

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Judith Ann Bastian Boser entitled "Intrapersonal Consistency of Teacher Responding in Good Student-Teacher Relationships." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Education.

William A. Poppen

William A. Poppen, Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Schuyler W. Huck

Russell L. French

H. Alan Foster

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Gath

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

INTRAPERSONAL CONSISTENCY OF TEACHER RESPONDING
IN GOOD STUDENT-TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Judith Ann Bastian Boser

December 1981

3055602

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine whether junior high school students tend to form good relationships with teachers who respond to them similarly or differently. Teacher verbal response roles considered were: 1. self, which included responding in terms of the teacher's positive feelings (encounter/encouragement), teacher's negative feelings (confrontation), or teacher's ideas (sharing); and 2. other, including responding in terms of the feelings, thoughts, behavior, or motives of the student.

Ninety eighth grade students participated in the study by describing two teachers with whom they had had good relationships, rating the quality of each relationship, indicating the frequency with which each teacher had used each of the seven response roles after seeing them demonstrated on videotape, then identifying the one response role used most by each teacher.

Ranking by frequency means showed that sharing was the role used most in both relationships. Binomial tests using a conditional probability model showed that the two teachers with whom the students had good relationships responded to them consistently by using the same type of verbal response both in an overall sense and with respect to the two individual response roles of encounter/encouragement and confrontation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Statement of Purpose	5
Hypothesis	6
Operational Definitions.	6
Assumptions.	8
Limitations.	9
Organization of Remainder of Dissertation. .	10
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
Rationale.	11
Student-Teacher Relationships.	16
Summary.	21
III. METHODOLOGY.	24
Subjects	24
Instrumentation.	25
Procedure.	31
Screening.	33
IV. RESULTS.	35
Statistical Treatment.	35
Summary.	43
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	45
Summary.	45

	PAGE
Conclusions.	47
Discussion	49
Implications	55
Recommendations for Further Study.	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	60
APPENDICES.	68
APPENDIX A. PARENT CONSENT FORM	69
APPENDIX B. SOURCES OF DIALOGUES.	70
APPENDIX C. ROLE DEFINITIONS.	71
APPENDIX D. VIDEOTAPE SCRIPT.	73
APPENDIX E. STUDENT RESPONSE FORM	78
APPENDIX F. USABLE STUDENT RESPONSES.	82
VITA.	84

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

There can be little argument about the desirability of a teacher's achieving good rather than poor relationships with students. Teacher job satisfaction has been significantly related to the student-teacher relationship (Behrman, 1977). The relationship and the teacher's attitude toward the student also have an impact on the student, specifically with respect to achievement, imitative learning, peer acceptance, self-concept, and attitude (Davidson and Lang, 1960; Dowling and Frantz, 1975; Evans, 1962; Jones, 1974; Lewis, Lovell, and Jessee, 1965; Pelkey, 1977).

Bush (1954) long ago decried the existence of an "ideal" teacher who is best for all students. Thelen (1968) and Cunningham (1975) have since demonstrated that there is no one type of teacher who is most effective with all types of students. But the question remains whether a particular type of good relationship with a teacher meets the needs of an early adolescent or if there is a variety of good relationships, each serving a different purpose. For example, one good relationship might be used by the student to obtain emotional support while another good relationship would be used to help clarify the student's values. If students do use good relationships differentially, a question which

arises is whether these relationships have different characteristic teacher verbal interactions.

When a junior high school student forms good relationships with more than one teacher, it may be that the teachers are similar and fit some internal conception of the student of what a teacher should be and how a teacher should relate to the student. Student attitude toward school and the teacher have been significantly correlated with the congruence between a student's present teacher and what the student considers the best teacher the student has had (Sweeting, Willower, and Helsel, 1978). Byrne's (1971) theory that interpersonal attraction is based on attitudinal similarity would also support the premise that the teachers a student likes would share some common values with the student.

Bennis (1979) has categorized relationships in four major types: expressive-emotional, confirmatory, change or influence, and instrumental. Teacher-student relationships, along with parent-child and therapist-client relationships, are classified as change relationships, according to Bennis. He does, however, maintain that his four types of relationships should not be considered as mutually exclusive but that each type should contain some elements of the other three types. Hardy (1977) at the elementary school level and Wilson (1976) at the secondary school level have found that some student-teacher

relationships are more accurately classified as expressive-emotional than change, supporting Marwell and Hage's (1970) contention that not all role-relationships are enacted in the same manner. In effect, not all teachers relate to their students in the same way. It has also been shown that students can and do differentiate between good and poor relationships they have had with teachers in terms of how they perceive the teachers as behaving (Boser and Poppen, 1978). Marwell and Hage's work encompassed all types of student-teacher relationships, and Boser and Poppen compared good and poor ones. Neither study explored the similarity or dissimilarity among good relationships.

In the interest of obtaining generalizable results, past researchers have ordinarily used each subject as a source of one piece or set of data about a particular type of relationship. This presupposes that there is little, if any, intrasubject variability with respect to whatever criteria is being used and that for an individual there is a particular behavior or pattern of behaviors which constitute the "good teacher relationship" construct for that student.

It is also important to identify behaviors which are relevant to interpersonal relationships. One eclectic model (Poppen, 1975), provides such a basis for examining teacher verbal behaviors (Boser and Poppen, 1978; Poppen and White, 1976). According to Poppen, there are two main

types of response roles: 1. self (responding to oneself by expressing one's own thoughts or feelings, either positive or negative), and 2. other (responding to the other person in a manner that acknowledges the feelings, thoughts, behavior, or motives underlying the other person's behavior).

While the self/other dichotomy is not unique (Crowley and Ivey, 1976; Guerney, 1977; Stiles, 1978), the two aspects which make the Poppen framework most appropriate for the current research are the delineation of specific, observable behaviors within the self and other categories and the relevance of those behaviors due to their foundation in theory and visibility in the skills currently being taught to teachers and teacher trainees in various problem-solving approaches (Carkhuff and Pierce, 1976; Dinkmeyer, McKay, and Dinkmeyer, 1980; Dreikurs, Greenwald, and Pepper, 1971; Ginott, 1972; Glasser, 1969; Gordon, 1974).

Statement of the Problem

Previous research has shown that there are teacher response roles which can be associated with good or "nearly ideal" student-teacher relationships and differentiate between good and poor relationships. However, it has been demonstrated with respect to at least one theoretical framework that all student-teacher relationships do not fit a uniform model. Therefore, the question which now arises is whether or not a junior high school student describes

good student-teacher relationships (a subgroup of student-teacher relationships in general) as being characterized by the same or different teacher response roles.

Statement of Purpose

The question being asked is whether good student-teacher relationships that a junior high school student experiences are characterized by the teachers' use of primarily the same verbal response role (indicating that for that student there is a good teacher relationship response role) or by different response roles (signifying that perhaps different interpersonal needs are being met by different teachers). More specifically: 1. Can a junior high school student identify more than one good student-teacher relationship the student has experienced? 2. Which response role or roles are found most frequently as the primary response role used by the teacher in good relationships? 3. Are two teachers with whom a student has had good relationships characterized by the most frequent use of the same verbal response role? In effect, the present study goes beyond the work of Marwell and Hage by looking at only one particular type of student-teacher relationship and, in addition, investigating the nature of the relationship in terms of verbal behavior.

Hypothesis

The hypothesis is that when a junior high school student identifies two teachers with whom the student has had good relationships in grades 7-8, the response role used most by the second teacher will tend to be different from that of the first teacher.

Operational Definitions

Response Roles:

Feelings. The teacher briefly reflects his/her perception of the student's feelings without evaluation, letting the student know that he/she understands what the student is feeling and accepts those feelings.

Thoughts. The teacher uses clarifying responses which call for further details or explanation of the student's ideas, showing that the teacher listened to the student when the student expressed his/her ideas. The teacher does not express a judgment about the ideas.

Motives. The teacher makes guesses about the student's motives underlying the student's present or past behavior without judging the motives, demonstrating to the student that the teacher is aware of his/her purposes.

Behavior. The teacher, from an objective viewpoint, asks the student to identify what the student is doing, focusing attention on the behavior itself and on the

student's acceptance of responsibility for his/her behavior by acknowledging it.

Encounter/Encouragement. The teacher expresses liking for the student unrelated to the student's behavior, confidence in the student's ability, or liking for the student under adverse conditions, such as when the student fails. The teacher is expressing positive personal sentiments about the student.

Confrontation. The teacher states his/her personal negative feelings arising from the student's behavior.

Sharing. The teacher shares his/her personal ideas, opinions, experiences, or feelings (about things other than the student or the student's behavior) with the student without trying to impose them on the student.

Self Roles. The teacher uses a self response role when using one of the three response roles in which the teacher expresses his/her own feelings or thoughts: encounter/encouragement, confrontation, and sharing.

Other Roles. The teacher uses an other response role when using one of the four response roles in which the teacher responds nonjudgmentally in terms of what the student (other) is feeling or doing, ideas the student has expressed, or motives underlying the student's behavior.

Teacher Primary Response Role. The response role which the student reports as having been used most often by that teacher is the primary response role for that teacher.

The student designates this role through the final ranking procedure by ranking it first as used most often.

Assumptions

For the purposes of this study, the following assumptions are made:

1. The quality of the student-teacher relationship is an important aspect of the child's educational experience.
2. A meaningful investigation of student-teacher relationships can be carried out by studying teachable behaviors or skills which can be acquired and implemented by classroom teachers.
3. Eighth grade students can differentiate between the seven response role behaviors when they are demonstrated on videotape.
4. Eighth grade students can generalize the demonstrated behaviors to similar situations in which they have been active participants.
5. The teachers whom these students have experienced in grades 7-8 are typical of teachers in general at these grade levels.
6. The students have interacted with a variety of teachers in grades 7-8 and have come in contact with and had an opportunity to develop relationships with teachers who have used each of the seven response roles.

7. The Poppen response role model (1975) is a valid model for studying teacher behavior in student-teacher relationships.

Limitations

Certain limitations must be imposed on interpretation of the results obtained in this study:

1. Data are based on student perceptions and reports of teacher behavior, which may not be totally accurate.

2. This study does not represent an all-inclusive study of teacher behavior but is limited to the seven verbal response roles. While other verbal and nonverbal behaviors may well affect the relationship, no attempt is made at this time to document them or control for them.

