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ABSTRACT

This was an exploratory study of communication barriers of women in Hawai‘i, comparing those in Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Education Diploma (GED), and the relationship of levels of anxiety and uncertainty of the participants to the types of programs in which they are enrolled. It also explored whether levels of anxiety and uncertainty were related to the participant’s expected completion of the program in which they are enrolled. Results of the study suggest that alternate methods of data collection and analysis may be needed. Research by Staley and Shockley-Zalabak (Carter & Spitzack, 1989) discusses the use of triangulated designs that include a variety of data collection methods, which may be more conducive to gathering data from women, such as interviews, observation, content analysis, videotapes and recordings. The study also suggests that these outcomes are not easily measured because we cannot know what effect outside experiences have on the participants’ self-reporting. Further research could be extended to explore other outcomes, such as retention and long-term career success.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In recent years there has been an increased effort to move people out of the welfare system into the workforce. Most of the emphasis has been placed on short-term job training, which in and of itself may not provide the necessary communication skills for long-term success. In a study by Waldron and Lavitt (2000), communication characteristics were examined and "results indicate that communication skill is a significant factor in predicting client outcomes" (p.1), meaning whether they were successful at maintaining employment following job training. Waldron & Lavitt's study also stated that previous reports on the issue did not address the questions of whether communication factors were significant in determining participant outcomes in welfare-to-work training programs, or whether the participants showed improvement in communication skills while participating in the programs.

Communication researchers have documented the impact of instruction on reducing communication apprehension and improving communication competence in educational settings. Rubin, Rubin, & Jordan (1997) conducted a study that examined the possible influences of a basic communication course on students' communication apprehension (CA) and communication competence (CC). The study also examined whether continued participation in the course has any significant impact on the students' perceptions of competence.
Besides the welfare-to-work programs, there are other programs that address the needs of those who wish to improve their literacy or job-readiness skills. Two of those, focused on in this study, are Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Education Diploma (GED) programs. ABE is a non-credit program designed to improve basic skills for students whose abilities range from non-literate to pre-college level. The GED program provides a means for students to complete requirements for a high-school diploma. In Hawai‘i, the Department of Education funds eleven community schools that provide ABE and GED programs with seven of those located on Oahu. Ninety-six percent of the students enrolled in these programs have not completed high school or a high school equivalency test. The average age of the participants is forty-one. (CASAS, 2003)

Another study by Lambert-Poor (2003) indicated that Hawai‘i has a higher than average ABE participation rate. This study also highlights certain conditions that are unique to Hawai‘i. Lambert-Poor states that the 2000 census showed that 21.4% of Hawai‘i’s population reported more than one racial/ethnic identity compared to the national average of 2.4%. “This multi-cultural society makes for a dynamic population of adult students and instructors who bring to the classroom a variety of backgrounds, educational needs and abilities” (p.19).

In my own experience of teaching adult literacy to women in rural Oahu I observed the communication characteristics of anxiety and uncertainty that indicated varying levels of communication competence and also required some sort of specialized instruction based on certain intercultural values and behaviors. Over the last decade there have been dramatic improvements in the statistics of women’s access and enrollment in
secondary education; however, these improvements are not necessarily reflected in literacy rates. "Among the world’s 900 million illiterates, women still outnumber men 2 to 1." (Jandt, 1998) While the women involved in these community programs may share some anxiety and uncertainty, each program has a different criterion for completion. These differences may be an indicator for success or completion of the program, or correlate with the anxiety and uncertainty of the women in each program. According to Jandt (1998), one of the first barriers to communication is high anxiety, especially in new or strange encounters, which can cause mistakes and feelings of awkwardness. Anxiety can also lead to avoidance of certain interactions. Imel (1994) uses the adage that "Adults vote with their feet" to describe the fact that most adult learners are not required to remain in the learning situation if it does not meet their needs. Imel also refers to Knowles’ (1980) andragogical model for adult education which makes the assumptions that adults’ readiness to learn is frequently a problem-centered orientation to learning as opposed to a subject-matter orientation; and that adults are generally motivated to learn due to intrinsic factors as opposed to extrinsic factors.

In understanding a rural culture, Dodd (1998) identifies a set of characteristic norms for rurality. Rural cultures emphasize practicality and simplicity in decision-making; they tend to hold traditional values and have strong bonds of friendship; rurality is a mindset that is often retained even if one is removed from the rural environment; and there are distinct differences in communication styles. While Oahu’s rural areas are in close proximity to its urban areas, Dodd’s characteristics were evident in the women with whom I worked. The increase in intercultural interactions due to social changes such as affirmative action, bilingual education programs, and the movement of immigrants makes
it necessary to develop intercultural communication skills (Brislin & Yoshida, 1994),
and Hawai‘i provides a context where all of these factors come together. Brislin and
Yoshida (1994) also point out the need for intercultural communication training in the
commonalities of the needs of the various audiences; “a) the necessity of establishing
good interpersonal relations with people, and b) communicating effectively in the
presence of cultural differences that can interfere with good relations” (p.5).

According to Gudykunst, Guzley, & Hammer, (Landis & Bhagat, 1996) it is
important to note that there is general agreement that training goals are different from
those of education. Training is designed more for job performance, while education is
more focused on improving overall competence, but the two are not mutually exclusive.
In intercultural training (ITe) there are usually three general goals for change: cognitive,
affective, and behavioral. These goals can also be applied to adult education.

