DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 252 894 CS 504 798

AUTHOR Hughey, Jim D.
TITLE Why Are Women Getting All Those A's?
PUB DATE 84
NOTE .; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (70th, Chicago, IL, November 1-4, 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Behavior Patterns; *Communication Research; Communication Skills; Comparative Analysis; *Females; *Grading; Higher Education; Males; *Performance Factors; Sex Bias; *Sex Differences; *Speech Communication; Speech Instruction; Speech Skills; Theories

ABSTRACT

To explain evidence that females receive higher grades in communication courses than males, one researcher has posed a competence/compliance paradox: either, women are more competent communicators and are only judged to be less competent in public life because of prejudice, or, women are not as competent as men in communication as demonstrated in public life and their higher grades in the classroom are an artifice created by the context and their high compliance with instruction. In an attempt to resolve this paradox, discriminant analysis and correlational procedures were used to examine the relationship between grades received by 2,083 male and female students and their communicative responsiveness, as indicated by nine responsiveness scales. The results indicated that the communication patterns of sensitive speaker, sensitive listener, and supportive norm are female-specific patterns and the pattern of problem handler is male-specific. The sensitive speaker pattern is salient to most assignment grades in the course and offers the most likely explanation of why women get higher course grades than men. Although the pattern is a compliance pattern that focuses on the other person, it also represents the fundamental competency in a speech communication course: speaking. The results seem to favor the competence explanation for higher grades for women, but they also suggest that women are communicatively compliant and more competent than males. (HTH)

ABSTRACT

WHY ARE WOMEN GETTING ALL THOSE A'S?

by

Jim D. Hughey

Empirical evidence substantiates that females receive higher grades than males in both performance and nonperformance communication courses. Pearson poses a competence/compliance paradox in explaining the phenomenon. This paper addresses the paradox through discriminant and correlational analyses of grades received by female and male students and their communicative responsiveness. It is argued that the findings do not rule out the compliance explanation but favor the competence rationale.

Jim D. Hughey is a Professor of Speech Communication at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 405-624-6150.

Submitted to

Instructional Development Division
Speech Communication Association

Chicago, Illinois
November 1-4, 1984

WHY ARE WOMEN GETTING ALL THOSE A'S?

Concerned with the issue of grade inflation, Geisinger (1980) asked, "Who are giving all those A's?" His examination of high-grading college faculty revealed that an instructor's grading philosophy along with the size of the class taught by the instructor gave a partial answer to the question. Applying his findings to the basic speech communication course, Hughey and Harper (1983a, 1983c) examined the final course grades along with the grading style of seventeen instructors. In the process of the investigation, they observed that between five to sixteen percent of the variance in final course grades could be attributed to the gender of the student receiving the grade. In this paper, attention is shifted from "who's giving" to "who's getting" all those A's, with the central focus on "why."

Pearson (1982) has accumulated impressive evidence that females receive higher grades than males in both performance and nonperformance communication courses. In addition to Pearson's other works (1980, 1981; Pearson & Nelson, 1981), Barker (1966) and Sprague (1971) suggest that women receive more favorable ratings than men.

In explaining why females get higher grades than males, Pearson (1982) poses this paradox:

> First, we might posit that women are more competent communicators as demonstrated in a variety of studies in controlled classroom situations, and they are only judged to be less competent in public life because of the prejudice against women. We can also hold, based on the same data, that women are not as competent as men in communication as demonstrated in the situation

> which occurs, after college, and that women's higher grades in the communication classroom are an artifact created by the context and their high compliance. Our task in resolving this dilemma is still incomplete (p. 11).

The competence/compliance dilemma is a very real one and demands a concerted research effort to resolve it.

This investigation was undertaken in an attempt to cope with the Pearson competence/compliance paradox. Discriminant analysis and correlational procedures were used to examine the nature of the relationship between grades received by female and male students in the basic course and their communicative responsiveness. The measure of responsiveness used in this study allows for the classification of communication patterns along Mastery (assertive, noncomplying), Flexible (harmonizing, complying), and Neutral (low competence) lines.

This study dealt with three questions.

> Q1 What patterns of responsiveness are more salient to one gender as opposed to the other?

Discriminant analysis was used to identify patterns of responsiveness that were gender-specific and patterns that were associated with higher grades regardless of gender.

> Q2 What gender-specific patterns are most salient to grades in the basic course?

Focusing in on the gender-specific patterns, we calculated correlation coefficients between patterns and grades for each assignment in the course.

> Q3 Do the salient patterns appear to favor a competence or compliance explanation?