3. The dialogues which the students view represent examples of each of the seven ways of communicating with students. The feelings role, for example, is demonstrated by showing one way to reflect the student's feeling state. There is no attempt to portray all possible feeling states or all possible empathic reflections in the situation. Examples have been selected from literature and validated by a panel of judges to verify that each dialogue is a recognizable example of the teacher behavior as defined in the operational definitions.

4. Participation by the students was voluntary. Consideration must be given to the fact that the data collected

may not be representative of those students who either did not choose to participate or were not present, possibly producing a biased group of subjects for the study.

5. Results should not be generalized beyond the student population from which the subjects were drawn or similar student populations.

Organization of Remainder of Dissertation

Chapter II is a review of the literature which provides a rationale for the study, an examination of various instruments used in the study of student-teacher relationships, and a summary of previous research on student-teacher relationships of junior high school students and the consistency of needs and relationships.

Chapter III describes the design of the study, development of instrumentation, and research procedures which were followed. The results of the study are presented in Chapter IV, followed by conclusions drawn from the study, discussion, implications, and recommendations for further study in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The first part of this chapter will present a rationale for the study based on the need for information about real relationships, the differences between and among relationships, the multidimensionality of relationships, and teacher communication behavior relevant to the student-teacher relationship. The second part of the chapter will review existing research about student-teacher relationships with the junior high school age student and what has been shown about needs and consistency in student-teacher relationships.

Rationale

Differences Between and Among Relationships.

In the area of relationships, several studies have focused on the qualities of teachers that students of various ages associate with the concept of an ideal student-teacher relationship (Dallolio, 1959; Hyman, 1968; Johnson, 1974; Reitz, Very, and Guthrie, 1965; Tyler, 1964), as though there were such a relationship. The work of Wish, Deutsch, and Kaplan (1976), however, showed that subjects' descriptions of real relationships differed from their concepts of typical relationships with respect to various types of relationships, among them the student-

teacher relationship. The four dimensions studied were cooperative and friendly versus competitive and hostile; equal versus unequal; superficial versus intense; and socioemotional and informal versus task-oriented and formal.

While some variation might be expected in descriptions or ratings of both real and typical relationships, one might reasonably expect to find concurrence in general between the two. If a real student-teacher relationship is not synonymous with a typical student-teacher relationship for an individual, this suggests that the characteristics of an existing good or nearly ideal relationship might not be identical to those of a hypothetical ideal relationship. It would follow, then, that if the intent is to learn about real relationships data should be based on real relationships rather than hypothetical ones.

Aside from the focus on an existing relationship, whether or not a particular type of relationship is a single construct may be equivocal. Friend is not a single construct (Murstein and Spitz, 1973). Factor analysis of the characteristics of best male friend, best female friend, most enjoyable friend, most useful friend, and most admired friend produced a different set of factors as well as different factor components for each type of relationship. Reisman and Yamokoski (1974) also found differences among friends in the verbal responses used to a

friend's problems. Although each friend was reported as using primarily one or two types of verbal response, not all friends used the same type(s) of response(s).

It cannot be assumed that Reisman and Yamokoski's findings automatically generalize to other relationships such as the student-teacher relationship since Wish, Deutsch, and Kaplan (1976) demonstrated that student-teacher relationships are not characterized in the same way as relationships with close friends or with casual acquaintances.

A facilitative or therapeutic model has often been applied to teaching and education. The communication skills taught to teachers frequently originated as skills for psychotherapists. Reisman and Yamokoski (1974) found that when a subject is discussing a problem, however, the subject neither experiences nor expects the same type of response from a friend as from a therapist. Conversely, in a similar study Venzor, Gillis, and Beal (1976) failed to show a significant difference in either expectancies or preferences for responses from friends and psychotherapists. Thus a discrepancy exists in this contest. Whether or not the behaviors proposed for therapists are equally appropriate for educators (as has been implied by their application and measurement) and induce a positive student-teacher relationship have yet to be investigated.

Relationship Instrumentation: Dimensionality, Communication Variables.

Instrumentation for examining relationships has also evolved from therapeutic origins in many cases. Variations of the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 1962) and other instruments have been used to measure such dimensions of teacher behavior as empathy, positive regard, congruence, and warmth as indicators of the student-teacher relationship. The use of such instruments was rendered questionable when it was found that junior high school students differ in their perceptions of such teacher qualities according to the race and sex of the student (Etinge, 1981). Furthermore, warmth, positive regard, and empathy have been shown not to be unidimensional constructs (Zimmer and Anderson, 1968; Zimmer and Park, 1967). Zimmer's investigations revealed a need for greater operationalism in identifying skills which could be taught.

Communication in interpersonal relationships also appeared to be multifaceted when Bienvenu and Stewart (1976) arrived at 11 factors which seemed to best fit the dimensions represented in their Interpersonal Communication Inventory. They named their factors as follows: self-disclosure, awareness (of self), evaluation and acceptance of feedback, self-expression, attention, coping with feelings, clarity, avoidance, dominance, handling differences, and perceived acceptance. Rather than focusing on a single

relationship or type of relationship, the items in their inventory referred to the person's interpersonal relationships in general.

In an effort to record and study specific teacher verbal behaviors rather than general perceptions of the relationship, the Flanders System of Interaction Analysis (Flanders, 1970) has been used, although its advisability in the study of student-teacher relationships is doubtful. The Flanders does record specific categories of teacher communication, but Mason (1970) failed to find either a linear or a quadratic relationship between measures of the Flanders and the quality of the relationship. Ryan (1974) found the only significant difference between teachers who had strong and weak interpersonal relationships with their students to be in the use of student ideas from among the Flanders categories.

Specific communication variables or written items pertaining to communication have been found to predict satisfaction-attraction in marital relationships (Clarke, 1974) as well as to distinguish between couples who are well or poorly adjusted (Boyd and Roach, 1977).

Poppen and White (1976) used the Poppen role-shifting framework to study adult behavior in adolescent-adult relationships. Good and poor relationships could be distinguished by the adults' use of seven of the eight verbal response roles: feelings, thoughts, behavior, motives,

encounter, sharing, and problem-solving. Their study focused on behaviors which were representative of various theoretical approaches and which were a part of the repertoire of teachers.

Student-Teacher Relationships

At least two rather extensive reviews of the research in student-teacher relationships have been compiled (Brophy and Good, 1974; Hawley, 1979). In addition, published articles and shorter reviews have presented less comprehensive summations (Bush, 1958; Evans, 1962; Fenner, 1968; Leavitt, 1959). Not only are studies reported which describe the relationship but also ones concerned with other variables which may overlap to varying degrees, such as classroom climate, teacher expectations, and teacher effectiveness. It would seem a digression at this point to review all those studies, even limiting the focus to those concerned with teacher behavior, since student-teacher interaction varies with the age level of the student (Ribble, 1976). It seems imperative to concentrate on the particular age group in question and to limit examination of existing research reports to those done with students representing the group under consideration.

The following review of research will be limited to those studies conducted with students of junior high school age, grades 7-9, concerning teacher qualities or the

relationship and those dealing with consistency within the relationship.

Preferred Teacher Qualities.

Gifted students in grades 6-8, when asked about desirable characteristics for teachers, gave answers which produced the following list: friendliness, knowledge of the subject, encouragement of independence, and patience (Jacks, 1972).

Leipold (1959) asked ninth graders from regular classrooms to describe the teachers they liked most. In classifying and tabulating their responses, he separated the girls' responses from those of the boys. Girls listed understanding most often. The second, third, and fourth ranked responses for the girls were a sense of humor, fairness, and personality. For the boys, the teacher's personality was most important, followed by the ability to make the class interesting, liking students, and a sense of humor.

Dallolio (1959) also used student descriptions written by ninth grade students but asked them about their ideal teacher rather than a real teacher they had encountered. Strictness, a sense of humor, and teaching ability were most important while understanding, respect, and not showing favoritism were also mentioned.

Saunders and Wright (1974) used a more structured approach in their research with students of various ethnic backgrounds. Junior high school students were asked to rank teacher behavior characteristics in order of importance in three separate categories: personality, academic, and physical attributes. All student groups preferred friendliness most among the personality characteristics. Also highly ranked in the personality category were liking all students and being fun. Means for eight of the ten personality items were within a one-point range on a nine-point scale, and all were considered to be important. The students attached about the same importance to those items in the personality category as to those in the academic category.

Student-Teacher Relationships: Good Versus Poor.

Jenkins (1951) asked junior high school teachers to identify the students with whom the teachers had the best and worst relationships. Jenkins' results can be examined only in a broad sense, representative of both types of students, since he combined their responses in presenting his results.

In interviewing the students, one of Jenkins' questions asked students to identify those things done by teachers which they (students) liked. He later classified their responses, with one of his resulting classifications being that of personal relations.

Friendliness, talking with students, helping students with personal problems, praising and encouraging students, showing interest in students as individuals, participating in activities with students, and showing interest in and encouraging extracurricular activities were among those responses listed as personal relations, although each of them was mentioned by not more than 5% of the students. Three teacher behaviors which were not classified as personal relations but were mentioned frequently by the students were: being fair (53%), not embarrassing students (29%), and being courteous (20%).

Nash (1976) also used interviews but in a different manner. Using one class of 12- and 13-year olds, Nash first asked each student to classify three of his/her teachers as those he/she got along with and those he/she did not get along with. The student was then asked to differentiate between the resulting two sets, producing some characteristics common to both teachers in one set while differing from the teacher in the other set.

From analysis of the conversations, Nash listed six constructs which were common to most or all the students: keeps order-unable to keep order; friendly-unfriendly; teaches you-doesn't teach you; explains-doesn't explain; fair-unfair; interesting-boring. The students' comments indicated that they got along with teachers whose behavior

matched their expectations but did not get along with teachers who fell short of those expectations.

Boser and Poppen (1978) used videotaped demonstrations of the seven types of teacher behavior described in the eclectic role-shifting model (Poppen, 1975). Ninth grade students were asked to rate the frequency with which the junior high school teacher with whom they had had the best relationship had used each of the seven types of response roles with them. Sharing was reported as the most frequently used of the seven response roles by teachers with whom these students had had their best relationships. Students reported that each of the seven response roles was used by the teachers, with encounter/encouragement ranked second in frequency of use, followed in order by feelings, thoughts, motives, behavior, and confrontation.

