


1991

## Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking: An Exploratory Study and Scale Development Based on Expectancy Theory

Edwin J. Dawson  
*University of Arizona*

Donald D. Yoder  
*University of Dayton*

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca>

 Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#), [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#), [Mass Communication Commons](#), [Other Communication Commons](#), and the [Speech and Rhetorical Studies Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Dawson, Edwin J. and Yoder, Donald D. (1991) "Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking: An Exploratory Study and Scale Development Based on Expectancy Theory," *Basic Communication Course Annual*: Vol. 3 , Article 19.  
Available at: <http://ecommons.udayton.edu/bcca/vol3/iss1/19>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Basic Communication Course Annual by an authorized editor of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).

# **Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking: An Exploratory Study and Scale Development Based on Expectancy Theory**

---

*Edwin J. Dawson  
Donald D. Yoder*

Researchers have long been interested in factors which influence people's propensity for communication. Communication researchers have examined communication apprehension, willingness to communicate, shyness, reticence and stage fright to assess the cognitive, affective, and behavioral responses to communication situations in an effort to explain and predict a person's predilection toward communication. Recently, some communication scholars have begun an investigation into the role motivation plays in human communication. However, scant research has investigated the factors or dimensions which comprise a construct identifying a person's motivation to communicate.

Two decades of previous research have investigated the avoidance of communication as a psychological experience in which subjective anxiety is a perceived outcome within a situation. Communication apprehension (McCroskey, 1984; 1978; 1977) shyness (Zimbardo, 1977), social anxiety (Biglan, Glaser, & Dow, 1979), stagefright, and predisposition towards verbal behavior (Mortensen, Lustig, & Arntson, 1977), are constructs which are based on emotional or cognitive assumptions. Behavioral measures of communication avoidance such as unwillingness to communicate (Burgoon, 1976),

BASIC COMMUNICATION COURSE ANNUAL

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

and reticence measures of overt patterns of behavior (McCroskey, 1982). Researchers have also examined avoidance of various contexts such as writing apprehension (Daly & Miller, 1975), and singing apprehension (Andersen, Anderson & Garrison, 1978). The communication apprehension construct (CA) has been the most widely researched communication avoidance factor since its initial conception by McCroskey in 1970.

Some research has examined the approach dimension of motivation to communicate. Notably, the Willingness to Communicate construct or WTC (McCroskey & Baer, 1985) is an adaptation of the unwillingness to communicate construct. McCroskey (1985) concluded that even though communication apprehension may be the single best predictor of willingness to communicate, "there are other theoretical predictors that can have a substantial impact on willingness to communicate" (3). The willingness to communicate can also be considered as an "approach" component of overall motivation to communicate.

Some research has been conducted that more directly investigates motivation to communicate. Researchers have conceptualized and operationalized motivation from a needs gratification approach. Most communication motivation measures are adapted from other standardized personality scales or attempt to measure only global motivation tendencies such as the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) and the Test Anxiety Questionnaire (TAQ) (Giffin and Gilham, 1971). The use of the TAT and the TAQ and similar instruments that measure general achievement/failure traits is only inferentially and indirectly a measure of communication motivation. Rubin, Perse and Barbato (1988) developed an Interpersonal Communication Motives measure (ICM) which measured the reasons why people initiate conversations with others. Their measure was derived from the uses and gratifications perspectives of mass communication research (Katz, Blumler & Gurevitch, 1974) and interpersonal needs research

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

(Bennis, Schein, Steele & Berlew, 1968; Schultz, 1966). The ICM scale seemed to be an accurate measurement of interpersonal motives from the conceptualization of need assessment and need gratification theories of motivation. The application of mass media variables seems to be an indirect measure of needs in interpersonal communication contexts and may miss important dimensions of the motivation construct unique to other communication contexts.

Beatty (1985) also suggested a link between motivation and communication apprehension. Beatty's research indicated that CA, motivation, and duration of speech correlated significantly. The three items which measured motivation (motivated-unmotivated; interested-uninterested; and involved-uninvolved) were an incomplete operationalization of the construct domain. The inferential and indirect manner with which communication motivation has been tested, and the dominance of need gratification research in this area, indicates that a different measure based on expectancy theory and designed to identify dimensions of the motivation construct may increase the understanding of an individual's motivation to communicate.