The most salient patterns (those associated most frequently with course assignments) were examined in the light of Pearson's competence/compliance paradox. Data from 2,083 students were examined in this study.

Student Responsiveness

Each student responded to the Conversation Self Report Inventory (CSRI) during the first week of the semester. Each item in the CSRI presents a Mastery Responsive, Flexible Responsive, and Neutral Responsive alternative to a total of 60 conversational situations. With the Mastery Responsive (MR) mode, a person chooses to impose his/her will on the conversation. For the Flexible Responsive (FR) mode, a person chooses to respond by adapting or harmonizing him/herself with the conversation. With the Neutral Responsive (NR) mode, a person chooses to detach him/herself from the conversation.

Eighteen conversational situations tap the actual behaviors exhibited in a conversation by a respondent: the respondent reports "this is what I actually do in a conversation." Twenty-four items deal with the image a respondent projects in a conversation: the respondent reports "this is the impression of me others might get in a conversation." Eighteen items deal with what a respondent expects in a conversation. Expectations are further broken down into six-item motivational ("this is what I want to do"), normative ("this is what most people do"), and value ("this is the best thing to do") dimensions. This tripartite division is consistent with the general theory of action which was articulated by Parsons and Shils (1951).

A recent factor analysis of the MR, FR, and NR scales (n = 2305) produced the nine scales used in this study. A descriptive summary of each scale is exhibited in Table 1, and the scale intercorrelations and reliabilities are presented in Table 2. Seven of the scales focus on the role requirements of a conversation, and two scales deal with the expectations of a person in a conversation.

Insert Tables 1 and 2 About Here

Scale 1 concerns the way a person views the purpose of conversation. It pits the MR mode against the NR mode of responsiveness; that is, the persuader responds in a conversation by promoting his/her own view rather than by being a communication avoider.

Scale 2 focuses on the way a person transmits information. It considers the FR option in opposition to the NR option: the sensitive speaker responds in a conversation through focusing on others and self-disclosure rather than through being a nonspeaker.

Two scales concern the way a person receives information. Scale 3 puts the FR mode against the MR mode: the sensitive receiver responds in a conversation by listening to the problems of others rather than by being a talkative speaker. In scale 4, the FR option is paired with the NR option; the unconditional listener responds in a conversation by listening to anything rather than by being a nonlistener.

The factor analysis pinpointed two scales having to do with conversational coherence. Scale 5 pits the MR mode against the NR mode: the conversational organizer responds to a confusing conversation by being organized rather than being a rambler. Scale 6 considers the FR option in relation to the NR option: the insightful conversationalist responds to a confusing conversation by figuring out the intentions of others rather than being puzzled. In essence scales 5 and 6 make the distinction between "being confusing" in a conversation and "being confused" in a conversation.

The final role requirement considered in this study concerns problem

management. Scale 7 puts the MR choice in opposition to the NR choice: the problem handler responds to a conflict in a conversation in a decisive way rather than being a conflict avoider.

The factor analysis highlighted two scales dealing with expectations. Scale 8 focuses on a normative orientation that places the FR mode against the NR mode: a person holding to a supportive norm contends that most people typically respond in a conversation in a supportive way rather than a neutral or detached way. Scale 9 deals with a value dimension of expectations that pits the MR mode against the NR mode: a person with a verbal value-orientation believes it is best to possess a good vocabulary in a conversation; he/she does not value nonparticipation in a conversation.

Neal and Hughey (1979) summarize the early validation studies of the CSRI. The inventory correlates with the expected dimensions tapped by the "California Psychological Inventory" and Gordon's "Survey of Interpersonal Values." Scores from the CSRI produce correlations in the .46 - .38 (n = 89) range for the Sociability, Benevolence, Tolerance, and Good Impression scales of these measures. Other significant relationships were noted between the CSRI and the Social Presence, Responsibility, Achievement, Intellectual Efficiency, and Feminity scales. Leesavan (1977) summarizes other validation studies where scales on the CSRI were related significantly to communication satisfaction, management style, decision-making effectiveness, and violence proneness. Recent studies have related the CSRI to teaching effectiveness and found the scales to successfully differentiate among teaching styles and course outcomes (Hughey & Harper, 1983b). Reliability coefficients for the nine scales are presented in Table 2 and range from .50 to .78 (n = 2305).

Grading Procedures in the Basic Course

The basic course is a hybrid course emphasizing both interpersonal and public communication. Students participate in interviews, private and public group discussion groups, and platform speaking experiences as well as take examinations and quizzes. They also produce written reports and outlines pertinent to oral communication experiences. In total there are 16 separate assessments of student performance.