Consistency in Needs and Relationships.

While not conducted at the junior high school level, there have been two studies examining the consistency of interpersonal needs and relationships.

Punke (1961), found some indication of either consistency or adaptation within the individual student. Of the 804 high school seniors in his study, 71% of the boys and 85% of the girls reported getting along very well with their teachers while seven boys and two girls reported that they got along poorly with their teachers. The majority of students had evidently developed either satisfying or

unsatisfying relationships with various teachers who may have behaved quite differently toward them. By using high school seniors, many of the students who had failed to adapt or had developed uniformly poor relationships were probably no longer among the group of subjects.

Brown (1976) found enough consistency in teacher and student needs and behaviors at the high school level over a two-year period to conclude that measurement need be conducted only once when using the FIRO-B (Fundamental Interpersonal Relations-Behavior). Measuring inclusion, control, and affection as both expressed and wanted by teachers and students, he found a wide range of needs for both teachers and students. Teachers indicated low inclusion needs in contrast to high student inclusion needs. Incompatibility was shown in the high expressed need of the students for affection and the low need to express affection on the part of the teachers. Although the composition of the student group was basically different at the time of the second measurement, the teacher group was primarily the same. Comparison of the two sets of scores showed little difference.

Summary

Real relationships are not characterized in the same way as typical or hypothetical ones. There appear to be

differences between different types of relationships, even to the point of classifying friendships differently.

Communication skills and instruments for measuring their use within the student-teacher relationship have been derived from the client-therapist relationship in many instances. Such instruments have generally proved unsatisfactory due to their lack of specificity as have the behavioral observation scales for teachers which do not focus on behaviors relevant to the relationship. Communication variables have been shown to differentiate between good and poor relationships in both the student-teacher and other relationships.

Various methodologies have been employed to determine what teacher qualities are liked by junior high school students and what comprises good student-teacher relationships for those students. Teacher qualities preferred by students are similar to and often repetitive of those found in descriptions of good student-teacher relationships. Among them are: friendliness; patience; teaching competence; being supportive, encouraging, and understanding; possessing classroom management skills; having a sense of humor; being fair; showing respect for students; and communicating clearly to students their own thoughts and feelings.

The majority of high school seniors consistently relate to their teachers in the same manner, and student and teacher interpersonal needs and behaviors were shown to be

fairly stable over a two-year period for high school students in general.

None of the studies, and particularly those involving junior high school students, considered in detail the teacher behaviors in more than one good relationship for the same student.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

One hundred and seven eighth grade students from a suburban middle school in East Tennessee participated in this project. The particular middle school was selected because its student body is representative of all socioeconomic levels, with middle and upper middle classes predominating. In previous research (Boser, 1978) with students representing various populations within the city and county schools in the same county as the participants in this study, responses of ninth grade students from this school were not significantly different from those of other schools when reporting the response role use of teachers with whom they had had good relationships in grades 7-8.

Some Black students attend the school although the percentage is low, approximately 3% according to school officials. The school is in a suburban area with some rural children in attendance. Total enrollment in the three middle school grades (6-8) is over one thousand.

Eighth grade students are assigned to homerooms by a stratified random procedure with the exception of band students and those students for whom special requests are on file. Socioeconomic status, achievement level, and sex are

considered when trying to achieve balance in each of the eight homerooms. Two teacher teams, each consisting of two eighth grade teachers, function as basic organizational units in providing a coordinated educational experience for the students assigned to their homerooms. Band students are assigned within one team to facilitate programming but constitute only a portion of the students in that team.

The teacher team containing the band students was selected by school personnel as potential subjects. The research project and its purpose were explained to the designated students in their homerooms one week in advance of the data collection. In order to participate, each student was required to have a Parent Consent Form (see Appendix A) signed and returned to the researcher. Parent Consent Forms were distributed when the project was described to the students.

Of the 145 students in the designated classes, 102 were present for data collection and had signed Parent Consent Forms.

Instrumentation

A videotape had been produced in previous research (Boser and Poppen, 1978) to demonstrate seven response roles found in current problem-solving procedures for educators. Student response forms were developed to

facilitate student recall of two seventh or eighth grade teachers with whom each student felt he/she had had the best relationships, validate the quality of the relationships, obtain a measure of each teacher's use of the demonstrated response roles, and ultimately to determine which role was used most by each teacher.

Videotape.

The Poppen role-shifting model (1975) was selected as the framework for this study after examination of previous research on student-teacher relationships. Boser (1978) describes the development of the videotape as follows:

Response Roles.

Seven teacher verbal response roles based on Poppen's role-shifting model (1975) were identified and defined: (a) feelings, (b) thoughts, (c) motives, (d) behavior, (e) encounter/encouragement, (f) confrontation, and (g) sharing. Six of the roles were demonstrated in dialogues found in books, a magazine article, and an educational film (see Appendix B). A dialogue similar to one which had been published was written for the seventh role.

Validation of Dialogues.

The written dialogues were submitted to five judges along with descriptions of the response roles (see Appendix C). The judges were asked to determine independently which role or roles, if any, each dialogue represented. The judges were four recent recipients of Masters degrees in Educational Psychology and Guidance and one doctoral student in that field. (pp. 28-29)

Naive raters or judges were sought rather than experts since previous research (Arnhoff, 1954; Cronbach, 1960) found naive raters were often more reliable.

Agreement among the judges was unanimous for dialogues representing the response roles of feelings, behavior, confrontation, and sharing that they were representative of the roles they were intended to portray. Agreement was 80% for dialogues representing the response roles of thoughts, motives, and encounter/encouragement, with the same judge causing lack of perfect agreement for all three dialogues.

Videotape.

A videotape script was written in which each of the dialogues was preceded by a brief description of the role portrayed in the dialogue. An introduction to the videotape was also written (see Appendix D).

Two adults and two students agreed to perform the roles on videotape and were given instructions regarding their assigned roles.

The adult performers, a man and a woman, were familiar with the roles being demonstrated and the theories behind them. Student performers, a boy and a girl, were from grades close to that of the intended subjects to aid subjects in identifying with the videotape performers. Teacher-student pairs for the dialogues were of both same-sex and opposite-sex composition in an attempt to avoid response bias due to the sex of the teacher. Both students participated in dialogues based on incidents of inappropriate behavior. Role assignments were as follows:

<u>Role</u>	<u>Teacher Sex</u>	<u>Student Sex</u>
a. Feelings	Female	Male
b. Thoughts	Male	Female
c. Motives	Female	Female
d. Behavior	Male	Male
e. Encounter/ Encouragement	Female	Female
f. Confrontation	Female	Male
g. Sharing	Male	Female

Performers practiced their roles until they felt comfortable in their performances. Cue words and phrases were written on cards and on a blackboard which were visible to performers but out of the field of vision of the camera. After taping each dialogue, a decision was made whether to erase the tape and repeat it or to proceed. Following each dialogue, instructions were recorded for subjects to mark their responses, and decreasing time intervals were allowed for them to do so. Once the tape was started, it would continue without interruption until all dialogues were shown and student responses to them were completed. (Boser, 1978, pp. 29-30)

In producing the original videotape, roles had been randomly arranged within the "other" and "self" subgroups producing the following sequence: feelings, thoughts, motives, behavior, encounter/encouragement, confrontation, and sharing. An alternate form of the videotape was produced from the original with the roles in a different order. Using a table of random numbers and organizing the entire group of seven without respect to subgroup resulted in this order: feelings, motives, encounter/encouragement, confrontation, behavior, thoughts, and sharing.

Student Response Forms.

The student response form consisted of four pages (see Appendix E). Pages one and three directed the student to describe two teachers. The first teacher (page one) was to be the teacher with whom the student had experienced the best or most nearly ideal student-teacher relationship in grades 7-8. This relationship was defined for the student as the one in which the student got along well with the teacher and was most satisfied with the way they got along.

The second teacher (page three) was to be one with whom the student had also had a very good or nearly ideal relationship in the same grades.

After students had described each relationship, they were asked to rate the overall quality of the relationship

on a 1-7 scale with 1 indicating nearly ideal, 7 meaning very poor.

Pages two and four were identical in form. The student was asked to indicate how often the teacher he/she had just described had talked with the student in a manner similar to that demonstrated on the videotape when the student had been in a situation similar to that of the student on videotape. Response options were: (1) always, (2) often, (3) sometimes, (4) seldom, (5) never. Cue words or phrases were used along with the letter designation of each scene (Scene A, Scene B, and so on) to aide in recall when doing the final ranking at the bottom of the page.

Finally, the student was to rank the seven roles according to the frequency with which the teacher had used them. The roles were listed in the same order as they had been presented on videotape, and the student was to place a "1" beside the role used most often, a "2" by the role used most of the six remaining roles, continuing until all seven roles were ranked.

One half of the student forms were constructed with the roles listed in the original sequence, while the other half of the forms used the alternate sequence to correspond to the alternate form of the videotape. Each student was also provided a copy of the videotape script for reference when the videotape was shown.

Validation of the Instrument.

Parts of the response form had been field tested prior to and during previous research with junior high school age students. The sections in which the students were directed to describe the relationship and rating the frequency of the teacher's behavior as the videotape was shown were identical to those used previously. The response form as used in this study was reviewed prior to use by persons knowledgeable in both research in general and in education, particularly in the area of student-teacher relationships and communication.

The research procedure was used with three classes of University undergraduates with one exception--the videotape was not shown. Since reading level was not considered a problem at the college level, participants read the script when arriving at the part of the process when the videotape would be shown. Students at this level were able to satisfactorily complete the process with little difficulty, although requests for clarification of the ranking procedure indicated a need for clearer directions for that component. When the forms were prepared for the middle school students, the ranking directions were expanded and made more explicit.

Test-Retest Reliability.

Student ratings of these teacher behaviors as demonstrated were found to be relatively stable when 32 ninth grade students repeated the ratings for best relationships

after one week (Boser, 1978). Test-retest reliability was determined by computation of Spearman rank-order correlation coefficients, which ranged from .44 to .73.