Most approaches to studying communication motivation and related constructs have focused on identifying approach *or* avoidance tendencies based on a need gratification approach. While this approach has potential uses, it seems inadequate to fully measure motivation resulting from the interplay of conflicting or compounding needs. For example, a highly anxious person may want to avoid communication, but a low anxious person does not necessarily seek to engage in communication. Conversely, a high CA person may still engage in communication if other approach tendencies outweigh the avoidance due to anxiety.

Research which examines such factors as communication apprehension, shyness, reticence and related constructs involve the analysis of specific communicative difficulties leading to the avoidance of communication. Albeit this direc-

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

tion of research has been useful in categorizing and labeling inadequacies, an expectancy based motivation construct of communication would allow for a multi-directional analysis of potential behavior. In short, a motivational construct will combine the forces of both avoidance and attainment of certain potential outcomes instead of separately measuring variables that restrict communication or that encourage communication.

The term motivation is viewed in reference to the tendency for the direction or selectivity of behavior to be “governed in some way by its relation to objectively definable consequences, and the tendency of behavior to persist until the end is attained” (Atkinson, 274). In any communication situation, there are consequences which a person wishes to attain (positive forces toward communication) and outcomes which the person wishes to avoid (negative forces away from communication). The balance of these positive and negative forces should be an indicator of the degree to which a person is motivated to perform or avoid communication. Two fundamental assumptions are central to the concept of motivation used in this study: 1) motivation consists of components referred to as force and direction (Duffy, 1957, Haire, 1964; Spence, 1958); 2) these components are comprised of learned and unlearned responses which are additive (Haire, 1964; Hull, 1943).

Haire (1964) argues that there are many forces that operate on a person, and the rate and direction of behavior are a complex resultant of these forces. Specifically, when two or more forces are playing out a particular goal related behavior “the rate of behavior is determined by the resultant of the two — the longer one minus the shorter one” (Haire, 165). Similarly, the interplay in direction of these forces moves a person towards or away from a particular behavior. Vroom (1964) introduced a similar motivational model for predicting the direction and intensity of behavior. He contends that an individual is faced with various alternative barriers and must

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

choose the most satisfying outcome or valences. The relationship between these valences and the desired outcomes is called "instrumentality." The overall valence according to Vroom (1964) is "a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valences of all other outcomes and his conceptions of its instrumentality for the attainment of these outcomes" (17). The factors that determine behavior have an additive function, such that when summed, indicate the direction and rate of behavior.

By combining the multiplicative properties of the two motivational components (Hull, 1943) and the additive properties of the factors related to the direction a behavior may take, the formulation of a mathematical measurement of motivation is created. This formula for motivation has more recently been advanced as expectancy theory. Expectancy theory states that "the strength of the tendency for an individual to perform a particular act is function of (a) the strength with which he expects certain outcomes to be obtained from the act, times (b) the attractiveness to him of the expected outcomes" (Hackman & Porter, 248). Similar formulations have been posited by Fishbein (1963), Hackman (1968), and Fering (1953).

Motivation is viewed here as containing both approach and avoidance directions. The direction of motivation is dependent upon both the importance of the need and the perceived expectancy that the reward will be earned. Thus, a very important need that has a low likelihood of being fulfilled is of little motivating force; conversely, a reward that is likely to occur but which is perceived as having little value will not be a strong motivator.

In light of the aforementioned assumptions, this study will describe motivation as: the combination of three factors — (a) particular outcomes which the individual perceives as occurring as a result of a behavior; (b) the strength of expectancy of those outcomes; and (c) the valence or direction the behavior will take to either approach or avoid the

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

outcome. This study will attempt to create a communication motivation measure based on expectancy theory which will account for the additive forces of a person's evaluation of positive and negative outcomes in combination with the force or importance of those outcomes.