Dinges & Baldwin (Landis & Bhagat, 1996) present a review of multiple studies
in the area of intercultural communication competence that also cover the concepts of
communication apprehension and anxiety/uncertainty management (AUM). However,
there have been few studies focused on the population in Hawai‘i, and women in
particular. More and more, employers and administrators believe that communication
training is the “key to welfare independence” (Waldron & Lavitt, 2000). All of this
demonstrates a need for communication educators to become involved in the adult
education and job-training arena.

Therefore, this was an exploratory study of communication barriers of women
enrolled in Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Education Diploma (GED) and the
relationship of levels of anxiety and uncertainty of the participants to the types of
programs in which they are enrolled. It also explored whether levels of anxiety and uncertainty were related to the participant’s expected completion of the program in which they are enrolled.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Over the last thirty years there has been extensive research examining the concepts of anxiety and uncertainty reduction. Much of the research is based on the work of Berger and Calabrese (1975, as cited in Hammer, et al, 1998), who viewed the reduction of uncertainty as a central, mediating mechanism for explaining communication behavior. Berger’s Uncertainty Reduction Theory (URT) has two main foci – an individual’s self-awareness and knowledge of others. In encounters with others (strangers), there is a strong desire to reduce uncertainty by gaining information about the other person and their abilities to communicate with us. Berger & Calabrese (1975) propose that to deal with uncertainty, people will try to predict others behavior and their own responses. Gudykunst (as cited in Hammer, et al, 1998) followed this with his extension termed Anxiety/Uncertainty Management (AUM), which views the reduction of uncertainty and anxiety as necessary and sufficient conditions for intercultural adaptation. The research of Spitzberg & Cupach (1984) in the construct of Intercultural Communication Competence (ICC) posits that managing anxiety is a necessary skill for effective communication. Another related area of research is Richmond & McCroskey’s (1985) communication apprehension theory, which is defined as “an individual’s level of fear or anxiety associated with either real or anticipated communication with another person or persons” (p.31). The following review offers a more in-depth look at each of these theories and the roles they have in understanding communication behaviors.
Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory (AUM)

Gudykunst (1993) posits, “effective communication is moderated by our ability to mindfully manage our anxiety and uncertainty about ourselves and the people with whom we are communicating.” (p.38) This theory was developed as an extension of the work of Berger and Calabrese’s (1975) uncertainty reduction theory in that Gudykunst (1994) believes that anxiety is the emotional equivalent of uncertainty. Gudykunst and Hammer (1987) incorporated both uncertainty reduction and anxiety reduction to formulate a theory that posits 7 assumptions, 24 axioms, and 50 theorems. In the early construction of the theory, Gudykunst (1993) suggested the axiom that:

“When we are mindful of the process of communication, a decrease in our anxiety about interacting with others and an increase in the accuracy of predictive and explanatory certainty regarding others’ behavior will produce an increase in the effectiveness of our communication.” (p.64)

Anxiety as defined by Gudykunst (1994) is the “feeling of being uneasy, tense, worried, or apprehensive about what might happen. It is an affective response, not a cognitive or behavioral response like uncertainty”(p.21). The anxiety is usually based on negative expectations from those with whom we are communicating. We worry about feeling incompetent, about being taken advantage of, about being stereotyped or ridiculed, and may fear rejection or disapproval. (Stephan & Stephan, 1985) Gudykunst (1994) also posits that individuals have minimum and maximum thresholds of anxiety. If the anxiety is below our threshold we are not motivated to communicate with others. Conversely, if the anxiety is too high, or above our threshold, we are so uncomfortable that we withdraw from communicating and are unable to collect information about
others. Generally, as we become familiar with others our level of anxiety will decrease. For us to be motivated to communicate our anxiety has to be at an optimum level below our maximum and above our minimum thresholds.

Gudykunst (1993) uses Berger & Calabrese’s (1975) definition of uncertainty as “our inability to predict and explain our own and other’s behavior” (p.39). He further explains that there are two types of uncertainty: predictive and explanatory. Uncertainty from a predictive standpoint is the degree to which we can predict the attitudes, beliefs, feelings, values, and behaviors of others. Explanatory uncertainty is the degree to which we can accurately explain why others behave the way they do.

Lustig & Koester (1996) cite Hofstede’s approach to uncertainty from the standpoint that “cultures differ in the extent to which they prefer and can tolerate ambiguity” and “refers to these variations as the uncertainty avoidance dimension” (p.133). There are no specific indicators for a culture’s preferences but generally cultures with extensive rules systems, and that are in the beginning stages of modernizing, which are characterized by a high occurrence of change, are high in uncertainty avoidance. Cultures that tend to be lower in uncertainty avoidance are those who are more advanced in modernization and therefore have reached some level of stability and predictability. Differences in levels of uncertainty avoidance can be a significant factor in intercultural communication.

Anxiety and uncertainty in intercultural situations can be underlying causes of ineffective communication. Littlejohn (2002) states, “The less you know and the more anxious you are, the less effective you will probably be in intercultural situations. This
makes the reduction or management of uncertainty [and] anxiety, especially important” (p.246-247).

**Communication Apprehension**

Richmond & McCroskey (1985) present a similar theoretical approach in the identification of four types of communication apprehension (CA): traitlike, context-based, receiver-based, and situational. Traitlike CA has a close correlation to certain personality characteristics, one of which is general anxiety. Traitlike CA is referred to as a “relatively enduring, personality-type orientation toward a given mode of communication across a wide variety of contexts” (p.33). This characteristic is often mistaken for CA since people with either high CA or high general anxiety may exhibit similar behaviors in communication situations. Generally, people who have high levels of high general anxiety will also have high levels of CA.