Procedure

Data collection took place during the fourth week of April, in accordance with scheduling demands and availability of students. Prior to administration, the band group was randomly assigned to form A (original sequence). Since it was anticipated that this group would be larger than any of the four science class groups, one other class was randomly selected to also use form A. The remaining three classes used form B (alternate sequence).

Data collection was conducted in the science classroom for the four science class groups. The band students met in the cafeteria during homeroom period for the research procedures. There were 18 students in the latter group, with 18, 22, 24, and 25 students participating in their respective science classes.

The directions were read to the students as they progressed from one task to another. Students were assured that there were no correct answers and that it was important for them to be as accurate as possible. They were also told that the researcher would collect their papers and that their teachers would not have access to them.

Each student described a teacher on page one, then rated the overall quality of the relationship. Copies of the script were distributed to the students, and the videotape was shown. The students indicated their responses on page two for the teacher just described, showing the relative frequencies with which the teacher had used the response roles that were demonstrated. Students then ranked the response roles, with the role used most frequently being assigned the first rank, the next role being ranked second, and continuing to the role used least.

Students repeated the process on pages three and four, describing another teacher with whom they also had had a very good or nearly ideal relationship.

The ranking process still proved too complex for the initial homeroom group of students, however. Of the 18 students in the first group, only seven correctly followed the entire procedure and were able to rank the seven roles for both teachers. Subsequent consultation with the students' teachers resulted in changing to a simplified procedure. The four groups which followed were asked to designate only first and second place rankings, since this seemed a more realistic expectation and would still provide sufficient discrimination to answer the research question being asked.

Verbal directions were given as the revised ranking procedure was demonstrated on the chalkboard. Students

were asked to look at the "Always" column on their forms. If only one response role was marked in that column, they were to put a star (*) in the margin beside that role. If two or more roles were marked in that column, they were to decide which of them had been used most and mark the star beside that role. Two stars were marked beside the role used next most often. If a student had not circled any roles in the "Always" column, the student was directed to look at the "Often" column, proceeding until the student was able to complete the two rankings.

The new ranking procedure was an improvement, although five response forms from students in the four remaining groups were omitted after screening for failure to properly indicate the first-ranked role (teacher primary response role) for each teacher.

Screening

Prior to analysis of the student's responses, the researcher screened the response forms in the following ways:

1. Descriptions of relationships were read to determine whether or not students were following directions and focusing on good relationships they had had with teachers.

2. Only relationships which students had rated 1, 2, or 3 on the overall rating were retained for analysis. Since 4 is the middle of the 7-point scale and the

instructions to the students specified that a rating of 4 indicated the relationship was neither pleasant nor unpleasant, a relationship rated 4 would be unacceptable for the purpose of this research, as would those rated 5, 6, or 7 which are on the "poor" part of the scale.

3. For the final rankings to be valid, they had to be consistent with the student's frequency ratings of the teacher's use of the roles when they were demonstrated on videotape. The role ranked "1" had to have the highest (or have one of the highest, if tied) frequency ratings at the top of the page. If the role ranked "1" in the ranking had been marked as being used "Often" while another role was marked "Always" when viewing the videotape, this was viewed as indicative of inconsistency or possible confusion, and the subject's responses were invalidated and removed from the data pool.

A response form was eliminated when it failed to meet the screening standards in any one of the three areas described above. Of the 107 students who participated, 98 of them (92%) identified two good student-teacher relationships. In addition to the nine omitted from analysis because the two relationships were not both rated good (1, 2, or 3), an additional eight response forms were excluded because the ranking of response roles was not done correctly or did not identify the primary response role for each teacher. This left a total of 90 usable response forms (see Appendix F).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Statistical Treatment

Students Identifying Two Good Relationships.

During the screen process it was found that 98 of the 107 students in the original subject group identified two teachers with whom they had had good relationships. This proved to be 92%.

Frequency of Response Roles as Primary Response Role.

The frequency with which each response role was the primary response role for teachers A and B (the first and second teachers rated by the student) is presented in Table 1. Sharing was the primary response role most frequently for both relationships. Feelings was next for teacher A relationships but fourth for teacher B relationships. Encounter/encouragement and confrontation occurred in the same order relative to each other in both relationships.

The same three roles had the lowest frequencies for both teachers, although the rank orders were different. Behavior and motives had identical frequencies (four and five respectively) in the two relationships; the difference in order is attributable to thoughts, which had a frequency

TABLE 1
FREQUENCIES OF RESPONSE ROLES AS PRIMARY RESPONSE ROLE
FOR FIRST (A) AND SECOND (B) TEACHERS DESCRIBED

	Teacher B							Subtotal A	Total A
	Self	Other	Sharing	Encounter/ Encouragement	Confrontation	Feelings	Thoughts	Behavior	Motives
Teacher A									
Self									
Sharing	18	6	4	4	4	4	4	4	40
Encounter/ Encouragement	4	7	2	2				2	15
Confrontation		3	4						7
Other									62
Feelings	5	2	2	4	1	2			16
Thoughts	1	1		1			1		3
Behavior	3					1			4
Motives		1		2	1	1		1	5
Subtotal B	31	20	12	11	7	4	5		
Total B			63					27	90

of three for teacher A and seven for teacher B. There were no instances in which thoughts or behavior was recorded for both teachers A and B, and in only one case was motives identified by the same student for both teachers.

Teachers' Use of the Same Primary Response Role.

It has been assumed that the first relationship identified (teacher A) is the relationship which would have been described had the student been asked about only one good relationship, as has been done in previous relationship research. Therefore, the first relationship and the primary response role associated with that relationship is a given condition. The question to be answered is whether a second good relationship (teacher B), once described and the primary response role determined, would differ from the one already established.

In looking at the extent to which the same response role occurred for both teachers, a conditional binomial probability model was used to test for statistical significance. Once the primary response role had been established for teacher A, the case was assigned a "+" if the same response role was attributed to teacher B (indicating a match); if a different primary response role was identified for teacher B, the case was classified as a "-" to signify that it was not a match.

The number of matches and nonmatches for each individual response role are presented in Table 2. The

TABLE 2
SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS FOR MATCHES RECORDED FOR RESPONSE ROLES, SELF AND
OTHER GROUPS, AND TOTALS BASED ON PRIOR PROBABILITIES
DETERMINED BY TEACHER A FREQUENCIES

Role/ Category	Number of Matches(+)	Number of Nonmatches(-)	Total	Probability
Sharing	18	22	40	$p(x \geq 18) = E(40, 18, .4444) = .5327$
Encounter/ Encouragement	7	8	15	$p(x \geq 7) = E(15, 7, .1667) = .00667$
Confrontation	4	3	7	$p(x \geq 4) = E(7, 4, .07778) = .00107$
Feelings	4	12	16	$p(x \geq 4) = E(16, 4, .17778) = .31372$
Thoughts	0	3	3	$p(x \geq 0) = E(3, 0, .03333) = 1.0000$
Behavior	0	4	4	$p(x \geq 0) = E(4, 0, .04444) = 1.0000$
Motives	1	4	5	$p(x \geq 1) = E(5, 1, .05555) = .24815$
Total of Response Roles	34	56	90	$p(x \geq 34) = E(90, 34, .2691) = .01598$
Self	48	14	62	$p(x \geq 48) = E(62, 48, .6889) =$ $1 - E(62, 15, .3111) = .09224$
Other	13	15	28	$p(x \geq 13) = E(28, 13, .3111) = .06431$
Total of Self and Other	61	29	90	$p(x \geq 61) = E(90, 61, .5714) =$ $1 - E(90, 30, .4286) = .0302$

response roles of thoughts, behavior, and motives occurred so infrequently as the primary response role for teacher A that matching by chance might have resulted in statistical significance when no real significance existed. Therefore, in addition to examining individual response roles and the total for the individual roles, categories were collapsed in the most logical and meaningful way (into self: sharing, encounter/encouragement, and confrontation; and other: thoughts, feelings, motives, and behavior) to take all the data into account. In Table 2, in addition to the numbers of matches and nonmatches for individual response roles, the numbers for the self and other categories are presented as well as figures for the total based on a sum of the self and other categories and a sum for the individual response roles.

As can be seen, the number of matches for the self group (48) exceeds the sum of matches for the three individual response roles (29) of which it is composed. This occurs because of the greater opportunity for matching. For example, a teacher primary response role for teacher B of confrontation would be a match if the primary response role for teacher A were either sharing, encounter/encouragement, or confrontation since all are in the more inclusive self category; whereas for confrontation as an individual response role, a match would result only if the primary response role for teacher A were confrontation. The same

situation occurs with respect to the matches for the other group (13) and the individual response roles within it (5 matches).

To conduct statistical tests, it was necessary to establish the expected probability levels for the respective roles, groups of roles, and totals. Since the true probabilities for the response roles were unknown, one question to be resolved was whether or not each role occurred as primary response role with the same frequency. In attempting to determine if there were equal probability of each role occurring as primary response role for teacher A, a chi-square test for significant differences was performed comparing the frequencies with which the various response roles occurred as primary response role for teacher A. The frequency differences observable in Subtotal_A column of Table 1 (p. 36) produced a chi-square value of 79.56 with 6 degrees of freedom, which was significant ($p < .001$). This was taken as verification that the response roles had different probabilities of being chosen as primary response role. The self and other categories also differed with a chi-square value of 12.8444 ($p < .001$) with 1 degree of freedom.

Since both relationships were to be the same type and quality, the probability of achieving a match for any one of the response roles was thus based on the frequency with which that response role had been the primary response role

for teacher A. Sharing, for example, was the primary response role in 40 of the 90 cases (44%) for teacher A (Table 1, p. 36). Therefore, of the 40 subjects who identified sharing for teacher A, if the categories are indeed independent and mutually exclusive it would be expected that 44% of those 40 subjects would also identify sharing for teacher B, resulting in 18 matches.

Statistical significance was determined using the Tables of the Cumulative Binomial Probability Distribution (1955). As can be seen in Table 2 (p. 38), the individual response roles of encounter/encouragement and confrontation matched to a significant degree ($p < .01$) while the response roles of thoughts and behavior had no matches ($p = 1.000$).