The grading scale is defined by 29 points with 29 = A+, 18 = D-, 16 = F, 0 = assignment not attempted. Specific departmental criteria are stipulated for each grade described in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 About Here

Both the mid-semester (50 items) and final examination (100 items) are prepared by the course director using input from those teaching the course. Each instructor submits five multiple-choice, four alternative items for each examination. Each instructor responds to a rough draft of the examination that is made up of all the submitted questions. The instructor also rates each item on a 0-5 scale (0 = throw the item out; 5 = one of the finest items I've ever seen). In a validation session with all instructors present, each item is reviewed; items scoring less than two are not retained for the examination. Other items are refined and polished. Alphas for the Mid-Term and Final are typically in the .80 - .94 range.

Approximately 32 sections of a maximum of 30 students are offered each semester. Most of the sections are taught by graduate teaching

assistants that are pursuing a two-year Master's program in speech communication. Each TA teaches two or three sections of the course. All TAs undergo a week-long training seminar at the beginning of each semester. Much of the seminar is devoted to training the TAs in the use of departmental criteria for the 16 assessments. The textbook (Hughey & Johnson, 1975) is competency-based and employs a behavioral-objective format.

Most of the students enrolled in the course come from the College of Business and the College of Arts and Sciences. It is a required course for most of the students in the course.

The data used in this study come from the fall semester of 1980 through the spring semester of 1981, along with the summer of 1983. Data from a total of 67 sections taught by 16 TAs and three faculty members were utilized in this study. Out of the total of 19 instructors, 10 were female and 9 were male. The grades for 2083 students were used in the analyses.

Statistical Analysis

The descriptive statistics for the responsiveness scales and student grades are presented in Table 4. The statistical procedures used in the study involved discriminant analysis and correlational analysis.

Insert Table 4 About Here

The final course grades for 2083 students were first converted to z-scores. Students (n = 1197) with a z-score greater than zero were defined as the high-grade group, and students (n = 886) with a z-score

of zero or less were defined as the low-grade group. These groups were partitioned into a female, high-grade group (n = 663); a male, high-grade group (n = 534); a female, low-grade group (n = 299); and a male, low-grade group (n = 587).

A discriminant analysis was run that pitted the nine responsiveness scales against the four final grade groupings. This analysis allowed us to classify the scales according to their ability to differentiate between females and males and their ability to separate between high course grades and low course grades.

After determining the classification of the scales, a correlational analysis was conducted for the total sample (n = 2083), for female students (n = 962) and for male students (n = 1121). Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated for each of the sixteen grades in the course and each of the gender-specific scales classified in the discriminant analysis. It was reasoned that the gender-specific scales that affected the greatest number of the sixteen grades held the answer to "Why are females getting all those A's."

Discriminant Analysis

Table 5 indicates the results of the univariate analysis. The value orientation scale was the only one with $p > .05$; all the others differentiated significantly ($p < .001$) among the four grade groupings.

Insert Table 5 About Here

Using Wilks stepwise procedure ($F > 1.00$ as the criterion for entry), we found that all nine scales were entered into the analysis and accounted

for 13.4% of the variance. Table 6 shows how each of the scales impacted upon the grade groupings.

Insert Table 6 About Here

A three function model was produced with the first two functions significant ($p < .0000$). The first function (accounting for 11.% of the unique variance) contained those scales that most clearly separated female students from male students and was named the "gender function." The second function (accounting for 2.1% of the unique variance) contained the scales that separated high-grade students from low-grade students and was named the "grade function." The third function (accounting for less than 1% of the unique variance) was not used in the remaining analyses.

Table 7 indicates that the sensitive speaker, sensitive listener, supportive norm, and problem handler were gender specific scales. The valence of the function loading (+ for females; - for males) suggests that sensitive speaking, sensitive listening, and the supportive norm are female-biased scales, whereas problem handling is a male-biased scale. This is made evident from Table 8.

The grade scales, in the order of salience, are the persuader, the organizer, the unconditional listener, the insightful conversationalist, and the verbal value. The valence of the function loading signifies that only the verbal value is indicative of a low grade.

Insert Tables 7 and 8 About Here

Correlational Analysis

Table 9 presents the correlations between grades and scales. Only correlations with $p < .05$ are tabled.

