

1999

The effect of teacher immediacy, affinity -seeking, and misbehaviors on instructional outcomes.

Katherine S. Thweatt

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Thweatt, Katherine S., "The effect of teacher immediacy, affinity -seeking, and misbehaviors on instructional outcomes." (1999). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 9901.
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/9901>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

**The Effect of Teacher Immediacy, Affinity-Seeking, and Misbehaviors on
Instructional Outcomes**

Katherine S. Thweatt

**Dissertation Submitted to the College of Human Resources and Education at West
Virginia University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of**

**Education
in
Curriculum and Instruction**

**Perry Phillips, Ed.D. Chair
James C. McCroskey, Ph.D.
Brian R. Patterson, Ph.D.
Ardeth Deay, Ed.D.
Warren DiBiase, Ed.D.**

Department of Educational Theory and Practice

**Morgantown, West Virginia
1999**

**Keywords: Immediacy, Affinity-Seeking, Misbehaviors, Credibility, Affective
Learning**

UMI Number: 3322879

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3322879
Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Abstract

The Effect of Teacher Immediacy, Affinity-Seeking and Misbehaviors on Instructional Outcomes

Katherine S. Thweatt

The purpose of this study was to investigate the mediating effect of teacher immediacy and affinity-seeking on misbehaviors and credibility and affective learning. Participants were undergraduate students enrolled in large-lecture courses at a large mid-Atlantic university. Teacher immediacy, affinity-seeking, and misbehaviors were manipulated in scenarios. Participants were exposed to one scenario and asked to complete credibility and affective learning measures in relation to the teacher in the scenario. The results of the study revealed that significant main effects were present for teacher immediacy, affinity-seeking, and misbehaviors. The significance level was set at .05. While significant interaction effects were present, the variance accounted for by these interactions was less than three percent in all cases. Variance accounted for in teacher caring by immediacy and affinity-seeking was much higher than variance accounted for in trustworthiness and competence. However, teacher misbehaviors accounted for more variance in teacher competence. Finally, immediacy and affinity-seeking created more variance in the affective learning variables than did teacher misbehaviors. The results of this study indicate students perceive teachers more positively when teachers are high in both immediacy and affinity-seeking thus leading to the conclusion that studying the main effects of these variables is more important than studying the interactions.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Perry Phillips for his guidance and support during my tenure as a doctoral student. Your willingness to allow me to make choices that ensured satisfaction with my degree will not be forgotten. You are a wonderful man and a delight to be around.

Also, James C. McCroskey will not be forgotten. His patience and kindness that began in my master's program have made my years at West Virginia University so pleasurable that leaving here saddens me. Without Jim, I could never have come so far and probably would not have wanted to. Jim, you are an inspiration and I will always cherish the moments that I sat in your office watching you get excited about the results of my data. You have done so much for me and never asked anything in return. Your time and effort will not fall by the wayside. The example you have set *will* be followed.

Brian R. Patterson has also made my time at WVU a time of enjoyment. Not only did he provide intellectual stimulation, but he's just "down right" fun! He always listened to me whether it was about school or life and I always felt better afterwards. Brian provided me with a foundation for thinking in different ways that will always be part of my teaching philosophy. I learned from him that we don't always have to know the answer and that it is okay to live with the questions. One last thing to thank Brian for is the sense of being welcome in his home. Even when my stress levels were at there highest, a trip to Brian's house and one of his incredible meals made everything that I was experiencing worth while. Brian loves his students and that love will be passed along to my own students.

Ardeth Deay and Warren DiBiase are two other individuals who deserve my appreciation. Their genuine interest and honest feedback served to strengthen my belief in the worthiness of instructional research. Dr. Deay and Dr. DiBiase epitomize supportiveness and enthusiasm. The kind and gentle nature with which these two individuals handle their students has also become a part of my teaching philosophy and will remain with me for life whether in the educational setting or the interpersonal setting.

Another individual who has made my life easier at WVU is Virginia Richmond. She makes it her job to look after those of us who are far away from home or even not so far. Her willingness to voice her appreciation of the impact of master's and doctoral students on the life of the department enables tired graduate assistants to see that their efforts do not go unnoticed. She understands the importance of positive feedback and has the ability to assess weak areas and offer guidance to strengthen those areas without hurting feelings. What I will always remember about VA is her responsive nature and ability to deal with any personality. If she sensed uncertainty or trepidation in a student then she worked extremely hard to create an environment where doubt and fear were completely allayed. Her efforts will not be forgotten.