High CA is seen as an inhibitor to developing communication competence and can have a serious impact on a “person’s behavior, relationships, the perception of others, occupational choice, and employment opportunities and education...To function in today’s society people must communicate with one another. Yet for some individuals communication experiences are so unrewarding that they either consciously or unconsciously avoid situations where communication is required.” (McCroskey, 1976; McCroskey & Richmond, 1979; McCroskey & Richmond, 1987; Richmond, 1984, as cited in [http://www.jcu.edu.au](http://www.jcu.edu.au))
Intercultural Communication Competence

Because of the unique intercultural environment of Hawai'i, and the interaction of many cultures in the programs being studied, understanding the goals of intercultural competence were factors considered in this study. According to Dinges & Baldwin (Landis & Bhagat, 1996), while this area of research continues to increase, there are many areas yet unexplored. In the early stages of the construct of Intercultural Communication Competence (ICC) the conceptualizations varied according to the researcher’s theoretical orientation, with such labels as cross-cultural adaptation and cross-cultural effectiveness. Over the last twenty years there has been a growing consensus towards a conceptualization of ICC by Spitzberg & Cupach (as cited in Wiseman, 2001), that “ICC involves the knowledge, motivation, and skill to interact effectively and appropriately with members of different cultures.”

We are not born with communication competence and it doesn’t occur spontaneously. Spitzberg & Cupach (1994) posit that there are certain conditions that must be present for optimal communication competence: knowledge, motivation, and skill. Gudykunst (1993) refers to knowledge as an “awareness or understanding of what needs to be done in order to communicate appropriately and effectively” (p.51) or the knowledge of more than one perspective. A knowledgeable communicator must have the necessary information about the people, the context, the rules, the norms, and the expectations of the interaction. Without this knowledge the communicator may choose inappropriate attributions and strategies, may violate the rules, and may not even be able to identify these errors in order to correct them. The intentions, needs, and feelings associated with any interaction are referred to as motivation. Motivation is defined as the
"desire to communicate appropriately and effectively" (p.44). Factors such as fear, anxiety, prejudice, and ethnocentrism can be of significant influence in our decisions to communicate with others. If our fears and anxieties dominate our feelings towards others we are likely to have negative motivation for interaction. Therefore, it is important to learn how to decrease the level of negative influences in order to increase positive motivation for communication with members of different cultures. Finally, skill refers to the actual performance of the communication interaction that is repeatable and goal-oriented. Skill is the ability "to engage in the behaviors necessary to communicate appropriately and effectively" (p.59) and to manage anxiety and reduce uncertainty.

In summary, the literature review suggests that reducing uncertainty and anxiety could be significant indicators of an individual’s predicted or expected success in their educational and/or training outcomes. The researcher also found that there appeared to be a lack of literature that focused on women in particular, and even more narrowly on women in Hawai‘i enrolled in ABE and GED programs in relationship to the measures of the study.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following research questions were developed with respect to the characteristics of anxiety and uncertainty and the women involved in the study.

RQ1a: Do the levels of communicative anxiety of women in ABE adult education/job-training programs differ from those of women in GED adult education/job-training programs?

RQ1b: Do the levels of communicative uncertainty of women in ABE adult education/job-training programs differ from those of women in GED adult education/job-training programs?

RQ2a: Do the levels of communicative anxiety of women in mandatory programs differ from those in voluntary programs?

RQ2b: Do the levels of communicative uncertainty of women in mandatory programs differ from those in voluntary programs?

RQ3a: What is the relationship between levels of anxiety and the education experience of the women enrolled in each program?

RQ3b: What is the relationship between levels of uncertainty and the education experience of the women enrolled in each program?

RQ4a: What is the relationship between levels of anxiety and the employment experience of the women enrolled in each program?
RQ4b: What is the relationship between levels of uncertainty and the employment experience of the women enrolled in each program?

RQ5a: What is the relationship between levels of anxiety and the participants’ expected completion of these programs?

RQ5b: What is the relationship between levels of uncertainty and the participants’ expected completion of these programs?

RQ6a: What is the relationship between levels of anxiety and the participants’ age?

RQ6b: What is the relationship between levels of uncertainty and the participants’ age?
CHAPTER 3
METHODS

Key Concepts

*Women in Adult Basic Education (ABE) programs* refers to women residing in Oahu, Hawai’i enrolled in an ABE adult education/job training program.

*Women in General Education Diploma (GED) programs* refers to women residing in Oahu, Hawai’i enrolled in GED adult education/job-training programs.

*Anxiety*

Conceptual definition: Anxiety as defined by Gudykunst (1994) is the “feeling of being uneasy, tense, worried, or apprehensive about what might happen. It is an affective response, not a cognitive or behavioral response like uncertainty.”

Operational definition: For the purpose of this study anxiety refers to the amount of general anxiety you experience when you communicate with others. Anxiety will be measured by survey questions adapted from Gudykunst (1994) using a 5-point Likert-type scale.

*Uncertainty*

Conceptual definition: Uncertainty is defined by Gudykunst (Wiseman, 1993) as “our inability to predict and explain our own and other’s behavior.”
Operational definition: For the purpose of this study uncertainty refers to the amount of general uncertainty you experience when you communicate with others. Uncertainty will be measured by survey questions adapted from Gudykunst (1994) using a 5-point Likert-type scale.