Insert Table 9 About Here

The female-biased, sensitive speaker scale is salient to the greatest number of specific grades (12 out of 16) given in the course. For the attendance grade, the relationship is negative indicating that less responsive speakers may be more regular in their class attendance; and less responsive males appear to do better on the mid-term examination. In all other cases, the relationship is positive, indicating that being a sensitive speaker reflects favorably on most of the grades given in the course. The fact that the scale is an asset to both females and males on a number of course assignments makes it the most likely candidate for explaining why women get all those A's. If this female-biased scale were a liability to males, we would be prone to dismiss the sensitive speaker scale as simply a good predictor of gender. But with the sensitive speaker regardless of gender, getting higher grades on a number of oral projects, we believe the scale is pointing to something females are more apt to do in their communication behavior than males. And when males exhibit this same behavior, they are rewarded.

The picture is much different for the female-biased sensitive listener scale. Being a sensitive listener appears to be an asset for test and attendance grades but a liability for some oral project grades. The reverse of the scale, the talkative speaker, facilitates higher oral project grades. The fact that the scale flip-flops according to the

nature of the assignment makes it a poor candidate for explaining why females get higher course grades than males. In other words, this scale is a good predictor of gender but a poor indicator of the composite, final course grade.

The supportive scale definitely does not explain why females get higher course grades. It is a female-biased scale that separates females from males; but females with the supportive orientation make lower grades on the mid-semester and final examination. Moreover, males with this orientation do not fair well on one of the oral projects. The scale is not salient for any other assignment.

The male-biased problem handler scale would have explanatory power only if the scale were negatively correlated with a number of grades received by female students. However, only the attendance grade is negatively correlated with the scale for females. All other salient grades are positively correlated with the scale. It should be noted that problem avoiding (the reverse of problem handling) affects the male attendance grade the same way it affects the female grade. Again, this scale separates the genders but does not explain why females get higher grades in the basic course.

Conclusions

Our previous work had led us to expect a significant linkage between grades and student responsiveness. Our expectation was confirmed in this study. We were neither surprised nor dismayed by the low-order correlations that we observed. With gender accounting for between five to sixteen percent of the variance in student grades, we figured that a single, responsiveness scale could not account for more than one or two

percent of the variance. But the accumulative effect of the patterns on sixteen grades adds up to an impact that is quite meaningful to students and instructors alike; it means the difference between an A or a B for a significant number of students.

Let us now deal with each of the three questions posed at the outset of this study.

Q1 What patterns of responsiveness are most salient to one gender as opposed to the other?

The patterns of the sensitive speaker, the sensitive listener, the supportive norm, and the problem handler are the most salient in differentiating between the genders. The first three are female-specific patterns, and the fourth is a male-specific pattern.

The sensitive speaker pattern is a compliance vs. low competence pattern inasmuch as the Flexible Responsive mode is pitted against the Neutral Responsive mode. In essence, we found that women are more likely to focus on others when speaking rather than not speaking at all. Males, on tne other hand, tend to be nonspeakers.

The sensitive listener pattern is a compliance vs. noncompliance pattern since the Flexible Responsive mode is paired with the Mastery Responsive mode. Females are more likely to listen to the problems of others whereas males are more likely to be talkative and concerned with holding the floor.

The supportive norm (compliance vs. low competence) is more characteristic of women than of men. The person holding this orientation believes that most other people are supportive in their conversations rather than that most other people are detached or neutral in their conversations. The problem handler pattern is a male-specific one with

the Mastery Responsive mode placed against the Neutral Responsive mode.

Q2 What gender-specific patterns are most salient to grades in the basic course?

The sensitive speaker pattern is salient to most assignment grades in the course and offers the most likely explanation of why women get higher course grades than men. Although the pattern is a compliance pattern that focuses on the other person, it also represents a most fundamental competency in a speech communication course: To speak. Indeed, if a female in a speech course is more likely to speak than a male, is it any wonder why females get higher grades than males?

The sensitive listener pattern is especially interesting. The data suggest that it has little power to explain the overall higher course grade earned by females since the scale correlates negatively with some assignment grades and positively with others. Grades that correlate negatively with it are oral performance grades. The way the scale is constructed a negative correlation means the student who is a talkative speaker gets a higher grade. But test grades correlate positively with sensitive listening. Pearson (1982) suggested that compliance may be at work in facilitating higher grades in nonperformance courses (those relying on test grades) unless the concept of competence is broadened "to suggest that women are also more sensitive to cues from lecturers and instructors" (p. 9). The results pertaining to the sensitive listening scale seem to favor a broad interpretation of competence.

Neither the supportive pattern nor the problem handler pattern offered clues as to why women get higher grades. In the few cases where the supportive norm was salient to grades, it was associated with lower grades. And the problem handler pattern is a male-biased pattern that

did not suggest why males get lower grades.