Three other individuals that simply made my life gratifying at WVU were my fellow doctoral students, Patty, Tim, and Mary. Patty loved me like a sister and took me under her wing when I entered the doctoral program. Although she was two years ahead of me, she always made time for me. Patty taught me things about life and relationships that no one else could have. She is the most loving and caring individual that I have ever

known and I am fortunate to have known her and still have her in my life. Like Patty, Tim cared for me too! Between the two of them I felt like they chose me to be their friend. I will never forget my surprise when Tim walked up to me and said, "I think we would be good study partners." He didn't know it or plan it, but he made me feel special and boy was he surprised when he got a demanding friend out of the deal. Tim will always be part of my life. The last individual, Mary, will always be in my heart. She allowed me to be a part of her life even when it was not easy for her. Her understanding of my need to care and letting me care has allowed me to grow as a person. Not only has she been there for me interpersonally, but she has been supportive and interested in the completion of my degree. Together, we discussed our work and helped each other through the work. In finishing my dissertation, she has been a "partner in crime." Leaving her only adds to my regret that my time at WVU has come to an end.

Finally, I must acknowledge my mother, father, and brother. You suffered through some hard times with me and you have delighted in the good times. I know that my bad times were also bad for you and I thank you for being patient and stubborn enough to stay with me until better times arrived. Your unconditional love is not taken for granted, but relished. Without the three of you, I would not be where I am today. I look forward to all of the good times that we have ahead of us. Thank you for being my family and my friends.

Table of Contents

Chapter One	
Introduction and Literature Review	Pg. 1
Immediacy.....	Pg. 2
Affinity-Seeking.....	Pg. 4
Teacher Misbehaviors	Pg. 8
Credibility.....	Pg. 11
Rationale.....	Pg. 12
Hypotheses and Research Questions.....	Pg. 16
Chapter Two	
Methodology	Pg. 19
Participants and Measures.....	Pg. 20
Manipulation Checks.....	Pg. 22
Chapter Three	
Results	Pg. 24
Manipulation Checks.....	Pg. 24
Study One: Credibility	Pg. 27
Study One: Affective Learning	Pg. 30
Study Two: Credibility.....	Pg. 34
Study Two: Affective Learning.....	Pg. 37
Chapter Four	
Discussion	Pg. 41
Credibility.....	Pg. 45
Affective Learning	Pg. 47
Conclusions	Pg. 49
Implications.....	Pg. 50
Future Directions.....	Pg. 51
Limitations	Pg. 52
References	Pg. 53
Appendix A: Affinity-Seeking Strategies	Pg. 57
Appendix B: Manipulations	Pg. 61
Appendix C: Instruments	Pg. 69
Appendix D: Manipulation Checks.....	Pg. 71
Tables	Pg. 73

The Effect of Teacher Immediacy, Affinity-Seeking, and Misbehaviors on Instructional
Outcomes

Chapter One

Introduction and Review of Literature

Overall, it would seem that teacher misbehaviors have an impact in the classroom. As indicated by Dolin (1995) misbehaviors may not be frequent, but when they do occur there is an effect. Identifying any problem in the classroom environment is a commendable task. After identifying a problem, the task is to find a solution. The goal of this manuscript is to investigate at least two possible solutions to overcoming teacher misbehaviors. Extant research demonstrates that immediacy has a powerful impact in the classroom and that affinity-seeking behaviors have similar effects. However, the impact of the interaction of teacher affinity-seeking behaviors and teacher misbehaviors has not been investigated. This researcher intends to extend previous work on immediacy and teacher misbehaviors and initiate an investigation of the combined effects of perceived teacher immediacy, perceived teacher affinity-seeking behaviors, and perceived teacher misbehaviors in relation to student affective learning and student perceived teacher credibility.

Affective learning is learning that focuses on students' attitudes toward the teacher and subject content. The concept of affective learning also includes the behaviors of a student toward a particular subject matter after the influence to learn is no longer present. The nature of this study did not allow for an investigation of students' behavioral intentions or affect toward subject matter. Affect toward the teacher, leading to affective learning, is the primary interest. Both immediacy and affinity-seeking

behaviors have been shown to positively impact affective learning. Conversely, by definition, teacher misbehaviors negatively impact any type of learning. The review of literature focuses on teacher immediacy, teacher affinity-seeking behaviors, and teacher misbehaviors. Another focus of the literature review is credibility. Credibility has been shown to have a positive impact on learning, but little research exist that offers advice to teachers on raising their level of perceived credibility. A rationale for examining the interaction of these variables and credibility as an outcome variable is presented along with hypotheses and research questions designed for this study.