Since a global measure of communication motivation is beyond the scope of this study, the public speaking situation will be used to generate potential outcomes and consequences of giving a public speech. In many colleges and universities, the public speaking course is the only exposure a student may get to communication. Since large numbers of students enroll in introductory public speaking courses, and since it is important to create a more complete understanding of the factors that affect these students, this study will use the public speaking situation to explore the new construct of communication motivation.

Since the motivational construct has been previously investigated using need gratification theory, it is important to explore the conceptual differences and similarities between Communication Motivation in Public Speaking based on expectancy theory and current measures of communication motives. Therefore, this study asks the following research questions:

- 1) What are the factor structure and reliability of a "communication motivation in public speaking" (CMPS) instrument which is based on expectancy theory?
- 2) What is the relationship between Communication Motivation in Public Speaking (CMPS) and the PRCA, WTC, and ICM?

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

## MEASUREMENT

Communication anxiety (avoidance) was measured with the Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA-24) (McCroskey, 1985). This instrument was designed to measure both trait and state communication apprehension in four contexts yielding four sub-scores: public speaking, meetings, small groups, and conversations. The reliability is consistently high, usually above .90, and the validity is well established in previous research (McCroskey, 1984).

A person's approach to communication was measured by the Willingness to Communicate (WTC) scale (McCroskey & Baer, 1985). This measure is based on the assumption that people exhibit a global willingness to approach communication (McCroskey, 1985). Respondents express the percentage of time (0 = never, to 100 = always) they would be willing to communicate with three types of people (strangers, acquaintances, friends) in four contexts (public speaking, meetings, groups and dyads). Previous internal reliability alpha estimates for the total WTC score was reported to be .92, with internal reliabilities for the subscores ranging from .65 to .76 (McCroskey & Baer, 1985). Factor analysis indicated the scale is unidimensional, and construct and predictive validity were present as well (McCroskey, 1985).

Interpersonal motives were measured with the Interpersonal Communication Motives (ICM) scale (Rubin, Perse & Barbato, 1988). The instrument consists of 28, 5 point Likert-type items used to ascertain interpersonal communication motives on six factors: pleasure, affection, inclusion, escape, relaxation and control. The Cronbach alpha for the factors are: pleasure (.89), affection (.85), inclusion (.84), escape (.77), relaxation (.81), and control (.75). Scores were validated in conjunction with the PRCA (McCroskey, 1970) and the Global Communication Satisfaction Instrument (Hecht, 1978).



*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

A new scale, based on expectancy theory, was developed that measured motivation specific to the public speaking context. The "Communication Motivation in Public Speaking" (CMPS) scale was developed in two separate studies. A pre-test was used to generate possible scale items and to determine a preliminary factor structure of the items. The second study further refined the CMPS items to create a reliable measuring instrument to be used in the analysis of the research questions.

In the pretest, the initial pool of items were generated from students enrolled in introductory public speaking classes (n=30). An open ended questionnaire was used to generate potential positive and negative consequences and outcomes of presenting a public speech in class (Babbie, 1973). Students were asked to consider potential outcomes that might occur while preparing the speech, during the delivery of the speech, and after the speech. The items from the open-ended questionnaire that were similar in idea (e.g., good grade, good mark, good score) or which depicted different degrees of intensity of the same idea (e.g., very frightened, a little scared, anxious) were collapsed into a single item. Items mentioned less than three times were omitted (Hackman, 1969).

After the items were categorized, the CMPS items were given to communication faculty, graduate students and undergraduate students for further reduction. Refinements in wording, categorizing, and the addition of other items were made to reduce redundancy, improve clarity, and increase the domain of the motivation construct measured by the CMPS.

Forty items were retained for the pre-test form of the CMPS. Each outcome was written as two Likert-type scales. One scale indicated the perceived likelihood (expectancy) that the outcome would occur. The more an outcome is perceived as likely to occur, the more that potential outcome will add to the person's overall motivation to either attain or avoid the outcome. Subjects responded to each item on a scale from "1=

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

not at all likely to occur” to “5= very likely to occur.” The second scale was used to indicate the motivational force of the item, i.e., whether the student would work hard to avoid or attain the outcome. This scale ranges from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” on items worded to represent the importance of avoiding or attaining each outcome.