Q3 Do the salient patterns appear to favor a competence or compliance explanation?

Our reading of the results favors a competence explanation. But our methodology does not permit us to rule out a compliance explanation. From working with the data, we have come to believe that communicatively women are both more compliant than males and more competent than males. The fact that the female-specific scales favor the Flexible Responsive mode means that females harmonize themselves with the communication situation. But only one of the female-specific, compliance scales has a consistently positive impact on the individual assignment grades that make up the final course grade. And that scale deals with the fundamental decision of speaking or not speaking in an encounter. To us this is a, if not the, most basic competency in a speech course.

In addition, the sensitive listener scale offers the link that Pearson (1982) suggests is necessary for a competence explanation for higher grades in nonperformance courses. Those who are sensitive listeners do perform better on tests.

Our methodology does not permit us to draw definitive conclusions or establish causal links. However, we believe that the results are suggestive of what researchers may find as they pursue Pearson's competence/compliance paradox.

REFERENCES

Barker, L. L. Irrelevant factors and speech evaluation. Southern Speech Journal, 1966, 32, 10-18.

Geisinger, K. F. Who are giving all those A's? An Examination of high-grading college faculty. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31, 11-15.

Hughey, J. D., & Harper, B. Grading style and instructor responsiveness. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, D.C., 1983a.

Hughey, J. D., & Harper, B. Instructor responsiveness and outcomes of the basic course. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Dallas, Tx., 1983b.

Hughey, J. D., & Harper, B. What's in a grade? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, D.C., 1983c.

Hughey, J. D., & Johnson, A. W. Speech communication: Foundations and challenges. New York: Macmillan, 1975.

Leesavan, A. T. Cultural differences in communication patterns: A comparison of Thais and Americans. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1977.

Neal, W. P., & Hughey, J. D. Personality correlates of communication sensitivity and general sensitivity. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, San Antonio, Tx., 1979.

Parsons, T., & Shils, E. Toward a general theory of action. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.

Pearson, J. C. An investigation of sex, sexism, and sex role identification and the evaluation of classroom speeches. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, New York City, New York, November, 1980.

Pearson, J. C. Evaluating classroom speeches: An investigation of speaker sex, sexism, and sex role identification. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Minneapolis, Minnesota, May, 1981.

Pearson, J. C. The influence of student gender on grading in the basic performance and nonperformance communication courses. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, Kentucky, 1982.

Pearson, J. C., & Nelson, P. E. The influence of teacher and student gender on grading in the basic public speaking and interpersonal communication courses. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association Conference, Anaheim, California, November, 1981.

Sprague, J. A. An investigation of the written critique behavior of college communication instructors. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1971.

Table 1. Descriptive summary of the nine responsiveness scales.

FACTOR LOADING	ITEM CONTENT
Role Requirement: PURPOSE	
SCALE 1:	The PERSUADER responds in a conversation by promoting his/her own view rather than being a COMMUNICATION AVOIDER.
	[positively scored items]
.61	promotes his/her own view when it's the best one
.53	wants to get the best view adopted
.37	enjoys persuading others
.36	may be inflexible when explaining views
	[reverse scored items]
.61	[DOES NOT] keep away from those who would tamper with his/her belief
.50	[DOES NOT] dislike getting involved in serious and demanding conversations
.37	[DOES NOT] seldom comment on what is said
Role Requirement: TRANSMISSION	
SCALE 2:	The SENSITIVE SPEAKER responds in a conversation through focusing on others and self-disclosure rather than being a NONSPEAKER
	[positively scored items]
.62	asks for the ideas of others frequently
.53	talks enthusiastically about other person
.52	reports that his/her sensitivity to others takes its toll from him/her emotionally
.44	reveals much information about self
.31	uses nonverbals to convey meaning
	[reverse scored items]
.68	is [NOT] a person whose shyness explains his/her lack of involvement
.62	[DOES NOT] refuse to talk much of the time
.53	[DOES NOT] fail to respond to others and what they say
.44	[DOES NOT] have difficulty in keeping a conversation going with those who don't talk much
.42	[DOES NOT] believe people react to him/her in a noncommital way
.20	[DOES NOT] feel forced to speak

Table 1. (Continued)

Role Requirement: RECEPTION

SCALE 3: The SENSITIVE LISTENER responds in a conversation as sensitive receiver rather than as a TALKATIVE SPEAKER