Expected completion of the program

Conceptual definition: Expected completion of the program will be defined as completion of the training program in which the participant is currently enrolled.

Operational definition: Expected completion of the program will be measured with Question 9 in the Questionnaire.

9) On a scale of 1 to 5, 1 being most likely and 5 least likely, do you expect or anticipate completing the program you are currently enrolled in? (Circle one)

Participants

The participants for the study were a non-probability convenience sampling of 50 women from east rural Oahu in adult education and job-training programs such as Adult Basic Education (ABE) and General Education Diploma (GED). The demographic data collected were age and ethnic/racial identity, educational background, employment status, and participation in educational/training programs. In regards to Human Subject Concerns, the study was reviewed and approved by the University of Hawai‘i Committee on Human Studies. Participation was on a voluntary basis only and all potential respondents were given the option for not completing the survey. For those who
voluntarily agreed to be a respondent, they were provided with a consent form (Appendix A) detailing that their participation in the study is voluntary in nature and that the study is not designed to potentially cause them harm in any way, shape, or form.

Procedures

The study data was collected by means of a survey with the questions adapted from the scales of Gudykunst (1994). However, other scales and instruments were reviewed by the researcher, which included McCroskey’s (1988) Self-Perceived Communication Competence Scale (SPCC), and several versions of McCroskey’s Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24). While McCroskey’s scales have been widely used and validated, the researcher chose the Gudykunst scales for their specific use of the variables of anxiety and uncertainty. Gudykunst (1994) notes, “Most of the questionnaires presented are adapted from reliable and valid measures used in research. Some I have developed for the purpose of this book. Although I have not assessed the psychometric properties of all the questionnaires, I believe they are all reasonable measures of the concepts under discussion” (p.32-33).

The researcher confirmed permission to administer the survey/questionnaire with the program coordinators, then hand delivered the survey to the various programs involved in the study. Each participant was given a consent form indicating that their identity and their responses would remain anonymous and confidential and that participation was voluntary. The researcher collected the completed surveys for analysis and each completed survey was assigned a number in order to establish a coding system for analysis.
Instruments

The levels of anxiety and uncertainty were measured using Gudykunst’s (1994) scales adapted for use in this study. For the two scales measuring anxiety, Gudykunst developed the items based on Stephan & Stephan’s (1985) model of intergroup anxiety. Stephan & Stephan (1985) posit that “like other types of anxiety, intergroup anxiety stems from the anticipation of negative consequences” (p.159). The survey was pre-tested, having 10 people complete a draft, provide feedback, and any ambiguities were corrected. The survey/questionnaire was pre-tested until the researcher was confident that the participants could understand the design as well as fulfill the purpose of the study.

According to Gudykunst (1994), the purpose of the first scale of the questionnaire “is to help [one] assess the amount of uncertainty [one] generally experience[s] when communicat[ing] with others. To score, “first reverse the responses for the even-numbered items…Next, add the numbers next to each of the items. Scores range from 10-50. The higher [the] score, the more uncertainty [one] experience[s] when interacting with others” (p.21).

Scale #1: Assessing Uncertainty

Respond to each statement by circling the degree (1 to 5) that best describes your interaction with others (persons you don’t know).

1= never, 2=almost never, 3=sometimes, 4=almost always, 5= always

1. I am not confident when I communicate with others.

2. I can interpret others’ behaviors when we communicate.
3. I am indecisive when I communicate with others.

4. I can explain others’ behavior when we communicate.

5. I am not able to understand others when we communicate.

6. I know what to do when I communicate with others.

7. I am uncertain how to behave when I communicate with others.

8. I can comprehend others’ behavior when we communicate.

9. I am not able to predict others’ behavior when we communicate.

10. I can describe others’ behavior when we communicate.

The purpose of scale number two “is to help [one] assess the amount of general anxiety [one] experience[s] when…communicat[ing] with others. To find the score, first reverse the responses for the odd-numbered items…Next, add the numbers next to each of the items. Scores range from 10-50. The higher [the] score, the more anxiety [one] experience[s] when interacting with others” (Gudykunst, 1994, p.24).

Scale #2: Assessing Anxiety

Respond to each statement by circling the degree (1 to 5) that best describes your interaction with others (persons you don’t know.)
1= never, 2=almost never, 3=sometimes, 4=almost always, 5= always

1. I am calm when I communicate with others.

2. I get frustrated when I communicate with others.

3. I do not get confused when I communicate with others.

4. I am insecure when I communicate with others.

5. I feel confident when I communicate with others.

6. I feel anxious when I communicate with others.
7. I do not get excited when I have to communicate with others.

8. I feel stress when I communicate with others.

9. I feel relaxed when I communicate with others.

10. I am worried when I communicate with others.

The purpose of the third scale “is to help [one] assess [one’s] orientation toward uncertainty. To find the score, first reverse the responses for the odd-numbered items…Next, add the numbers next to each of the items. Scores range from 10-50. The higher [the] score, the greater [the] uncertainty orientation” (Gudykunst, 1994, p.124).

Scale #3: Assessing Orientation to Uncertainty

Respond to each statement circling the degree (1 to 5) that best describes the way you typically respond when interacting with others:

1=always false, 2=usually false, 3=sometimes false/sometimes true, 4=usually true, 5=always true.