The motivational level for each item is the number ascertained from multiplying the force and the direction component. The mean of all negatively worded outcomes is then subtracted from the mean of the positively worded outcomes. In light of the conceptualization of motivation, the resulting total score is an indication of low to high motivation.

The pre-test of the CMPS was conducted with subjects enrolled in the introductory public speaking class (N=200). Different students than those who generated the initial items were used. Factor analysis of CMPS was conducted to determine dimensionality and factor structure of the 40 items. The criteria for item retention was a primary loading above .50 with no other loading above 50% of the primary loading (Burgoon, Coker, & Birk, 1988). Twenty-four items comprising seven factors which accounted for 65.1% of the total variance were retained.

## METHOD

The sample for this study consisted of undergraduate students enrolled in introductory public speaking courses (N=204). Demographic analysis indicated that 39% were male, 61% were female. The students' varied in age (18-20 = 41%; 21-25 = 38%; 26-30 = 8%; 31+ = 12.3%) and year in school (freshman = 25%; sophomores= 32%; juniors = 15%; seniors = 24%; special status = 3%).

Packets containing the PRCA, WTC, ICM, and CMPS instruments were distributed to each subject during class.

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

The tests were randomly ordered in order to avoid test order effect.

Factor analysis was used to investigate research question #1. Cronbach's alpha was computed to determine the dimensional and overall reliabilities of the CMPS. Pearson product-moment correlations were computed to investigate the relationship between the dimensions of the PRCA, Willingness to Communicate, and Interpersonal Communication Motivation measures and the CMPS. The alpha level for all significance tests was set at .05.

## **RESULTS**

The CMPS was subjected to factor analysis in the actual study. Principal Components factor analysis with varimax rotation produced a six factor structure which met the 1.0 eigenvalue cutoff criterion. A factor needed to have at least two items loading at least .60 on the primary factor and less than .40 on any other factor to be considered a meaningful dimension (McCroskey, 1977). Two factors failed to meet this criteria and were removed from further analyses. Six other items had multiple loadings and were also removed from the analysis. The remaining 16 items comprise four dimensions of the Communication Motivation in Public Speaking Instrument. (See Table 1 for the rotated factor solution of the 16 items retained.) These four factors accounted for 61.5 percent of the total variance.

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

**Table 1**  
**Rotated Factor Loadings for the CMPS**

	Factor Loadings			
	1	2	3	4
<b>Factor I: Negative feedback</b>				
I will confuse the audience.	.76	-.03	-.03	.00
I will be disappointed . . .	.60	.35	.03	-.21
I will receive a good grade.*	.66	.24	-.17	-.14
I will fail in accomplishing purpose.	.72	.18	.05	-.15
I will receive negative feedback.	.66	.15	-.04	.09
<b>Factor II: Public Speaking Anxiety</b>				
My voice will tremble.	.21	.75	-.01	.05
I will feel "butterflies" . . .	.01	.82	.05	.15
I will worry about next speech.	.18	.76	.02	-.09
I will remain nervous . . .	.25	.69	.07	-.13
<b>Factor III: Positive Learning Outcomes</b>				
I will improve research skills.	.13	.10	.84	.13
I will learn to budget time.	-.00	-.04	.74	.24
I will feel a sense of accomplishment	-.23	.12	.65	.39
I will enjoy preparing speech.	-.11	-.00	.76	.05
<b>Factor IV: Positive Audience Feedback</b>				
I will receive positive feedback.	-.23	.07	.25	.65
I will influence audience beliefs.	.03	-.14	.18	.85
I will motivate people . . .	-.05	.04	.17	.86

Parenthetical numbers correspond to CMPS items. See Figure A.

\*Scoring for this item was reversed.