FACTOR LOADING	ITEM CONTENT
	[positively scored items]
.58	may spend too much time listening to problems of others
.54	may be too open to ideas of others
.50	may be too sensitive to emotions of others
.35	may be taken advantage of in conversations
.35	is warm and considerate
.34	wants to protect the feelings of others
	[reverse scored items]
.71	is [NOT] talkative and concerned with holding the floor
.64	is [NOT] strong and steadfast in his/her views
.62	is [NOT] more eager to talk than most
.62	is [NOT] threatening in a conversation
.45	is [NOT] too eager to pursue his/her own interests
.42	[DOES NOT] debate and impose his/her views on others
.36	[DOES NOT] force his/her views on others

SCALE 4: The UNCONDITIONAL LISTENER responds in a conversation by listening to anything rather than being a NONLISTENER

FACTOR LOADING	ITEM CONTENT
	[positively scored items]
.64	always gives others the time to make his/her point clear
.56	listens to others even when they don't have anything to say
.43	practices good listening habits
.38	is better at taking criticism than most
.35	always feels he/she can learn from listening
.33	is eager to listen
	[reverse scored items]
.58	[DOES NOT] fail to listen closely
.52	[DOES NOT] have difficulty concentrating in conversations
.38	is [NOT] easily distracted in conversations

Table 1. (Continued)

Role Requirement: COHERENCE

SCALE 5: The conversational ORGANIZER responds to a confusing conversation by being organized rather than being a RAMBLER.

FACTOR LOADING	ITEM CONTENT
	[positively scored items]
.67	is more organized than most in confusing conversations
.60	is organized, not vacillating, in confusing conversations
.55	wants to get things organized in confusing conversations
.53	takes charge and makes sure things are organized in confusing conversations
.40	straightens things out by giving structure in confusing conversations
	[reverse scored items]
.64	is [NOT] more rambling than most in conversations
.62	is [NOT] confusing
.46	[DOES NOT] fail to explain his/her views in a coherent way
.36	is [NOT] too aimless in conversations

SCALE 6: The INSIGHTFUL conversationalist responds to a confusing conversation by figuring out the intentions of others rather than being PUZZLED.

FACTOR LOADING	ITEM CONTENT
	[positively scored items]
.58	figures out what others are trying to say in confusing conversations
.44	picks up on motives as easily as if they were his/her own in confusing conversations
	[reverse scored items]
.66	is [NOT] puzzled by others in confusing conversations
.39	[DOES NOT] have a hard time making sense out of confusing conversations
.34	[DOES NOT] find out at a later time that people were upset during a confusing conversation

Table 1. (Continued)

Role Requirement: PROBLEM MANAGEMENT

SCALE 7: The PROBLEM HANDLER responds to a conflict in a conversation in a decisive way rather than being a CONFLICT AVOIDER.

FACTOR LOADING	ITEM CONTENT
	[positively scored items]
.57	wants to take decisive and unpopular actions when things get out of hand
.55	handles conflict in a more confident and rational way than most
.49	believes the best advice is to "Be Assertive" in difficult situations
.49	stands up for views in a confident and assertive way in conflict situations
.37	is confident of ability to give good advice in difficult situations
.35	is good at restoring order when things get out of hand
	[reverse scored items]
.61	[DOES NOT] want to avoid unpleasantness in conflict situations
.52	[DOES NOT] avoid the point of contention in conflicts
.50	[DOES NOT] respond to conflicts in a more cautious and reluctant way than most
.49	[DOES NOT] value staying out of conflicts
.43	[DOES NOT] believe the best advice is to "stay out of the line of fire" in difficult situations
.42	[DOES NOT] become quiet and uncommunicative in conflicts
.39	[DOES NOT] become tense and uncomfortable in conflicts

Table 1. (Continued)

NORMATIVE ORIENTATION

SCALE 8: The SUPPORTIVE NORM contends that most people respond in a conversation in a supportive way rather than a neutral or DETACHED way.

FACTOR LOADING	ITEM CONTENT
	[positively scored items]
.69	contends most people respond in a supportive or empathetic way
.49	contends most people listen to nonverbals for meaning
.45	contends most people's purpose is to learn the views of others
.39	contends most people prevent conflicts in a satisfactory way
	[reverse scored items]
.68	[DOES NOT] contend most people respond in a detached or neutral way
.68	[DOES NOT] contend most people fail to cope with conflicts
.62	[DOES NOT] contend most people listen to very little
.51	[DOES NOT] contend most people's purpose is to pass the time of day

VALUE ORIENTATION

SCALE 9: The VERBAL VALUE contends that a good vocabulary is preferable to NONPARTICIPATION in a conversation.