The total number of observed matches for all 90 subjects was 34. Since each response role had a different probability of occurrence, based on the frequencies for teacher A, the overall probability of matching for all seven response roles was computed by squaring each of the seven response role probabilities and summing them ($p = .2691$). The same procedure was used to determine the overall probability of matching when response role categories were collapsed into self and other ($p = .5714$).

The total number of 34 observed matches for the 90 subjects, representing the total of the matches for the seven individual response roles, was tested against the

overall probability (.2691) and found to be significant ($p < .05$).

For the self and other groups, the other group approached statistical significance ($p = .0643$), but the total for self and other of 61 matches was significant ($p < .05$).

While several of the individual response roles did not match to an extent greater than would have been expected by chance, nor did the self and other groups, the overall results show that as a total group of response roles, matching did occur to a significant degree ($p < .05$).

Two additional tests were conducted to determine whether the frequencies for the response roles for teachers A and B as primary response role differed (Subtotal columns, Table 1, p. 36), and whether the self and other frequencies differed (total columns, Table 1). A chi-square value of 172 with 6 degrees of freedom was significant ($p < .001$) when the response role totals were compared using relationship A as the expected frequency for relationship B, indicating that the data obtained from the first relationship (teacher A) for the group of 90 eighth grade students was not the same as that from the second relationship (teacher B).

Comparison of the self and other totals, however, produced a chi-square value of .0518 with 1 degree of freedom, which was not significant and was hardly surprising since there was a difference of only one in each category between teachers A and B. Thus the frequencies for self and other were not different for the two relationships.

Summary

The frequency with which each response role was the primary response role was tabulated for teacher A and for teacher B. The number of times the primary response role for teacher B matched that of teacher A was determined for each individual response role, for the self and other categories, and for the total group.

The results of both chi-square tests comparing observed frequencies of the primary response roles and the self/other frequencies for teacher A were significant, showing that there was not equal probability of occurrence for the seven response roles as primary response role nor for the self and other groups of response roles.

Using prior probabilities based on the frequency with which each role was the primary response role for teacher A, only encounter/encouragement and confrontation matched at a significant level among the individual response roles ($p < .01$). The total number of matches representing the sum of matches for the seven individual response roles was significant ($p < .05$) as was the total consisting of the number of matches for the self and other groups ($p < .05$), thus permitting rejection of the hypothesis that when a junior high school student identifies two teachers with whom the student has had good relationships in grades 7-8, the response role used most by the second teacher will tend to be different from that of the first teacher.

The frequencies of the occurrence of the response roles for teachers A and B were compared producing a significant chi-square value ($p < .001$), showing that data relevant to one good student-teacher relationship were not synonymous with that from another good student-teacher relationship for the overall group of students when looking at group rather than intrapersonal consistency with respect to the seven individual response roles. When the self and other distributions were compared, however, they were found to be nearly identical.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine whether junior high school students relate best with teachers who behave similarly toward them or differently with respect to seven teacher response roles found in current problem-solving approaches.

The subjects were 90 eighth grade students from a suburban middle school in East Tennessee. During the research process, each student wrote descriptions of two teachers with whom he/she felt he/she had had good relationships in grades 7-8. After rating the overall quality of each relationship, the students watched videotaped demonstrations of the teacher response roles of feelings, thoughts, motives, behavior, encounter/encouragement, confrontation, and sharing. After seeing each scene, they reported the frequency with which the teacher they described had used that type of response with them when a similar situation had occurred. Finally, the students used a ranking procedure to identify the response role used most frequently (primary response role) by that specific teacher.

In analyzing the data, the relative frequency with which each response role was identified as the primary response role was recorded for teacher A and teacher B. The total number of times both teachers were reported by a student as using the same primary response role was determined for each of the seven response roles, for the self and other categories, and for the total for all individual response roles as well as the total for self and other categories.

A chi-square test showed significant differences existed between the observed frequencies for the seven response roles for teacher A as the primary response role. A conditional binomial probability model was used with the observed frequencies for teacher A (the first teachers rated by the students) serving to establish expected frequencies for teacher B (the second teachers rated by the students). The individual response roles of encounter/encouragement and confrontation as well as the total number of matches representing the sum of the individual response roles and the total of matches from the self and other categories were all statistically significant ($p < .05$). Since both totals showed that matching for the two relationships did occur to a significant degree, the hypothesis was rejected.

Conclusions

The following conclusions seem to be justified in light of this study, although generalizability is limited by the assumptions and limitations stated in Chapter I (pp. 8-10).

1. Each response role can be the primary response role in a good relationship. The seven response roles were not used with equal frequency as the major type of teacher communication in good relationships, but each of them did serve as the primary response role for some students. Thus any of the seven has the potential of being the key type of interaction.

2. A student is most likely to develop a good relationship with a teacher who uses sharing most often. While sharing was cited most often by the students as the response role used most by both teachers with whom they had had good relationships, it did not have a greater number of matches than would have been expected. In fact, the .44 probability for sharing which was observed for teacher A was remarkably accurate in predicting the number of instances in which teacher B also used sharing most and appears to represent the true probability for this group of students and teachers.

3. Good relationships are more likely to be characterized by teacher self roles than other roles. Considered as a group, students in this age group tend to characterize

good student-teacher relationships more often by the teacher's use of the broader self group of response roles (sharing, encounter/encouragement, and confrontation) than by the other group of response roles (feelings, thoughts, behavior, and motives). Self roles were the primary communication technique in approximately 70% of the relationships for teacher B just as they were for teacher A, showing remarkable consistency. With respect to these two categories, then, a researcher could feel confident in using one relationship as symbolic of good relationships in an overall sense if a similar student population were studied.

4. In terms of intrapersonal consistency, students are especially likely to develop good relationships with two teachers who use the same response role if that role is either encounter/encouragement or confrontation. Both response roles were designated as the primary response role in both relationships for a student to a degree greater than would have been expected on the basis of chance alone.

5. More students were shown to have formed good relationships with two teachers who use primarily a self orientation in their interactions with the student (53%) than with two teachers who use the other orientation (14%). While some students reported good relationships with a teacher (teacher A) whose primary response role was from the other orientation, it was balanced by another

relationship in which the teacher used the self orientation by over half (15 of 28) of those students. Thus few students reported consistently forming good relationships with teachers who verbally focus primarily on the student.

6. There is overall intrapersonal consistency in the response roles used most by two teachers with whom the students form good relationships. In looking at the total numbers of matches, it makes no difference whether that total is the sum of the numbers of matches for the seven individual response roles or for the two larger categories of self and other. Both totals were statistically significant ($p < .05$) when tested against their respective expected probabilities (Table 2, p. 38). This provides the most sound evidence for rejection of the hypothesis which stated that when a junior high school student identifies two teachers with whom the student has had good relationships in grades 7-8, the response role used most by the second teacher will tend to be different from that of the first teacher.

Discussion

Just as Hardy (1977) found that all student-teacher relationships were not characterized in the same way, this investigation showed that not all good student-teacher relationships were typified by the same primary response

role. Each of the seven response roles, to a greater or lesser extent, was the major type of interaction in good relationships with the difference between the response role frequencies being significant.

Good relationships were more likely to be characterized by sharing, encounter/encouragement, confrontation, or feelings than by motives, thoughts, or behavior. The preference for sharing may be partially a function of the age of the students. Pre-adolescent students are already in transition from childhood to adulthood, and the adult's sharing of ideas may be a symbol of acceptance of the student's increasing maturity by relating to the student more as an equal than as a subordinate.

Thoughts, behavior, and motives were the primary type of communication least often in both relationships. Recent trends toward assertiveness and reflective or active listening skills have directed attention toward self response roles and feelings, which had the highest frequencies, so it is possible that fewer teachers have been exposed to training in the techniques of using thoughts, behavior, or motives responses or have not learned to do so properly. In either case, the teachers may be using them less, thereby decreasing the chance of their being the primary response role. The fact that some students did identify each of them as the major type of transaction and that the students were exposed to the same teachers may mean that the

teachers were behaving differentially toward the students with respect to the response roles, using some roles more with some students than with others. This would not be totally unexpected since teachers have been found to behave differentially toward students when other behavior variables have been studied (Brophy and Good, 1970; Silberman, 1969).

While Murstein and Spitz (1973) found intrasubject differences among five different types of friends, the finding of the present study that there is intrasubject consistency in student-teacher relationships may be due to the greater specificity in the relationships being compared. Murstein and Spitz looked at different types of friends while the current investigation focused on relationships between the subjects and their teachers, considering only good relationships as identified by the students.

Each of the self roles matched at or above the expected probability level. It is also important to note that the three self roles were among the four roles with the highest frequencies in both relationships. Students seemed to develop good relationships more frequently and more consistently with teachers who are authentic (Moustakas, 1966), openly declaring their own thoughts and feelings (both positive and negative) in a nonjudgmental way and thus giving the student a measure of security in knowing the teacher's frame of mind.

Although self-disclosure is defined in various ways, the self roles in this approach could all be included as forms of self-disclosure. The results of this study clearly support Jourard's (1971) advocacy of self-disclosure as integral in the development and maintenance of relationships in finding that good relationships are characterized by self roles more often than other roles and that students are particularly likely to relate well to two teachers who both use the encounter/encouragement or confrontation response roles. Clearly, receiving either positive or negative sentiments from the teacher can be the dominant feature of both relationships. While the term "feedback" has been perhaps overused, it appears that it is descriptive of a good relationship between a teacher and an early adolescent. A student would not find it excessive to receive either type of feedback from more than one source.

Among the response roles in which the teacher responds in terms of the other, only the role of feelings was the primary response role to an extent comparable with any of the self roles. The frequency for feelings was greater than that for two of the self roles for the first relationship, each of which achieved significant matching. Therefore, lack of consistency for feelings in the two relationships cannot be attributed to the sample size, as might be the inference with thoughts, behavior, and motives which showed low frequencies as primary response role in both

relationships. A larger sample size might have made more distinct the tendency not to match for those roles with low frequencies.

The results reported herein are somewhat consistent with those of an earlier study (Boser and Poppen, 1978) in which sharing and encounter/encouragement were also shown to be used most by teachers in good junior high school student-teacher relationships. The major discrepancy between results of the two studies is in the placement of confrontation. In the previous study, confrontation was used least of the seven response roles in good relationships whereas in the current study confrontation would be ranked fourth for teacher A and third for teacher B based on the numbers of students designating confrontation as the primary response role.