1. I do not compare myself to others.

2. If given a choice, I prefer to go somewhere new rather than somewhere I’ve been before.

3. I reject ideas that are different than mine.

4. I try to resolve inconsistencies in beliefs I hold.

5. I am not interested in finding out information about myself.

6. When I obtain new information, I try to integrate it with information I already have.
7. I hold traditional beliefs.

8. I evaluate people on their own merit without comparing them to others.

9. I hold consistent views of myself.

10. If someone suggests an opinion that is different than mine, I do not reject it before I consider it.

The purpose of scale number four “is to help [one] assess the amount of uncertainty [one] experience[s] when communicating in different relationships. To score, “first reverse the responses for the even-numbered items...Next, add the numbers next to each of the items. Scores range from 10-50. The higher [the] scores, the more uncertainty [one] experience[s] when interacting in the different relationships” (Gudykunst, 1994, p.217).

Scale #4: Assessing Uncertainty When Communicating in Different Relationships

Respond to each statement by indicating how often the situation occurs when you communicate in different relationships.

1=never  2= almost never  3= sometimes  4= almost always  5=always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own Group</th>
<th>Other Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am not confident when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can interpret _____ behavior when we communicate.</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am indecisive when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can explain _____ behavior when we communicate.</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am not able to understand _____ when we communicate.</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I know what to do when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am uncertain how to behave when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can comprehend _____ behavior when we communicate.</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. I am not able to predict _____ behavior when we communicate. _____  _____
10. I can describe _____ behavior when we communicate. _____  _____

The purpose of the last scale “is to help [one] assess the amount of anxiety [one] experience[s] when...communicat[ing] in different relationships. To find the score, first reverse the responses for the odd-numbered items...Next, add the numbers next to each of the items. Scores range from 10-50. The higher the scores, the more anxiety [one] experience[s] when interacting in the different relationships” (Gudykunst, 1994, p.219).

Scale #5: Assessing Anxiety When Communicating in Different Relationships

Respond to each statement by indicating how often the statement applies in a particular relationship.

1 = never  2 = almost never  3 = sometimes  4 = almost always  5 = always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Own Group</th>
<th>Other Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel calm when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I get frustrated when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not get confused when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am insecure when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel composed when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel anxious when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do not get excited when I have to communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel stress when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel relaxed when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am worried when I communicate with ______.</td>
<td>_____  _____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Data Analysis

The focus of the analysis was on levels of anxiety and uncertainty and their relationship to education and training outcomes. Frequency and descriptive statistics, t-tests and correlations, using SPSS, were applied to analyze the data with an alpha level of .10 used for all tests. The researcher took into account the specific limitations of each type of analysis (t-tests and correlations) with the primary limitation the degree to which inferences can be made from correlations. There is also concern for generalizability, which extended research could answer (Keyton, 2001).

Of the total sample (N=41) of this study, 41% of the respondents identified themselves as Hawaiian, 20% Caucasian, 10% Japanese, 5% Korean, and the remaining 24% as mix of Puerto Rican, Samoan, Filipina, Polynesian, Thai, French, and Mexican. Age was fairly evenly distributed (22-27%) across all four ranges (18-27, 28-37, 38-47, 48+), with the highest percentage of 27% (n=11) in the 38-47 range.

The education level with the highest reported frequency was high school grade 12, (32%, n=13) followed by grade 9, (17%, n=7) and the lowest level at a college junior (2%, n=1). Two thirds (66%) of the participants indicated they were unemployed which was determined as a variable in research question number four. Regarding current enrollment, 56% (n=24) represented the two majors groups of comparison (ABE and GED) for research questions 1 and 2, and 66% (n=27) of that group reporting they were
enrolled voluntarily. The remainder of the participants were enrolled in similar types of programs, such as Family Literacy and Women in Transition. Fifty-six percent (n=23) of the participants also responded that they had been previously enrolled in a similar program, with 70% of those spending less than 6 months in the program. Only twenty-three participants responded whether or not they had completed a previous program, with only 43% of those completing the program. Reasons for short-term enrollment or not completing a program included the program ended or was ongoing. Seventy-three percent of the respondents indicated they expected to complete the program in which they were currently enrolled.

The overall scores for each scale indicate respondents reporting some level of generalized uncertainty and anxiety, with an orientation to uncertainty having the highest mean of 32. There was a noticeable difference in the standard deviation for the last two scales due, perhaps, to a higher number of responses left unanswered by the participants.

Table 4.1: Mean scores for each scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to uncertainty</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Group uncertainty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Group uncertainty</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Group anxiety</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Group anxiety</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 41; Score range 10 – 50. The higher the score is, the higher the level of uncertainty or anxiety.*
Research Question 1a:

Research question 1a was “Do the levels of communicative anxiety of women in Hawaii in ABE adult education/job-training programs differ from women in GED adult education/job-training programs?” There seems to be no significant difference in level of anxiety for the women in ABE (M = 25, SD = 4.5) and the women in GED (M = 27, SD = 7.1) programs, t (22) = -1.12, p = .273. (Refer to Table 4.2)

Research Question 1b:

Research question 1b was “Do the levels of communicative uncertainty of women in Hawaii in ABE adult education/job-training programs differ from women in GED adult education/job-training programs?” A significant difference of levels of uncertainty were reported between women in ABE (M = 26, SD = 2.8) and women in GED (M = 23, SD = 4.7) programs, t (22) = 2.02, p = .055. (Refer to Table 4.2)