FACTOR LOADING	ITEM CONTENT
	[positively scored items]
.61	values a good vocabulary
.54	values people who express themselves on any subject
	[reverse scored items]
.70	[DOES NOT] value nonparticipation in a conversation
.67	[DOES NOT] value not having to say much in a conversation

Table 2. Scale alphas and intercorrelations among responsiveness scales.

SCALE DESCRIPTORS [Descriptors in brackets indicate the scale opposite]	SCALE INTERCORRELATIONS (Scale alpha indicated in parentheses)								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. PERSUADER [communication avoider]	(.53)								
2. SENSITIVE SPEAKER [nonspeaker]	.26	(.77)							
3. SENSITIVE LISTENER [talkative speaker]	-.46	-.29	(.78)						
4. UNCONDITIONAL LISTENER [nonlistener]	.02	.20	.19	(.59)					
5. ORGANIZER [rambler]	.34	.22	-.26	.23	(.69)				
6. INSIGHTFUL [puzzled]	.16	.15	-.04	.17	.20	(.50)			
7. PROBLEM HANDLER [conflict avoider]	.46	.36	-.48	.08	.38	.20	(.78)		
8. SUPPORTIVE NORM [detached norm]	.06	.13	.04	.19	.11	.08	.08	(.65)	
9. VERBAL VALUE [nonparticipation value]	.14	.13	-.12	.07	.12	-.00	.16	.13	(.65)

Table 3. Grades in the basic course.

Grade	Brief Description
Grade 1a*	Attendance and class participation.
Grade 2dc	Oral project #1--describing and analyzing a problematic communication episode.
Grade 3w	Written portion of project #2--transceiver analysis profile based on an in-class interview.
Grade 4dc	Oral portion of project #2--describing, analyzing, and evaluating an in-class interview.
Grade 5c	Content portion of project #3--forms of support and visual aids in a speech to inform.
Grade 6d	Delivery portion of project #3--speech to inform.
Grade 7c	Content portion of project #3--organization and wording in a speech to inform.
Grade 8wdc	Written work and participation in project #4--private problem-solving discussion (annotated bibliography, written test covering discussion principles, participation/leadership assessment by the instructor).
Grade 9d	Delivery portion of project #5--public persuasive group discussion followed by a forum period.
Grade 10c	Content portion of project #5--evidence and reasoning.
Grade 11w	Written portion of project #6--audience analysis, speech outline, post-speech evaluation of a speech to persuade.
Grade 12d	Delivery portion of project #6--speech to persuade followed by a forum period.
Grade 13c	Content portion of project #6--all content factors are emphasized in a speech to persuade.
Grade 14t	Standardized, objectively scored Mid-Term Examination.
Grade 15t	Standardized, comprehensive, objectively scored Final Examination (this grade is doubled and becomes grade 16, also).
Grade 17t	Quizzes devised and administered by the instructor.
Grade 18f	The FINAL COURSE grade determined by the number of points accumulated by the student.

*The designations by the grade indicate: a = attendance grade; c = content grade; d = delivery grade; f = final course grade; t = test grade; w = written work grade.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics for the responsiveness scales and student grades.

Variable	Total Sample (n = 2083) Mean	Std. Dev.	Female Students (n = 962) Mean	Std. Dev.	Male Students (n = 1121) Mean	Std. Dev.
Scales*						
1. Persuader	2.23	.39	2.20	.38	2.27	.39
2. Sensitive Speaker	2.03	.45	2.13	.46	1.95	.42
3. Sensitive Listener	2.11	.41	2.17	.40	2.05	.41
4. Unconditional Listener	2.22	.38	2.26	.38	2.19	.38
5. Organizer	2.17	.40	2.15	.40	2.19	.40
6. Insightful	2.38	.47	2.42	.45	2.35	.48
7. Problem Handler	2.12	.41	2.08	.41	2.16	.41
8. Supportive Norm	2.23	.42	2.28	.42	2.19	.41
9. Verbal Value	2.29	.55	2.29	.56	2.29	.54
Grades**						
1a	25.69	3.89	25.96	3.76	25.46	4.00
2dc	23.53	2.32	23.84	2.30	23.27	2.31
3w	24.80	2.43	25.29	2.31	24.37	2.46
4dc	24.77	2.81	25.17	2.20	24.42	2.29
5c	24.98	2.34	25.30	2.19	24.70	2.44
6d	25.34	2.00	25.58	1.91	25.13	2.05
7c	25.18	2.34	25.46	2.23	24.94	2.41
8wdc	25.06	2.44	25.55	2.27	24.65	2.51
9d	25.78	1.96	25.97	1.89	25.62	2.00
10c	25.50	2.02	25.72	1.94	25.30	2.08
11w	25.06	2.99	25.61	2.79	24.59	3.09
12d	25.29	2.51	25.62	2.43	25.02	2.56
13c	24.85	2.67	25.27	2.53	24.48	2.74
14t	22.60	3.29	23.24	3.22	22.06	3.26
15t	22.21	3.35	22.90	3.32	21.62	3.27
17t	23.70	3.44	24.48	3.20	23.02	3.50
18f***	413.90	35.81	421.56	35.09	407.32	35.12