Reliability for Each Factor (Cronbach's alpha)

Negative Audience Feedback = .76

Public Speaking Anxiety = .78

Positive Learning Outcomes = .78

Positive Audience Feedback = .78

The first dimension, *negative feedback*, was labeled from 5-items depicting outcomes associated with negative feedback from the audience. The locus of control was centered in the perception of the audience's appraisal of the public speaking

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

experience. The negative feedback dimension accounted for 24.5% of the total variance. The second factor reflected the domain of *public speaking anxiety*. These 4-items reflected outcomes that are commonly associated with communication apprehension. The public speaking anxiety dimension accounted for 20.5% of the total variance. The third factor consisted of items reflecting the student's perception of *positive learning outcomes*. This dimension contains items with the apparent focus is on educational and self-growth rewards for the student. The dimension of positive learning outcomes accounted for an additional 10.5% of the total variance. The fourth factor that emerged reflected positive audience centered outcomes. The *positive audience feedback* dimension accounted for 5.6% of the variance.

The final 16-item Communication Motivation in Public Speaking Instrument (CMPS) was used in the remainder of this study. The four dimensions seem conceptually clear and seem to accurately reflect the positive and negative outcomes associated with the public speaking situation. The final four dimensions include both the positive and negative dimensions of self and audience centered evaluations of the speaking situation. Reliability estimates using Cronbach's (1951) internal reliability formula were used to assess each emerging factor reliability and are reported in Table 1.

*Research question #2* examined the validity of the Communication Motivation in Public Speaking instrument. First, the relationship between the PRCA and the CMPS was assessed. The results of the Pearson product-moment correlations between the total communication apprehension score and each of the dimensions of the CMPS revealed that the total PRCA score positively correlated with negative feedback ( $r=.30$ ;  $p < .001$ ) and with public speaking anxiety ( $r = .54$ ;  $p < .001$ ), but was negatively correlated with positive learning outcomes ( $r = -.33$ ;  $p < .001$ ) and with positive audience feedback ( $r = -.35$ ;  $p < .001$ ). (See Table 2 for an overall correlation matrix.)

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

**Table 2**  
**Pearson Correlations: Communication Motivation in Public Speaking; Personal Report of Communication Apprehension**

	1	2	3	4	Total CMPS
Group	-.27**	-.23**	.21*	.37**	-.45**
Meeting	-.23**	-.27**	.22*	.43**	-.48**
Conversation	-.21*	-.25**	.11	.37**	-.40**
Public Spk	-.36**	-.37**	.42**	.56**	-.69**
TOTAL PRCA	-.33**	-.35**	.30**	.54**	-.63**

Where 1 = Positive Learning Outcomes; 2 = Positive Audience Feedback; 3 = Negative Feedback; 4 = Public Speaking Anxiety.

N = 203

\* $p < .01$ ; \*\* $p < .001$ .

Analyses of specific dimensions of the PRCA and the CMPS indicated that virtually all of the PRCA dimensions showed a significant positive correlation with the avoidance dimensions of the CMPS and significant negative correlations with the approach dimensions of the CMPS. (See Table 2.) The total PRCA score correlated with the total CMPS score ( $r = -.63$ ;  $p < .001$ ). These results indicated that the multi-dimensional construct of CMPS, accounting for both approach and avoidance, and the unidimensional construct of PRCA, accounting for avoidance, are negatively correlated.

The relationship between the Willingness to Communicate Instrument (WTC) and the CMPS was also examined.

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

Pearson correlation results indicated that the total Willingness to Communicate (WTC) score positively correlated with positive learning outcomes ( $r = .14$ ;  $p < .05$ ), but negatively correlated with public speaking anxiety ( $r = -.16$ ;  $p < .05$ ). Analysis of the correlation among the dimensions of the WTC and the CMPS indicated that the WTC dimension of willingness to speak in public positively correlated with positive learning outcomes ( $r = .16$ ;  $p < .05$ ), positive feedback ( $r = .18$ ;  $p < .01$ ) and with the total CMPS score ( $r = .30$ ;  $p < .001$ ). This dimension also negatively correlated with negative feedback ( $r = -.16$ ;  $p < .05$ ) and public speaking anxiety ( $r = -.23$ ;  $p < .001$ ). Willingness to talk to strangers correlated with the total CMPS score ( $r = .28$ ;  $p < .001$ ). These findings further substantiate the relationship between a person's willingness to communicate in public and with strangers and the comparable construct of motivation to give a public speech. The failure of the CMPS dimension scores to correlate with willingness to speak in a dyad, with a friend, and with an acquaintance, indicate that the CMPS is specifically measuring the public speaking context. (See Table 3.)