Research Question 2a: Do the levels of communicative anxiety of women in mandatory programs differ from those in voluntary programs? There appears to be no significant difference in levels of anxiety between the women in mandatory (M = 23, SD = 5.2) and the women in voluntary (M= 25, SD = 5.4) programs, t (37) = -1.064, p = .294. (Refer to Table 4.2)

Research Question 2b: Do the levels of communicative uncertainty of women in mandatory programs differ from those in voluntary programs? Again, there was no significant difference reported for levels of uncertainty between the women in mandatory (M = 25, SD = 5.2) and women in voluntary (M = 25, SD = 3.8) programs, t (37) = .044, p = .965. (Refer to Table 4.2)
Table 4.2: T-test for Equality of Means for Uncertainty and Anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABE</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>GED</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t = 2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p = .055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t = -1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p = .273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 22; p<.10; critical t = 1.717

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MANDATORY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>VOLUNTARY</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t = .044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p = .965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t = -1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p = .294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df = 37, p<.10, critical t = 1.697
Correlations, with an alpha level of p<.10, were used to assess the relationships for research questions three through six. (Refer to Table 4.3)

**Research Question 3:**
Research question 3a was "What is the relationship between levels of anxiety and the education experience of the women enrolled in each program?" There was a strong significance (r = .301, p = .056) indicated between level of Anxiety with Other Group and the education experience of the women enrolled in these programs.

Research question 3b was "What is the relationship between levels of uncertainty and the education experience of the women enrolled in each program?" The results for Uncertainty with Other Group approached significance (r = .222, p = .164).
(Refer to Table 4.3)

**Research Question 4:**
Research question 4a was "What is the relationship between levels of anxiety and the employment experience of the women enrolled in each program?" There was no significance reported between levels of anxiety and employment. However, for Research question 4b, "What is the relationship between levels of uncertainty and the employment experience of the women enrolled in each program?" there seems to be a slight significance between Orientation to Uncertainty (r = .276, p = .080) and employment. And, Uncertainty with Other Group appeared to approach significance (r = .242, p = .127).
(Refer to Table 4.3)
Research Question 5:

Research question 5a was "What is the relationship between levels of anxiety and the participant’s expected completion of the programs?" The results indicate an approaching significance ($r = -0.272, p = .085$) between the participant’s levels of Anxiety with Own Group and their expected completion.

Research question 5b was "What is the relationship between levels of uncertainty and the participant’s expected completion of the programs?" The results here also indicate an approaching significance ($r = -0.251, p = .114$) between levels of Orientation to Uncertainty and participant’s expected completion of the program.

(Refer to Table 4.3)

Research Question 6:

Research question 6a was "What is the relationship between levels of anxiety and the participants’ age?" There was significance ($r = -0.255, p = .107$) reported for the measure of Anxiety. However, for Research question 6b, "What is the relationship between levels of uncertainty and the participants’ age?," there was no significant relationship reported between levels uncertainty and the participant’s age.

(Refer to Table 4.3)
Table 4.3

Correlations between Levels of Uncertainty and Anxiety and Education, Employment status, Expected completion of the program, and Age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Educ.</th>
<th>Empl.</th>
<th>Compl.</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertainty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>-.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation to Uncertainty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>-.251</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertainty with Own Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>.615</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncertainty with Other Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td>.222</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety with Own Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.272</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anxiety with Other Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>r</em></td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>p</em></td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>.563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 41; df = 40; p < .10; Critical r = .257
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Findings

In examining the study sample, it was consistent with the CASAS (2003) report. According to CASAS, the average enrollment in ABE programs in 2001-2002, across the eleven programs in Hawai‘i, was 1,006. Seven of those programs are on Oahu, averaging an enrollment of 638, with the study’s sample representative of approximately 6% of that population. Enrollment in adult basic education has shown to be related to the ethnicity distribution of the state’s population but is comparatively higher in ethnic minority groups. In the CASAS (2003) report ethnicity distribution for Hawaii showed that 36.6% identified themselves as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 39.3% as Asian, 15.5% White, 7.8% Hispanic, 1.9% Black, and 0.9% American Indian. As in CASAS, the participants in this study reported the highest ethnic distribution (41%) among Native Hawaiians, followed by 15% Asian (10% Japanese, 5% Korean), and 20% White (Caucasian), and the remaining 24% a mix of Hispanic and Pacific Islanders.

The results of the overall scores for the scales indicated levels of uncertainty and anxiety that could represent certain thresholds for the respondents. Gudykunst (1994) posits that there are thresholds for both uncertainty and anxiety. When uncertainty is above the individual’s maximum threshold there may not be sufficient information with which one could predict other’s behaviors that might lead to avoidance of interaction with others. Conversely, when the uncertainty is below the minimum threshold the behaviors of others may be highly predictable and therefore does not motivate interaction
with others. Thresholds for anxiety are similar in that “for us to be motivated to communicate with others, our anxiety has to be below our maximum threshold and above our minimum threshold” (p.23).

Orientation to Uncertainty reported the highest mean of 32. Gudykunst (1994), explains that “the more uncertainty oriented we are, the more likely we are willing to question our own behavior...[and] the more we would try to gather information about strangers” (p.123). Therefore, the respondents of this study may tend to be more open to trying to understand themselves and their environment.