The use of a ranking procedure in the present study may well be responsible for the difference. When the student was forced to rank the response roles, the distance between them in terms of frequency of usage was distorted. In the earlier study, in which each role was merely given a rating from 1 to 5 to indicate frequency, roles which were used similarly could have been given the same rating rather than differentiating between them. For purposes of the present study, the ranking procedure was determined to be most effective for accomplishing the objective of the study. It is interesting to note that it is only with

respect to this one role that a major difference was noted in placement and that this role is not among those used with considerable frequency in good relationships.

There is a general overall consistency in the use of the seven individual response roles and the self and other categories in good relationships. This would support the use of data from a subject about one good student-teacher relationship in terms of these response role behaviors as representative of that type of relationship for that subject. In addition, results from the group of students with reference to self and other categories would be representative of good relationships for that group of students although the group data would not necessarily be representative of the distribution among the seven individual response roles.

One aspect of this study which seems somewhat unique, compared with prior research in this area, is the attempt to focus only on good relationships which have been verified by a qualitative rating by the student. In prior research, a student's best relationship with a teacher may have been only a neutral one or a poor one. Conclusions based on that type of relationship would not necessarily be the same as those based on relationships which are pleasant and enjoyable. It was somewhat disturbing to learn that 8% of the students of the original subject pool did not (or could not) identify two teachers with whom they

had had good relationships during their seventh and eighth grade years.

Within the limitations inherent in this study and with due consideration of the assumptions, it can be concluded that in terms of intraindividual differences in interpersonal relationships there does seem to be overall consistency in the response roles used by teachers with whom students of junior high school age develop good relationships. Students are most likely to develop good relationships with two teachers who use the same response role most, especially if that role is either encounter/encouragement or confrontation, and a larger percentage of the response roles used most in good relationships is likely to be composed of self rather than other response roles.

Implications

In terms of practical application to improve relationships, it would be inappropriate and unfounded at this point to say that the use of a particular response role would determine the quality of the relationship or that implementing a teacher role shift to sharing (which had the highest frequencies in both relationships) would improve a relationship. As can be seen from this set of data, there are some students, albeit a small number, who relate well to two teachers who are both mainly characterized by other response roles. In addition, each response role has the possibility of representing a good relationship.

The results do suggest the use of self roles, sharing in particular, since it is most often descriptive of good student-teacher relationships. The use of encounter/encouragement or confrontation would probably not prove detrimental since students do not seem to find it unacceptable for more than one teacher to respond to them in those ways. There is also the possibility that these roles find greater acceptance because of the context in which they occur. Confrontation and encounter/encouragement roles, which were found to be characteristic of good relationships, may owe their positions in part to the teacher's use of sharing, which is found to predominate most often in good relationships.

The technique of enacting a role shift (Poppen, 1975) to improve a relationship would probably be most justified if the teacher were using primarily a role from the other orientation, since even in good relationships the students who related well to one teacher who responded frequently with a response role from the other category were not particularly likely to form a close association with a second teacher who related to them in the same way. In essence, those roles can be overdone. On the other hand, students were likely to relate closely with more than one teacher who each used a self role.

Recommendations for Further Study

One question which arises from this particular study concerns those students who could not identify two good relationships during the seventh and eighth grade years in school. It would be interesting to further examine such students to see if the lack of rapport with any teachers has a significant effect on the student during the years in which the student first lacks such contact and in the years to follow.

Future researchers might benefit from using a larger, more diverse group of subjects, particularly if they wish to investigate the use of those roles which were used less frequently as the primary response role.

While this study dealt only with the primary response role, a more complete ranking might have produced different results. For example, if teacher A had used sharing and encounter/encouragement first and second while teacher B had used feelings and encounter/encouragement, the common denominator for the two relationships would not be the first ranked role but the second. This information was not available in the present study.

If data collection were expanded to include ranking of all seven roles, attention should be given to refining the ranking procedure since there was a problem in using the method originally planned for this study. Whether the procedure was at fault or if part of the difficulty was

due to the particular group of students who initially attempted to do the ranking cannot be determined. Monitoring of the subjects during the ranking phase would be recommended to insure accuracy in following directions.

Interpersonal relationships are reciprocal, and the teacher's behavior is to some extent influenced by the behavior of the student. Attention to the student verbal communication patterns as well as those of the teacher would shed additional light on the complex nature of the relationships in question.

It would have been helpful in the present study to determine whether the two relationships occurred concurrently or if one preceded the other in time. This information could introduce a new variable into a future study.

This study was limited to a particular type and quality of relationship. Other youth-adult relationships should be examined to see if the patterns formed for this group are similar to those when young people relate to other adults or if they seek to meet other needs through their relationships with other adults. In particular, the probability for sharing which seemed so accurate in this study and the consistent percentages of self and other primary response roles should be tested in other studies to see if the results obtained in this study are unique or do exist in other settings with other students as they describe good relationships with teachers and other adults.

Finally, in terms of practical applications, experimental studies which utilize either single response roles or controlled combinations of them might provide the basis for conclusions regarding their impact on relationships.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnhoff, F. N. Some Factors Influencing the Unreliability of Clinical Judgments. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1954, 10, 272-275.
- Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Dimensions of Therapist Response as Causal Factors in Therapeutic Change. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 43, No. 562.
- Behrman, E. H. Teacher-Student Relations as a Predictor of Teachers' Job Satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1976) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37A, 5467. (University Microfilms No. 77-4684)
- Bennis, W., Van Maanen, J., Schein, E. H., and Steele, F. I. Essays in Interpersonal Dynamics. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1979.
- Bienvenu, M. J., and Stewart, D. W. Dimensions of Interpersonal Communication. The Journal of Psychology, 1976, 93, 105-111.
- Boser, J. Identification of Teacher Verbal Response Roles for Improving Student-Teacher Relationships. Unpublished Masters Thesis, The University of Tennessee, 1978.
- Boser, J., and Poppen, W. A. Identification of Teacher Verbal Response Roles for Improving Student-Teacher Relationships. Journal of Educational Research, 1978, 72, 90-93.
- Boyd, L. A., and Roach, A. J. Interpersonal Communication Skills Differentiating More Satisfying From Less Satisfying Marital Relationships. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 540-542.
- Brophy, J. E., and Good, T. L. Teachers Communication of Differential Expectations for Children's Classroom Performance: Some Behavioral Data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-376.
- Brophy, J. E., and Good, T. L. Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.

- Brown, R. D. Exploration of Teacher-Student Interpersonal Relations. (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1970) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36A, 7222. (University Microfilms No. 76-106)
- Bush, R. M. A Study of Teacher-Pupil Relationships. New York: Prentice-Hall and Company, 1964.
- Bush, R. M. Principles of Successful Teacher-Pupil Relationships. Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, 39, 271-273.
- Byrne, D. The Attraction Paradigm. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Carkhuff, R. R., and Pierce, R. M. Teacher as Person. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1976.
- Clarke, F. P. Interpersonal Communication Variables as Predictors of Marital Satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Denver, 1973) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34A, 4458-4459. (University Microfilms No. 73-30,188)
- Cronbach, L. J. Essentials of Psychological Testing. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Crowley, T. J., and Ivey, A. E. Dimensions of Effective Interpersonal Communications: Specifying Behavioral Components. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 22, 267-271.
- Cunningham, W. G. The Impact of Student-Teacher Pairings on Teacher Effectiveness. American Educational Research Journal, 1975, 12, 169-189.
- Dallaglio, M. Junior High School Students Reflect on the Ideal Teacher. Clearing House, 1959, 34, 26-28.
- Farquon, H. H., and Lang, G. Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings Toward Them Related to Self-Perception, School Achievement and Behavior. Journal of Experimental Education, 1960, 29, 109-117.
- Dinkmeyer, D., McKay, G. D., and Dinkmeyer, B., Jr. Systematic Training for Effective Teaching: Teacher's Handbook. Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Service, 1980.

- Dowling, T. J., and Frantz, T. T. The Influence of Facilitative Relationship on Imitative Learning. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1975, 22, 259-263.
- Dreikurs, R., Greenwald, B. B., and Pepper, F. C. Maintaining Sanity in the Classroom: Illustrated Teaching Techniques. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Etinge, E. E. A Correlational Study of Pupil-Teacher Relationship and Academic Achievement. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1980) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1981, 41A, 3487-3488. (University Microfilms No. 8100569)
- Evans, K. M. Sociometry and Education. London, England: Routledge and Kegan Press, 1962.
- Fenner, M. S. The Teacher-Student Relationship. National Education Association Journal, 1968, 57, 15-18.
- Flanders, N. A. Analyzing Teaching Behavior. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Ginott, H. G. Between Parent and Teenager. New York: Avon, 1969.
- Ginott, H. G. Teacher and Child. New York: Macmillan, 1972.
- Glasser, W. Schools Without Failure. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.
- Gordon, T. Teacher Effectiveness Training. New York: Peter H. Wyden, 1974.
- Guerney, B. G. Relationship Enhancement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Hardy, T. A. Teacher-Student Dyadic Relationships in the Elementary Classroom: A Participant Observation Study. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1976) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37A, 6941.
- Hawley, H. P. The Classroom Communion: A Study of Teacher-Student Personal Relationships in Education With Emphasis on Secondary Education. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1978) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 39A, 5433. (University Microfilms No. 7906006)

- Hyman, R. T. The Concept of an Ideal Teacher-Student Relationship: A Comparison and Critique. In R. T. Hyman (ed.) Teaching: Vantage Points for Study. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1968, 175-185.
- Individual Psychology A Demonstration with a Parent, a Teacher, and a Child. Washington, D. C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1969. (Film)
- Jacks, W. R. Attitudes, Preferences and Perceptions of Gifted Sixth and Eighth Grade Students. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32A, 4450-4451. (University Microfilms No. 72-6067).
- Jenkins, D. H., and Lippitt, R. Interpersonal Perceptions of Teachers, Students, and Parents. Washington, D. C.: Division of Adult Education, National Education Association, 1951.
- Johnson, C. N. The Concept of an Ideal Teacher-student Relationship: Comparisons of Perceptions of Faculty, Students and Administrators of a Junior College. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, 1973) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34A, 5483. (University Microfilms No. 74-5262)
- Jones, S. R. R. A Comparison of Teacher and Student Perceptions of Interpersonal Relationships and Self-Concepts. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1973) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34A, 3873. (University Microfilms No. 73-31,477)
- Jourard, S. M. The Transparent Self. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, 1971.
- Leavitt, J. Teacher-Pupil Relationships. Review of Educational Research, 1959, 29, 209-217.
- Leipold, L. E. Students Do Have Favorite Teachers. Clearing House, 1959, 34, 240-241.
- Lewis, W. A., Lovell, J. T., and Jessee, B. E. Interpersonal Relationship and Pupil Progress. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 396-401.
- Marwell, G., and Hage, J. The Organization of Relationships: A Systematic Description. American Sociological Review, 1970, 35, 884-900.