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

**Table 3**  
**Pearson Correlations: Communication Motivation in Public Speaking; Willingness to Communicate**

	1	2	3	4	Total CMPS
Public	.16*	.18**	-.16*	-.23***	.30***
Meetings	.12	.12	-.10	-.14*	.20**
Group	.12	.09	-.11	-.18**	.21**
Dyad	.10	.06	-.05	-.04	.10
Stranger	.15*	.13	-.16*	-.25***	.28***
Acquaintance	.13	.13	-.09	-.12	.19**
Friend	.09	.07	-.03	-.01	.08
Total WTC	.14*	.13	-.11	-.16*	.22**

Where 1 = Positive Learning Outcomes; 2 = Positive Feedback; 3 = Negative Feedback; 4 = Public Speaking Anxiety.

N = 203

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ .

The relationship between the Interpersonal Communication Motives instrument (ICM) and the CMPS was assessed. Pearson correlations revealed that the interpersonal needs associated with the more positive dimensions of pleasure, affection, and relaxation were correlated with the positive dimensions of positive learning outcomes and positive audience feedback. This was consistent with Rubin, Perse and Barbato's (1988) findings that the pleasure, affection and control motives were related negatively to Communication Apprehension and therefore should be positively correlated with the positive dimensions of the CMPS instrument. The control motive, however, did not correlate significantly with



*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

any CMPS dimensions. In addition, the ICM dimension of escape was negatively correlated with the positive CMPS dimensions and positively correlated with the negative CMPS dimensions of negative feedback and public speaking anxiety. The correlations between the CMPS dimensions and the ICM dimensions supported the initial suggestion that the fulfillment of interpersonal needs should have low correlations with the Communication Motivation in Public Speaking Instrument. (See Table 4.)

**Table 4**  
**Pearson Correlations: Communication Motivation in Public Speaking, Interpersonal Communication Motives**

	1	2	3	4
Pleasure	.23***	.24***	-.09	-.05
Affection	.33***	.27***	-.01	.09
Inclusion	.03	.12	.15*	.16*
Escape	-.26***	.16*	.23***	.14*
Relaxation	.19**	.25***	.03	.07
Control	-.12	.11	.02	-.08

Where 1 = Positive Learning Outcomes; 2 = Positive Feedback; 3 = Negative Feedback; 4 = Public Speaking Anxiety.

N = 202

\*p < .05; \*\*p < .01; \*\*\*p < .001.

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

## DISCUSSION

A motivational scale based on expectancy theory was constructed which measured the directionality and the intensity of motivation to communicate in a public speaking situation. The scale effectively measured the interplay between the approach and avoidance forces toward specific communication outcomes. Research Question #1 attempted to determine the factor structure of the CMPS instrument. A pretest identified specific outcomes that students evaluate when giving a public speech. Factor analysis reduced the number of outcomes to 16 specific consequences representing four dimensions of public speaking motivation. The four dimensions of the CMPS reflected both the approach and avoidance conceptualization of motivation suggested by expectancy theory. The reliability estimates ranged from .75 to .78 which are reasonable for a new measure (Nunnally, 1967). These findings argue that the Communication Motivation in Public Speaking instrument (CMPS) is a reliable measure of motivation based on expectancy theory. Since the scale items are drawn from a large sample of outcomes generated by the students themselves, and are representative of the domain of the construct, the content validity is adequately established.

Research Question #2 explored the relationship between communication apprehension (as measured by the PRCA), willingness to communicate (WTC), interpersonal communication motivation (ICM), and Communication Motivation in Public Speaking (CMPS). As posited in the conceptualization of the CMPS, results indicated that communication apprehension was correlated to the negative dimensions of the CMPS instrument and negatively correlated to the positive dimensions.