CASAS (2003) reported that seventeen percent of ABE enrollees had less than a high school diploma or its equivalent. In Research Question 1a and 1b, that number was considerably higher where forty-nine percent reported completing grade 12 or less. This group also reported significant levels of anxiety and uncertainty when dealing with others, which is consistent with Gudykunst’s (1994) assessment that “Most people will experience more uncertainty in their initial interactions with members of other groups than with members of their own group” (p.216) and “Most people will experience more anxiety in interacting with members of other groups than in interacting with members of their own group” (p.218). (Refer to Table 4.3)

The CASAS report also states that forty-five percent of those enrolled in ABE programs are unemployed compared against Hawai’i’s state rate of unemployment of 4.5%. Sixty-six percent of the participants in this study reported they were unemployed which is slightly higher than indicated in the CASAS report and the participants reported significant levels of uncertainty in regards to their employment status. (Refer to Table 4.3)
ABE level completion is achieved by completing the CASAS post-test that puts the student in a higher functioning level than achieved in the pre-test. Hawai‘i reported 28.8% level completion rate. While the results of this study did not measure level completion, it did indicate that $n = 23$ out of $N = 41$ reported that they had completed a previous program in which they were enrolled, and 73% indicated that they expected to complete their current program.

The CASAS age distribution showed the highest percent (34.2) in the age range of 25-44, with the national average of twenty-nine. Consistent with CASAS, the largest percentage of participants in this study fell in this age range with the highest frequency ($N = 41, n = 11, 27\%$) reported between the ages of 38-47. The higher reported age may be a contributing factor to the level of significance ($r = -.255, p = .107$), in that the older the participant, the less anxiety they were reporting. (Refer to Table 4.3)
Limitations

The first limitation encountered with this study occurred late in the process. Just prior to distribution of the survey/questionnaire, one-half of the initial sample dropped out of the study. Therefore, adjustments had to be made to the criteria and methods of analysis.

Availability and access to the remaining sample also posed a problem due to the irregular attendance of the participants in the remaining programs. This limitation is examined by DeCoito & MacKeracher (1984), where one of the most reported barriers to women's regular attendance in ABE programs was the lack of childcare. Other major needs reported in the study were psychological and financial concerns that may interfere with regular attendance.

While the relationship between programs and expected completion showed some significance, the data was collected in the first two weeks of the programs schedule and, therefore, further studies might be done with a pre-post design. The time limitation of conducting only one test at the beginning of the program, and not having a pre-post design, could possibly affect the ability to determine if the results are predictive indicators for the participant's success in the programs.

Another possible limitation was in the cross-cultural appropriateness of the Gudykunst scales for this particular sample. The indication for this appeared in the high reported standard deviations for the last two scales used for the survey. While Gudykunst (1994) indicates that he has taken a "cultural general approach" (p.32), the scales—particularly the last two, may not have translated well into the culture of ABE and GED
programs where literacy is a prominent issue. The limitation might also be in the
format of the scale rather than content. (Refer to Table 4.1)
Implications

The exploratory nature of the study suggests that other factors or variables may need to be explored as well as alternate methods of measurement. Research by Staley and Shockley-Zalabak (1989) discusses the use of triangulated designs that include a variety of data collection methods, which may be more conducive to gathering data from these women, such as interviews, observation, content analysis, videotapes and recordings. "This multi-level triangulation can encourage the use of qualitative and quantitative approaches with particular emphasis on the active participation of women and those with whom they most frequently interact." (p.256)

Communication theories of URT and AUM would suggest that maintaining optimal levels of anxiety and uncertainty increase the likelihood for communication competence and overall improved performance. Gudykunst (1994) proposes several strategies for managing anxiety and uncertainty. Gudykunst, citing Prather (1986), indicates that one way to manage anxiety is to withdraw or break away from the situation, in order to regain calmness. Other strategies include those of Spitzberg & Cupach (1984) in gaining communication competence through motivation, knowledge, and skills. A similar strategy for intercultural communication and training presented by Brislin & Yoshida (1994) contains three goals of training: 1) awareness, knowledge, and information; 2) attitudes; and 3) skills. Intercultural training (ITC) based on the AUM theory would have the following goals: “a) to help trainees to understand how their ability to manage their uncertainty and anxiety influence their ability to adapt to new cultures, b) to help trainees successfully manage their uncertainty in new cultural
environments, and c) to help trainees successfully manage their anxiety in new cultural environments." (Gudykunst, 1996, p.74)

Imel (1994) suggests that creating the environment for adult learners must meet both physical and psychological needs. That environment must be non-threatening and non-judgmental so that any anxieties the learners have might be diminished. Another strategy that may be better suited for this particular sample group might be content analysis using journal writing. Kerka (1996) states that benefits of journal writing are that they are a less formal, less threatening way for older students to approach writing. Journal entries can record concrete experiences or feelings, reflections, and problem solving strategies. All of these strategies can be carried over to the area of adult education and job-training programs.
Conclusion

The results of this study provide some particular demographics and characteristics of the women in these programs, specifically the ones who identified themselves as Hawaiian that would suggest alternate methods of analysis. Overall, the current study supports the need for communication educators to become involved in the adult education and job-training arena. It also indicates the need for consideration of the intercultural needs, goals, and objectives of both education and training programs.

Predicting outcomes and student success involves many factors, both measurable and salient, but identifying all of them is almost impossible. The results of this study would suggest that alternate methods of data collection and analysis be employed by future researchers. The study also suggests that these outcomes are not easily measured because we cannot know what effect outside experiences have on the participants' self-reporting. We now need to extend the research to explore other outcomes, such as retention and career success.
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The purpose of this research study is to examine the communication barriers of anxiety and uncertainty for women in relationship to their employment outcomes. If you agree to participate you will be asked to complete a series of questionnaires relating to anxiety and uncertainty. The questionnaires should take about 30 minutes to complete. All information will remain confidential to the extent allowed by law.