- Mason, J. A Study of the Relationships Between the Behavioral Styles of Classroom Teachers and the Quality of the Teacher-Student Interpersonal Relations. Educational Leadership Research Supplement, 1970, 4, 49-56.
- Moustakas, C. The Authentic Teacher. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard A. Doyle, 1966.
- Murstein, B. I., and Spitz, L. T. Aristotle and Friendship: A Factor-Analytic Study. Interpersonal Development, 1973, 4, 21-34.
- Nash, R. Teacher Expectations and Pupil Learning. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Pelkey, G. F. The Effect of Parent Effectiveness Training and Teacher Effectiveness Training on Student Self-Image. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1976) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37A, 5590.
- Poppen, W. A. Role-shifting: An Eclectic Model for Improving Relationships. Paper presented at the Southern Association of Counselor Educators and Supervisors, Mobile, Alabama, October 1975.
- Poppen, W. A., and White, P. An Analysis of Descriptions of Ideal and Poor Relationships. Paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 1976.
- Punke, H. H. Pupil-Teacher Relationships of High School Seniors. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1961, 45, 64-71.
- Raths, L. E., Harmin, M., and Simon, S. B. Values and Teaching: Working with Values in the Classroom. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.
- Reisman, J. M., and Yamokoski, T. Psychotherapy and Friendship: An Analysis of the Communications of Friends. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21, 269-273.
- Reitz, W. E., Very, P. S., and Guthrie, G. M. Experience, Expertness, and Ideal Teaching Relationships. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1965, 25, 1051-1060.

- Ribble, J. M. A Description of Teacher-Student Interaction From a Developmental Perspective. (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1976) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37A, 3266-3267. (University Microfilms No. 76-27,757)
- Ryan, J. F. The Association of Teacher-Student Interpersonal Relationship and Classroom Verbal Interaction. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, Columbia, 1972) Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 34A, 4089-4090. (University Microfilms No. 73-21,820)
- Saunders, J. O. L., and Wright, R. E. Good Teachers. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 1974, 58, 38-43.
- Silberman, M. L. Behavioral Expression of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Elementary School Students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 402-407.
- Stiles, W. B. Verbal Response Modes and Dimensions of Interpersonal Roles: A Method of Discourse Analysis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36, 693-703.
- Sweeting, L. M., Willower, D. J., and Helsel, A. R. Teacher-Pupil Relationships Black Students' Perceptions of Actual and Ideal Teacher/Pupil Control Behavior and Attitudes Toward Teachers and School. Urban Education, 1978, 13, 71-81.
- Tables of the Cumulative Binomial Probability Distribution. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- Thelen, H. A. Classroom Grouping for Teachability. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.
- Tyler, L. L. The Concept of an Ideal Teacher-student Relationship. Journal of Educational Research, 1964, 58, 112-117.
- Venzor, E., Gillis, J. S., and Beal, D. G. Preference for Counselor Response Styles. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 538-542.
- Wilson, S. You Can Talk to the Teacher: Student-Teacher Relations in an Alternative High School. Teachers College Record, 1976, 78, 77-100.

- Wish, M., Deutsch, M., and Kaplan, S. J. Perceived Dimensions of Interpersonal Relations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 33, 409-420.
- Zimmer, J. M., and Anderson, S. Dimensions of Positive Regard and Empathy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 417-426.
- Zimmer, J. M., and Park, P. Factor Analysis of Counselor Communications. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 198-203.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

PARENT CONSENT FORM

Dear Parents,

I would like your permission for your son/daughter to participate in a research project to try to find ways to improve student-teacher relationships in the classroom. I am a graduate student at the University of Tennessee, and this project is being carried out in connection with my doctoral program in Education. This project has been approved by the Knox County school system.

Students will be asked about two teachers with whom they have had good relationships. The students will be shown a videotape showing demonstrations of seven different communication skills which are commonly used by teachers to help the students in reporting how often the teachers used these skills. The students will not be asked to name the teachers, nor will they be asked to put their own names on their response forms. Your child's classroom teachers will not be involved in any way, and participation will not affect the students' grades or school standing. Students may withdraw from participation at any time without being penalized.

If you have questions or would like additional information, please contact Dr. William A. Poppen, Department of Educational Psychology and Guidance, University of Tennessee, at 974-5131.

I would greatly appreciate your cooperation by allowing your son/daughter to participate in this project so that we can gain information which might be helpful in improving learning conditions for middle school students.

Judy Boser

William A. Poppen,
Major Professor

_____ has my permission to
participate in the research project concerning teacher verbal
response roles at Farragut Middle School on_____.

Date_____ Parent or Guardian_____

APPENDIX B

SOURCES OF DIALOGUES

Feelings, Dialogue A: Ginott (1969, p. 66)

Thoughts, Dialogue B: Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966, p. 75)

Motives, Dialogue C: Individual Psychology A Demonstration with a Parent, a Teacher, and a Child (1969).

Behavior, Dialogue D: Glasser (1974), p. 8)

Encounter/Encouragement, Dialogue E: Ginott (1972, p. 126)

Confrontation, Dialogue F: Gordon (1974, pp. 146-147)

APPENDIX C

ROLE DEFINITIONS

- I. The teacher responds in terms of his thoughts or feelings about things other than the student or his behavior.

Sharing: The teacher states his personal ideas, opinions, experiences, or feelings (about things other than the student or his behavior) with the student without trying to impose them on the student.

- II. The teacher responds objectively in terms of the student's feelings, thoughts, motives, or behavior. (The teacher does not verbally express approval or disapproval.)

Feelings: The teacher briefly reflects his perception of the student's feelings without evaluation, letting the student know that he understands what the student is feeling and accepts those feelings.

Thoughts: The teacher uses clarifying responses which call for further details or explanation of the student's ideas, showing that the teacher listened to the student when he expressed his ideas. The teacher does not express his judgment about the ideas.

Motives: The teacher makes guesses about the student's motives underlying the student's present or past behavior without judging the motives, demonstrating to the student that the teacher is aware of his purposes.

Behavior: The teacher, from an objective viewpoint, asks the student to identify what the student is doing, focusing attention on the behavior itself and on the student's acceptance of responsibility for his behavior by acknowledging it.

- III. The teacher responds in terms of his own feelings about the student or his behavior.

Encounter/Encouragement: The teacher expresses liking for the student unrelated to his behavior,

confidence in the student's ability or liking for him under adverse conditions, such as when the student fails. The teacher is expressing positive personal sentiments about the student.

Confrontation: The teacher states his personal negative feelings arising from the student's behavior.

APPENDIX D

VIDEOTAPE SCRIPT

(Introduction)

Students and teachers spend a lot of time together. Sometimes they get along well together--other times they don't. The way a teacher talks to his or her students is one factor influencing their relationship. Teachers don't really know how their behavior affects their students, only the students can answer that.

You are about to see some different ways in which teachers respond verbally to their students. After each different scene you will have time to record your response to that particular teacher response role.

(TAPE A)

Sometimes a teacher is sensitive to the student's feelings underlying what the student says. He not only lets the student know that he understands the student's feelings but also makes the student more aware of exactly what his feelings are.

Student: I missed out on that job I was telling you about.

Teacher: You really wanted this job, didn't you?

Student: I sure did.

Teacher: And you were so well equipped for it, too.

Student: Yeah! A lot of good that did me.

Teacher: What a disappointment.

Student: It sure is.

Teacher: Looking forward to a job and having it slip away just when you need it is tough.

Student: Yeah! I know.

It's not the end of the world. I'll find another job.

Now you will have time to mark your response to scene A.

Please be sure that you record your response for A.

(TAPE B)

Listening carefully to a student's ideas may be shown either through restating the student's ideas, which lets the student know that he is understood by the teacher, or by asking questions that bring out details and help the student state his ideas more clearly.

Student: Some day I'd like to join the Peace Corps.

Teacher: What are some good things about that, Clara?

Student: Oh, the chance to be of some help to others excites me, and going to faraway places does too.

Teacher: Of the two, which one would you put first?

Student: I guess the faraway places part.

Teacher: Are you glad that that one is first?

Student: No, I guess people would respect me more if the helping part was first.

Teacher: I see.

Now mark your response for B.

(TAPE C)

In the next instance, the teacher tries to help the student recognize his motives so that the student understands the purpose of what he does at certain times.

Teacher: I hear you are having some trouble with the librarian. Why do you disobey her?

Student: Oh, I don't know. I guess because she's so bossy or doesn't like me.

Teacher: May I tell you what I think?

Student: I guess so.

Teacher: Could it be that you want to keep the librarian busy with you, or to get her to pay more attention to you? It's a good and effective way of getting her attention, isn't it?

Student: Oh, I suppose. (Smiles, to indicate that the student agrees)

Teacher: I think maybe it is.

Student: Well, maybe. (Still smiling)

Mark your response for this scene for C.

(TAPE D)

Asking questions about what a student is doing can focus attention on the behavior itself. This, in turn, may help the student develop a more accurate picture of his behavior, as is shown in this scene.

Teacher: What did you do, Tom?

Student: What?

Teacher: What did you do, Tom?

Student: Nothing

Teacher: Please, Tom, I just asked you what you did.
Tell me.

Student: Well, this is my place in line, and they won't
let me in.

Teacher: What did you do, Tom?

Student: It's my place, so I pushed my way in.

Mark your response for scene D.