*Possible range for scale means: 3 (high) to 1 (low).

**Possible range for grades included in analysis: 29 (A+) to 16 (F).

***Possible range for final course grade: 493 to 0.

Table 5. Scale means and Wilks' Lambda for the four grade groupings (df = 3, 2079)

	Scale	Scale Means: Female high-grade (n = 663)	Male high-grade (n = 534)	Female low-grade (n = 299)	Male low-grade (n = 587)	Lambda	Sig.
1.	Persuader	2.23	2.30	2.13	2.24	.98	.0000
2.	Sensitive Speaker	2.13	1.95	2.11	1.94	.96	.0000
3.	Sensitive Listener	2.17	2.05	2.17	2.05	.98	.0000
4.	Unconditional Listener	2.28	2.21	2.21	2.18	.99	.0000
5.	Organizer	2.17	2.22	2.10	2.16	.99	.0005
6.	Insightful	2.43	2.38	2.38	2.33	.99	.0012
7.	Problem Handler	2.09	2.17	2.06	2.15	.99	.0001
8.	Supportive Norm	2.26	2.16	2.31	2.20	.99	.0000
9.	Verbal Value	2.27	2.27	2.33	2.31	1.00	.2168

Table 6. Scales entered into the final discriminant analysis.

Scale	Lambda	Significance
2. Sensitive Speaker	.96	.0000
3. Sensitive Listener	.91	.0
1. Persuader	.89	.0
8. Supportive Norm	.89	.0
7. Problem Handler	.88	.0
6. Insightful	.87	.0
5. Organizer	.87	.0
9. Verbal Value	.87	.0
4. Unconditional Listener	.87	.0

Table 7. Summary of the results of the discriminant analysis: Correlations between responsiveness scales and functions (and standardized coefficients).

	Scale Descriptor	Function 1: Gender	Function 2: Grades
2	Sensitive Speaker	.57 (.90)	.23 (.13)
3	Sensitive Listener	.43 (.47)	.07 (.35)
8	Supportive Norm	.31 (.25)	-.29 (-.41)
7	Problem Handler	-.28 (-.32)	.14 (-.15)
1	Persuader	-.28 (-.21)	.57 (.70)
5	Organizer	-.17 (-.14)	.44 (.31)
4	Unconditional Listener	.23 (-.04)	.42 (.34)
6	Insightful	.19 (.21)	.36 (.18)
9	Verbal Value	.01 (.02)	-.30 (-.36)

Table 8. Canonical discriminant functions evaluated at the group centroids.

Groups	Function 1: Gender	Function 2: Grades
1. High grades, female	.35	.04
2. High grades, male	-.27	.23
3. Low grades, female	.29	-.37
4. Low grades, male	-.29	-.06

Table 9. Correlations ($p < .05$) between gender-specific scales and grades.

	SCALE 2: Sensitive Speaker			SCALE 3: Sensitive Listener			SCALE 8: Supportive Norm			SCALE 7: Problem Handler		
Grade	T*	F**	M***	T	F	M	T	F	M	T	F	M
1a	-.04		-.08	.11	.08	.12				-.11	-.11	-.10
2dc	.09		.12	-.05		-.08				.05		.11
3w	.09											
4dc	.10		.08									.08
5c	.09	.07	.08			-.06				.07		.10
6d	.12	.10	.10	-.05		-.08				.08	.07	.11
7c	.09	.07	.06						-.07			
8wdc												
9d	.14	.13	.12	-.09	-.08	-.12				.11	.10	.14
10c	.11	.12	.08	-.05	-.07	-.07				.08	.10	.09
11w	.05											
12d	.10	.08	.07			-.06				.05	.09	
13c	.05											
14t			-.06	.07				-.07				
15t				.07				-.07				
17t				.07		.06						

*T = total sample (n = 2083)

**F = female (n = 962)

***M = male (n = 1121)