The relationship between communication motivation in public speaking and willingness to communicate as measured

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

by the Willingness to Communicate instrument (WTC) also contributed to the construct validity of the CMPS. While the total WTC and total CMPS scores were significantly related (.22;  $p < .01$ ), willingness to speak in public and with strangers were the only dimensions with consistent significant correlations with the CMPS dimensions. Willingness to communicate with friends or in dyads did not significantly correlate with the total CMPS score. This result was expected because the CMPS is intended to measure public speaking and not the interpersonal situation of the dyad. These results support the predictive validity of the CMPS instrument.

The relationship between the communication motivation in public speaking instrument and the Interpersonal Communication Motives scale (ICM) (Rubin, Perse & Barbato, 1988) revealed some correlations among dimensions. The dimensional motives of pleasure, affection and relaxation were significantly correlated to the positive dimensions of the CMPS instrument. The escape motive was negatively correlated with positive audience feedback and positive learning outcomes and positively correlated with negative audience feedback and public speaking anxiety. The control dimension did not correlate significantly with the CMPS dimensions. This indicates that measurement of motivation from a need gratification conceptualization is not isomorphic with measurement of motivation conceptualized as expectancy potential. It also suggests that motivational factors relevant to interpersonal communication are different than motivational factors relevant to the public speaking context.

The CMPS seems to be a valid combination of propensities to approach and avoid public speaking. It also seems to be a predictor of public speaking motivation, rather than general communication motivation. Approach dimensions in the CMPS correlated positively with the WTC (an approach instrument) and negatively with the PRCA (an avoidance measurement). Conversely, the avoidance dimensions of the CMPS correlated positively with the avoidance measure

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

(PRCA) and negatively with the approach measure (WTC). The highest correlations were with public speaking dimensions of the other instruments with few significant correlations with interpersonal dimensions of the WTC, PRCA, and ICM. The correlations among the instruments give some evidence of construct and discriminant validity. This may indicate that though the constructs measured by the CMPS and the other instruments are similar, the expectancy theory approach to communication motivation may provide additional or different information in explaining the variance in people's propensity to communicate.

Pedagogical applications of the CMPS are important to examine. Introductory communication course instructors often assume that reduction of anxiety is tantamount to increasing motivation to present public speeches. This study clearly demonstrates that apprehension is just one of the dimensions of the motivation to communicate construct. People with low apprehension cannot be assumed to be highly motivated. Teachers need to be concerned with all the factors which contribute to motivation.

The results of the study also indicate that audience reactions are an important factor in motivating students to give public speeches. Impressing the student audience that they do have an impact on their peers may increase their awareness of the transactional nature of the communication context. They may become aware of their own role in the success or failure of a speaker and hence become more motivated to participate in the public speaking process.

Perhaps the individual item scores of the CMPS reflect the most important pedagogical implications in this investigation. In addition to the total CMPS score, dimensional scores indicate specific areas that are contributing to the student's motivation. Scores on individual items reflect specific outcomes that are affecting the student's motivation to communicate. Communication instructors can measure the impact of 16 potential outcomes which may affect student's

### *Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

motivation to participate in public speaking. Self-diagnosis may help the student re-evaluate the factors that are hindering their motivation to communicate and accentuate factors that are contributing to their motivation.

Teachers often try to discover what motivates students through trial and error. A common strategy is to assume factors that would motivate the teacher (e.g., grades, learning, self growth) also motivate the students. The CMPS scores may assist in the teacher's diagnoses of a performance situation in motivational terms, and provide the potential to "change aspects of the situation to obtain higher levels of effort from the performers" (Hackman & Porter, 254). Specific interventions designed for the specific student may improve the ability of teachers in the introductory course to increase motivation.

### *Limitations of the Study*

The most significant limitation of the present research is the fact that the potential consequences that were generated by the students were reduced from over 100 to 16. While it is evident that there are more than 16 consequences for giving a public speech that will effect a student's motivation, pragmatics dictated the outcomes be limited to a manageable number of items. In future research, additional consequences should be collected from students and "nonstudents" to fully explore the domain of the motivation construct. In addition, future research should investigate the relationship between other variables, (e.g., number of previous speeches, and previous public speaking instruction, gender, class size, gender of teacher) and a person's motivation to communicate. Motivational factors for other communication contexts (e.g., interpersonal, organizational, conflict, problem solving, interviewing) also need to be identified.