(TAPE E)

At times teachers encourage the student by letting him
know that they respect and value the student as a person.

(Student is finishing helping the teacher rearrange the
books in the class library)

Teacher: The books are all in order now. It'll be easy
for the students to find any book they want.
It was a difficult job. But you did it. Thank
you.

This was scene E. Now mark your response.

(TAPE F)

When the teacher is upset, the teacher may confront
the student to let him know that the teacher would like
things changed.

(Teacher talks privately with student outside the classroom)

Teacher: Allen, your being late to class is causing me a
problem. When you come in late I have to stop
whatever I'm doing. It's distracting to me, and
I'm frustrated.

Student: Yeah, well, I've had a lot to do lately and some-
times I just can't get here on time.

Teacher: That's all well and good, but I just can't go on ignoring it. I just can't continue to be interrupted.

Student: I didn't think it would be such a problem. I'll try to sort of slip in quietly after this.

Teacher: I just want you here on time from now on.

Mark your response to scene F now.

(TAPE G)

Teachers may talk about themselves, sharing their ideas, opinions, experiences, or feelings about things other than the student or his behavior with the student without attempting to impose their standards or expectations on the student.

(Students are finishing an essay on capital punishment)

Teacher: Please turn in your papers on capital punishment before you leave today.

(Student brings his paper to teacher's desk)

Student: We're writing what we think about capital punishment, but I was wondering what you think about it?

Teacher: My thought about capital punishment is that in most situations you really don't solve the problem by killing another person.

Student: So you think it should be changed?

Teacher: Well, that's what I think about it, but I know some people feel pretty strongly in the other direction. I guess I'd want to be pretty sure that I was right before I tried to change things.

Student: Yeah, I see what you mean.

Mark your response to scene G.

APPENDIX E

STUDENT RESPONSE FORM

____ Male
____ Female

STUDENT-TEACHER RELATIONSHIPS

Describe in a brief paragraph the teacher you have had in grades 7-8 with whom you feel you have had the best or most nearly ideal student-teacher relationship. This type of relationship would be the one in which you got along well with the teacher and were most satisfied with the way in which you got along.

Do not identify the teacher by name.

OVERALL RATING

How would you rate the quality of the relationship? Circle the number that best describes the relationship as you see it. Circling the number 1 would indicate that the relationship was nearly ideal; circling the number 7 would indicate that the relationship was very poor or unpleasant for you. The numbers between 1 and 7 represent varying degrees of pleasantness-unpleasantness, with 4 meaning that the relationship was neither pleasant nor unpleasant.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Nearly						Very
Ideal						Poor

VIDEOTAPE

You will be seeing a series of conversations between teachers and students. After seeing each scene, indicate how often the teacher you have described talked with you in this manner by circling one of the following:

- 1 Always
- 2 Often
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Seldom
- 5 Never

Do not start until the first conversation has been demonstrated.

Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	
1	2	3	4	5	Scene A. Student's feelings
1	2	3	4	5	Scene B. Student's thoughts
1	2	3	4	5	Scene C. Student's motives
1	2	3	4	5	Scene D. Student's behavior
1	2	3	4	5	Scene E. Teacher's positive feelings
1	2	3	4	5	Scene F. Teacher's negative feelings
1	2	3	4	5	Scene G. Teacher's ideas

RANKING

Rank the roles according to the frequency with which the teacher used them. For example, place a "1" in the blank beside the role that the teacher used most; then place a "2" beside the role used most often of the six remaining roles. Continue until you have ranked all seven roles. Do not mark any two roles with the same number.

- ____ Scene A. Student's feelings
- ____ Scene B. Student's thoughts
- ____ Scene C. Student's motives
- ____ Scene D. Student's behavior
- ____ Scene E. Teacher's positive feelings
- ____ Scene F. Teacher's negative feelings
- ____ Scene G. Teacher's ideas, experiences, or opinions

In a brief paragraph, describe another teacher you have had in grades 7-8 with whom you feel you have also had a very good or nearly ideal student-teacher relationship.

Do not identify the teacher by name.

OVERALL RATING

Rate the overall quality of the relationship in the same manner as you did for the first teacher you described. Remember that circling the number 1 indicates a very good or nearly ideal relationship, 7 indicates a very poor or unpleasant relationship, and 4 means that the relationship was neither pleasant nor unpleasant.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Nearly						Very
Ideal						Poor

VIDEOTAPE

You will be seeing a series of conversations between teachers and students. After seeing each scene, indicate how often the teacher you have described talked with you in this manner by circling one of the following:

- 1 Always
- 2 Often
- 3 Sometimes
- 4 Seldom
- 5 Never

Do not start until the first conversation has been demonstrated.

Always	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	
1	2	3	4	5	Scene A. Student's feelings
1	2	3	4	5	Scene B. Student's thoughts
1	2	3	4	5	Scene C. Student's motives
1	2	3	4	5	Scene D. Student's behavior
1	2	3	4	5	Scene E. Teacher's positive feelings
1	2	3	4	5	Scene F. Teacher's negative feelings
1	2	3	4	5	Scene G. Teacher's ideas
-	-	-	-	-	- - - - -

RANKING

Rank the roles according to the frequency with which the teacher used them. For example, place a "1" in the blank beside the role that the teacher used most; then place a "2" beside the role used most often of the six remaining roles. Continue until you have ranked all seven roles. Do not mark any two roles with the same number.

- ____ Scene A. Student's feelings
- ____ Scene B. Student's thoughts
- ____ Scene C. Student's motives
- ____ Scene D. Student's behavior
- ____ Scene E. Teacher's positive feelings
- ____ Scene F. Teacher's negative feelings
- ____ Scene G. Teacher's ideas, experiences, or opinions

APPENDIX F

USABLE STUDENT RESPONSES

Student ID Number	Primary Response Role Teacher A	Primary Response Role Teacher B
1B002	Feelings	Feelings
1B003	Sharing	Confrontation
1B004	Encounter/Encouragement	Sharing
1B005	Encounter/Encouragement	Encounter/Encouragement
1B006	Sharing	Sharing
1B007	Confrontation	Confrontation
1B008	Sharing	Sharing
1B011	Confrontation	Confrontation
1B013	Motives	Feelings
2B003	Feelings	Thoughts
2B004	Encounter/Encouragement	Sharing
2B005	Encounter/Encouragement	Sharing
2B006	Encounter/Encouragement	Confrontation
2B007	Confrontation	Encounter/Encouragement
2B008	Feelings	Sharing
2B009	Encounter/Encouragement	Encounter/Encouragement
2B010	Sharing	Sharing
2B011	Thoughts	Sharing
2B012	Feelings	Motives
2B013	Motives	Feelings
2B014	Sharing	Sharing
2B015	Feelings	Sharing
2B016	Feelings	Feelings
2B017	Sharing	Feelings
2B018	Sharing	Behavior
2B019	Sharing	Thoughts
2B020	Sharing	Thoughts
2B021	Sharing	Sharing
2B022	Encounter/Encouragement	Encounter/Encouragement
3A001	Sharing	Feelings
3A002	Sharing	Sharing
3A003	Sharing	Behavior
3A004	Sharing	Encounter/Encouragement
3A005	Sharing	Sharing
3A006	Sharing	Feelings
3A007	Sharing	Sharing
3A008	Sharing	Sharing
3A011	Sharing	Sharing
3A012	Sharing	Sharing
3A013	Encounter/Encouragement	Encounter/Encouragement
3A014	Sharing	Sharing

Student ID Number	Primary Response Role Teacher A	Primary Response Role Teacher B
3A015	Sharing	Encounter/Encouragement
3A016	Behavior	Sharing
3A017	Confrontation	Feelings
3A018	Encounter/Encouragement	Motives
4A001	Motives	Motives
4A002	Confrontation	Confrontation
4A003	Thoughts	Feelings
4A004	Sharing	Confrontation
4A005	Feelings	Feelings
4A006	Feelings	Feelings
4A007	Encounter/Encouragement	Motives
4A008	Sharing	Encounter/Encouragement
4A009	Sharing	Sharing
4A010	Encounter/Encouragement	Encounter/Encouragement
4A012	Feelings	Sharing
4A013	Encounter/Encouragement	Encounter/Encouragement
4A014	Behavior	Sharing
4A015	Motives	Thoughts
4A016	Behavior	Sharing
4A017	Confrontation	Confrontation
4A018	Sharing	Encounter/Encouragement
4A019	Motives	Encounter/Encouragement
4A020	Motives	Feelings
4A021	Sharing	Encounter/Encouragement
4A023	Sharing	Sharing
4A024	Behavior	Thoughts
5B001	Sharing	Sharing
5B002	Sharing	Thoughts
5B003	Confrontation	Encounter/Encouragement
5B005	Behavior	Sharing
5B006	Feelings	Encounter/Encouragement
5B007	Feelings	Sharing
5B008	Confrontation	Encounter/Encouragement
5B009	Sharing	Sharing
5B010	Sharing	Confrontation
5B011	Confrontation	Feelings
5B012	Sharing	Thoughts
5B013	Sharing	Confrontation
5B014	Encounter/Encouragement	Sharing
5B015	Sharing	Behavior
5B016	Encounter/Encouragement	Thoughts
5B017	Feelings	Sharing
5B019	Encounter/Encouragement	Encounter/Encouragement
5B020	Encounter/Encouragement	Feelings
5B021	Encounter/Encouragement	Confrontation
5B022	Sharing	Sharing
5B023	Feelings	Sharing
5B024	Sharing	Encounter/Encouragement
5B025	Sharing	Sharing

VITA

Judith Ann Bastian Boser was born in Evansville, Indiana, on March, 22, 1938. She attended the public schools in that city, graduating from Central High school in June 1955. She received a Bachelor of Science degree in Education with majors in Physical Education and English in June of 1959 from Indiana State University, Terre Haute. While employed as a physical education teacher, she completed the requirements for the Master of Science degree in Education with a major in Guidance at Butler University, Indianapolis, in August of 1962.

Mrs. Boser was employed as a counselor and physical educator in the public schools of Indiana and Tennessee for a total of ten years. She enrolled in the Graduate School at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in September of 1974. She received a Master of Science degree in Education with a major in Educational Psychology in March of 1978 and the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Education in December of 1981.