason to "escape" their day's work in television because of the stress in their dealings with clients. Further research into the role TV plays for the MRC student might be helpful to determine the reasons for their higher involvement with television.

The sex differences for all 116 respondents are not so marked on WAT, PRCA and TVC as they were between high and low scorers on the three scales. For the population as a whole, only the almost nine point difference on PRCA is significant. As discussed in relation to Tables 8, 9, 10, the higher apprehensiveness of female community college students to oral communication may indicate that the shy, retiring female still exists. There may also be a disproportionate female representation from the MRC and Secretarial faculties who, as shown in Table 4, were more apprehensive than Business students.

Table 6 indicates that first year students are generally more apprehensive about oral and written communication and more involved with television than second year students. Only the differences between PRCA and TVC are significant however. The difference in
PRCA scores may be due to the aforementioned training effect of opportunity to practise oral presentation skills with video feedback for reinforcement. Most of the second year students were in the Business program. Second year also involves heavier work loads leaving less time for television than first year students might have available. The educational implications of oral and written communication apprehension and television centrality must be further studied to determine whether they are intervening variables in the educational process.

4. FURTHER RESEARCH SUGGESTIONS

A relationship has now been established between television centrality and communication apprehension. Further research must be done to determine if this relationship is causal. Two variables which are thought to cause communication apprehension are the ethnicity and the location (rural vs. urban) of the environment in which a child grows up. The study reported here should be replicated and data gathered to determine if these variables could also be contributors to television centrality. More research, perhaps using path analysis, should be done to assess whether television centrality and communication apprehension are linked as cause and effect. This study has offered
some interesting results but there is still much to be learned about TVC and CA.
ENDNOTES
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Communications Survey

Directions: Below are a series of statements about your personal communication activities. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. Please indicate the degree to which each statement applies to you by marking whether you (1) Strongly Agree; (2) Agree; (3) Are Uncertain; (4) Disagree or (5) Strongly Disagree with the statement. Work quickly, just record your first impression.