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, P.A., Anderson, J., & Garrison, J. (1978). Singing apprehension: The development of two constructs. *Sign Language Studies, 19*, 155-86.
- Atkinson, J.W. (1964). *An Introduction to Motivation*, The University Series in psychology. Princeton, NJ: D. Van Nostrand.
- Babbie, E.R., (1973). *Survey Research Methods*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Babbie, E.R., (1979). *The practice of social research*, 2nd edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Beatty, M.J. & Forst, E.C., & Stewart, R.A. (1985). *Communication apprehension and motivation as predictors of public speaking duration*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, Colorado.
- Bennis, W.G., Schein, E.R., Steele, F.A., & Berlew, D. (1968). Towards better interpersonal relationships. In W.G. Bennis, E.R. Schein, F.A. Steele, & D.E. Berlew (Eds.), *Interpersonal dynamics: Essays and readings on human interaction*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey.
- Biglan, A., Glaser, S., & Dow, M., (1979). *Conversational skills training for social anxiety: An Evaluation of validity*. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, San Antonio, TX.
- Burgoon, J.K. (1976). The unwillingness-to-communicate scale: Development and validation. *Communication Monographs, 43*, 60-9.

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

- Daly, J.A., Miller, M. (1975). The empirical development of an instrument to measure writing apprehension. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 9, 242-9.
- Duffy, E. (1957). The psychological significance of "arousal" or "activation." *Psychology Review*, 64, 265-75.
- Fishbein, M., (1963). An investigation of the relationships between beliefs about an object and the attitude toward that object. *Human Relations*, 16, 233-9.
- Giffin, K., Gilham, S. (1971). Relationship between speech anxiety and motivation. *Speech Monographs*, 38, 70-3.
- Hackman, J.R., Anderson, L.R. (1968). The strength, relevance, and source of beliefs about and object in Fishbein's attitude theory, *Journal of Social Psychology*, 76, 55-67.
- Hackman, J.R., Porter, L. (1974). Expectancy theory predictions of work effectiveness. *Studies in Personnel and Industrial Psychology*, 3rd Ed. Fleishman, E. and Bass, A. (Eds.), Homewood, IL: Dorsey, 248-57.
- Haire, M. (1964). *Psychology in management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hecht, M.L. (1978). The conceptualization and measurement of interpersonal communication satisfaction. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 253-64.
- Hull, C.L. (1943). *Principles of behavior*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Katz, E., Blumler, J.G., & Gurevitch, M. (1974). Utilization of mass communication by the individual. In J.G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.) *The uses of mass communications: Current perspectives on gratifications research*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- McCroskey, J.C., (1984). Self-report measurement. In J.A. Daly and J.C. McCroskey (Eds.) *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

*Measurement of Communication Motivation in Public Speaking*

- McCroskey, J.C., (1977). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 78-96.
- McCroskey, J.C. (1976a). Oral communication apprehension: A summary of recent theory and research. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 78-96.
- McCroskey, J.C., (1976b). The effects of communication apprehension on nonverbal behavior. *Communication Quarterly, 24*, 39-44.
- McCroskey, J.C. & Baer, J. (1985) *Willingness to communicate: The construct and its measurement*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, Co.
- Mortensen, D. C., Lustig, M., Arntson, P., (1977). The Effects of predispositions toward verbal behavior in interaction patterns in dyads. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 61*, 146-58.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rubin, A.M., Perse, E. & Barbato, C. (1988). Conceptualization and measurement of communication motives. *Human Communication Research, 14*, 4, 602-28.
- Schutz, W.C. (1966). *The interpersonal underworld*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.
- Spence, K.W. (1958). A theory of emotionally based drive (D) and its relation to performance in simple learning situations. *American Psychologist 13*, 131-41.
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.