There are no known risks associated with participation in this study and any risks associated with participation in this study are considered slight. If you find yourself feeling distressed by completing the questionnaires or would like to discontinue your participation for any reason, you may immediately stop your participation with no penalty or consequence. There is not expected to be any direct individual benefit to you for your participation in this study.

Please understand that this project is voluntary and you may refuse to participate or withdraw from this study at any time without penalty or consequence.

Please read the following:
I certify that I have read and understand the foregoing, that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters, and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the project at any time without prejudice.

I herewith give my consent to participate in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the principal Investigator or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence.

If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact:

Committee on Human Studies
University of Hawaii, 2450 Maile Way, Honolulu, Hi. 96822
Phone: (808)956-5000
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

For this section, please answer each question as indicated by instructions in parentheses ( ).

1) Ethnicity: ________________________________
   (Please indicate the ONE that you identify with the most)

2) Age: (check one)

   18-27_____  28-37_____  38-47_____  48+_____  

3) Education level: (circle highest grade or level completed)

   College: Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior

   High school: 9  10  11  12

   Other: ________________________________

4) Employment status: (check one)
   Currently employed___
   Currently unemployed___

5) Which program are you currently enrolled in: (check one)
   ABE (Adult Basic Education) _____
   GED (General Education Diploma) _____
   Family Literacy_____
   Other (name program) ________________

6) Is the program you are currently participating in a: (check one)
   Mandatory program____
   Voluntary program____
7) Have you previously participated in: *(check all that apply)*

A) a mandatory education/job-training program? 

If yes, how long were you in the program?  
Less than 6 months ___ 6 months to 1-year ___ more than 1 year ___

Were you able to complete the program(s)?  
Yes ___ No ___

If no, what were the reasons? ____________________________________________

B) a voluntary education/job-training program? ___

If yes, how long were you in the program?  
Less than 6 months ___ 6 months to 1-year ___ more than 1 year ___

Were you able to complete the program(s)?  
Yes ___ No ___

If no, what were the reasons? ____________________________________________

8) On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being least likely and 5 most likely), do you expect or anticipate completing the program you are currently enrolled in? *(circle one)*

(Least likely) 1 2 3 4 5 (Most likely)
Personal Communication Assessment

Respond to each statement by circling the degree (1 to 5) that best describes your interaction with others (persons you don’t know).

1 = never, 2 = almost never, 3 = sometimes, 4 = almost always, 5 = always

1. I am not confident when I communicate with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
2. I can interpret others’ behaviors when we communicate. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
3. I am indecisive when I communicate with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
4. I can explain others’ behavior when we communicate. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
5. I am not able to understand others when we communicate. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
6. I know what to do when I communicate with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
7. I am uncertain how to behave when I communicate with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
8. I can comprehend others’ behavior when we communicate. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
9. I am not able to predict others’ behavior when we communicate. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
10. I can describe others’ behavior when we communicate. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

1. I am calm when I communicate with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
2. I get frustrated when I communicate with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
3. I do not get confused when I communicate with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
4. I am insecure when I communicate with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
5. I feel confident when I communicate with others. [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
1= never, 2=almost never, 3=sometimes, 4=almost always, 5= always

6. I feel anxious when I communicate with others. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I do not get excited when I have to communicate with others. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I feel stress when I communicate with others. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I feel relaxed when I communicate with others. 1 2 3 4 5
10. I am worried when I communicate with others. 1 2 3 4 5

Respond to each statement circling the degree (1 to 5) that best describes the way you typically respond when interacting with others:

1=always false, 2=usually false, 3=sometimes false/sometimes true, 4=usually true, 5=always true.

1. I do not compare myself to others. 1 2 3 4 5
2. If given a choice, I prefer to go somewhere new rather than somewhere I’ve been before. 1 2 3 4 5
3. I reject ideas that are different than mine. 1 2 3 4 5
4. I try to resolve inconsistencies in beliefs I hold. 1 2 3 4 5
5. I am not interested in finding out information about myself. 1 2 3 4 5
6. When I obtain new information, I try to integrate it with information I already have. 1 2 3 4 5
7. I hold traditional beliefs. 1 2 3 4 5
8. I evaluate people on their own merit without comparing them to others. 1 2 3 4 5
9. I hold consistent views of myself. 1 2 3 4 5
10. If someone suggests an opinion that is different than mine, I do not reject it before I consider it. 1 2 3 4 5
Respond to each statement by indicating how often the situation occurs when you communicate in different relationships.

1=never  2= almost never  3= sometimes  4= almost always  5=always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Own Group</th>
<th>Other Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am not confident when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can interpret _____ behavior when we communicate.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am indecisive when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can explain _____ behavior when we communicate.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am not able to understand _____ when we communicate.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I know what to do when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am uncertain how to behave when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I can comprehend _____ behavior when we communicate.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am not able to predict _____ behavior when we communicate.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I can describe _____ behavior when we communicate.</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respond to each statement by indicating how often the statement applies in a particular relationship.

1=never  2= almost never  3= sometimes  4= almost always  5=always

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Own Group</th>
<th>Other Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel calm when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I get frustrated when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not get confused when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am insecure when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel composed when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel anxious when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I do not get excited when I have to communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel stress when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel relaxed when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am worried when I communicate with _____</td>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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