SA A UN D SD

1. I am quite able to make correct decisions on difficult questions. 1 2 3 4 5

2. I like to watch a lot of television. 1 2 3 4 5

3. I avoid writing. 1 2 3 4 5

4. While participating in a conversation with a new acquaintance, I feel very nervous. 1 2 3 4 5

5. I am never able to do things as well as I should. 1 2 3 4 5

6. I have no fear of my writing being evaluated. 1 2 3 4 5

7. I talk less because I'm shy. 1 2 3 4 5

8. Watching TV is my favourite way to learn about people. 1 2 3 4 5

9. I like to have the TV on when I'm not watching it. 1 2 3 4 5

10. My life is full of interesting activities. 1 2 3 4 5

11. I wish I could get more stations on my TV. 1 2 3 4 5

12. I believe people tell lies any time it is to their advantage. 1 2 3 4 5

13. I look forward to writing down my ideas. 1 2 3 4 5
14. I have no fear of facing an audience. 1 2 3 4 5
15. I look forward to expressing my opinions at meetings. 1 2 3 4 5
16. I never did my homework in front of the TV. 1 2 3 4 5
17. I'll watch almost any program on television. 1 2 3 4 5
18. If someone gave me too much change I would tell him. 1 2 3 4 5
19. I would be willing to do something a little unfair to get something that was important to me. 1 2 3 4 5
20. I am afraid to express myself in a group. 1 2 3 4 5
21. I look forward to an opportunity to speak in public. 1 2 3 4 5
22. I never fall asleep in front of the television. 1 2 3 4 5
23. My mind seems to go blank when I start to work on a composition. 1 2 3 4 5
24. Expressing ideas through writing seems to be a waste of time. 1 2 3 4 5
25. I get along with people at parties quite well. 1 2 3 4 5
26. I find the prospect of speaking mildly pleasant. 1 2 3 4 5
27. When communicating, my posture feels strained and unnatural. 1 2 3 4 5
28. I am tense and nervous while participating in group discussions. 1 2 3 4 5
29. My parents often used to watch TV programs with me. 1 2 3 4 5
30. I never eat meals in front of the TV. 1 2 3 4 5
31. I like to watch TV even when I'm doing other things. 1 2 3 4 5
32. I often talked to my family about issues in the programs I watched. 1 2 3 4 5
33. I try to block out all other noise so I can concentrate on watching TV. 1 2 3 4 5
34. There is a remote control switch on the TV I watch. 1 2 3 4 5
35. I would enjoy submitting my ideas to magazines for evaluation and publication. 1 2 3 4 5
36. I like to write my ideas down. 1 2 3 4 5
37. I did many very bad things as a child. 1 2 3 4 5
38. Although I talk fluently with friends, I am at a loss for words on the platform. 1 2 3 4 5
39. I have no fear about expressing myself in group. 1 2 3 4 5
40. My hands tremble when I try to handle objects on the platform. 1 2 3 4 5
41. I always avoid speaking in public if possible. 1 2 3 4 5
42. I feel that I am more fluent when talking to people than most other people are. 1 2 3 4 5
43. I feel confident in my ability to clearly express my ideas in writing. 1 2 3 4 5
44. I'm glad I grew up the way I did. 1 2 3 4 5
45. I like to have my friends read what I've written. 1 2 3 4 5
46. I am fearful and tense all the while I am speaking before a group of people. 1 2 3 4 5
47. I was never told to watch TV so I disturb others. 1 2 3 4 5
48. I would rather talk to people than watch TV. 1 2 3 4 5
49. I never look at the TV listings. 1 2 3 4 5
50. I never watched TV with my friends. 1 2 3 4 5
51. There was more than one TV in my house when I was growing up. 1 2 3 4 5
52. When I was a child, I would almost always rather read than watch TV. 1 2 3 4 5
53. I like to read about my favourite TV stars. 1 2 3 4 5
54. I used to decorate my room with pictures of TV stars. 1 2 3 4 5
55. Television is not important in my household. 1 2 3 4 5
56. My parents used to restrict my TV watching. 1 2 3 4 5
57. I like to have the TV on when I have visitors. 1 2 3 4 5
58. I often question whether life is worthwhile. 1 2 3 4 5
59. I'm nervous about writing. 1 2 3 4 5
60. My thoughts become confused and jumbled when I speak before an audience. 1 2 3 4 5
61. I like everyone to be quiet while we all watch TV. 1 2 3 4 5
62. I often used to rush home from school to watch my favourite TV programs. 1 2 3 4 5
63. I like to get involved in group discussions. 1 2 3 4 5
64. People seem to enjoy what I write. 1 2 3 4 5
65. I am always prepared to do what is expected of me. 1 2 3 4 5
66. My daily life includes many activities I dislike. 1 2 3 4 5
67. I enjoy writing. 1 2 3 4 5
68. Although I am nervous just before getting up, I soon forget my fears and enjoy the experience.

69. Our family never watched TV when I was a child.

70. I never seem to be able to clearly write down my ideas.

71. Writing is a lot of fun.

72. Conversing with people who hold positions of authority causes me to feel fearful and tense.

73. I am one of those lucky people who could talk with my parents about my problems.

74. I have often learned to solve my own problems from solutions I've seen on TV.

75. I like seeing my thoughts on paper.

76. Many things make me uneasy.

77. I dislike to use my body and voice expressively.

78. I feel relaxed and comfortable while speaking.

79. I am careful to plan for my distant goals.

80. Instead of watching television, my parents often read to me when I was a child.

81. Discussing my writing with others is an enjoyable experience.

82. It's easy for me to write good compositions.

83. I feel self-conscious when called upon to answer a question or give an opinion in class.

84. There are many programs on TV that I try not to miss.
85. I find it very difficult to concentrate.

86. I don't think I write as well as most other people.

87. I face the prospect of making a speech with complete confidence.

88. Sometimes, my friends and I imitate people on TV.

89. I don't like my compositions to be evaluated.

90. I'm afraid to speak up in conversations.

91. I never pretend that I'm the one on TV.

92. I would enjoy presenting a speech on a local television show.

93. I'm no good at writing.

94. My friends and I often discussed the TV programs we watched.

95. Watching TV is my favourite way of relaxing.

To interpret the above data, we also need some background information about you. Please write the appropriate number in the boxes beside each question.

96. What is your age?

97. Are you male (1) or female (2)?

98. How many years of formal schooling have you completed?

99. What program are you in?
   Business (1)
   Secretarial (2)
   Craft and Design (3)
   Nursing (4)
   Mental Retardation Counsellor (5)
100. What year of your program are you in (1) or (2)?

101. What was your Grade Point Average at the end of first semester?

102. On the average, how many hours of TV do you watch per day?

103. On the average, how many hours do you spend reading per day?

104. On the average, how many hours do you spend interacting with other people per day?

Thank you very much for your time to complete this survey, and your help in conducting this research.
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