Immediacy

According to Mehrabian (1969), “Immediacy refers to communication behaviors that enhance closeness to and nonverbal interaction with another.” Another definition of immediacy is “communication that enhances physical or psychological closeness.” Immediacy has been conceptualized as both verbal and nonverbal communication. Nonverbal immediacy cues include eye contact, gestures, relaxed body position, directing body position toward students, smiling, vocal expressiveness, movement, and proximity (Mehrabian, 1969). Verbal cues that are related to immediacy include using words that involve the sender and the receiver, such as “we” (Mehrabian, 1969). Words that increase the solidarity between the sender and receiver are seen as more immediate as well. Other aspects of verbal immediacy are the use of humor and calling students by name (Frymier, 1993).

A clear and simple definition of immediacy is “behaviors that reduce the distance between people” (Andersen, 1978). Reducing distance between people can be psychological as well as physical (Mehrabian, 1969). Andersen (1978) hypothesized that

immediate behavior increases student affect, behavioral commitment, and cognitive learning. The results of her research indicated that 20% of the variance in students' affect toward the course content was predicted by immediacy. Immediacy also accounted for 18% of variance in student behavioral commitment. However, Andersen's research did not indicate that immediacy alone predicts variance in cognitive learning. The results showed that perceived solidarity in the classroom along with immediacy explained 4% of the variance in cognitive learning. Later research, as indicated below, does show that immediacy predicts cognitive learning.

Research has revealed a number of benefits to immediate behavior in the classroom. Thomas, Richmond, and McCroskey (1994) found that teachers who engaged in immediate behaviors increased their communication competence and it is expected that this will result in more student affective and cognitive learning. Competent communicators can be described as having assertiveness and responsiveness skills (Richmond, & McCroskey, 1992). Thomas et al. stated, "...it is theoretically justified to teach pre-service and in-service teachers to engage in immediate behaviors which will increase their basic communication competence and can be expected to result in more student affective and cognitive learning" (p. 1).

Immediacy has also been shown to impact cognitive learning in students, although this was not found in Andersen's (1978) original work investigating immediacy in the instructional setting. Richmond, Gorham, and McCroskey (1987) developed a cognitive learning loss scale that determined what the student perceived he/she could learn in a particular class with an ideal instructor and what he/she actually learned. Students were placed in learning level categories that were created by the authors. The classifications,

based on a 0-9 scale, were as follows: Low = 0-3, Moderate = 4-6, and High = 7-9. The students were then asked to complete a scale that measured perceived immediacy of teachers from their previous semester in school. Scores for immediacy were compared to learning. The results indicated that there is a nonlinear relationship between cognitive learning and immediacy. Moderately immediate behaviors created more cognitive learning, but immediacy increased beyond moderate levels may have little impact (Richmond et al., 1987).

Immediacy has been shown to impact a number of variables that affect students in the classroom. Students have been shown to have more affect for teachers high in immediacy, consequently impacting affective learning (Andersen, 1979; Kearney, Plax, & Wendt-Wasco, 1985; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986; Richmond, McCroskey, Plax, & Kearney, 1986). Research also indicates that students are unable to differentiate prosocial from antisocial Behavior Alteration Techniques when used by more immediate teachers (Kearney, Plax, and Burroughs, 1991).

Affinity-Seeking

The concept of affinity-seeking behaviors was originally conceptualized by McCroskey and Wheelless (1976). In an effort to determine the knowledge and skills that individuals must possess to increase affinity from others, these researchers provided seven categories on which people could report: control physical appearance, increase positive self-disclosure, stress areas of positive similarity, provide positive reinforcement, express cooperation, comply with the other person's wishes, and fulfill the other person's needs.

In an effort to continue this line of research, Bell and Daly (1984) developed a typology of affinity-seeking behaviors that could be used in a variety of communication contexts. The typology was developed by asking small groups to create a list of behaviors in which people can engage or things people can say to get others to like them. In creating this typology, the researchers took care to ensure that each strategy within the typology was communicative in nature. Bell and Daly (1984) state, “[the] category had to refer to messages and or alterations of a person’s self-presentation for the purpose of achieving liking of another” (p. 96). Their research resulted in a typology consisting of 25 affinity-seeking strategies. (see Appendix 1)

Although the teacher student relationship is more likely thought of as a professional relationship, the amount of time that teachers and students spend together leads to a relationship that is more interpersonal in nature. As in any interpersonal relationship, the teacher-student relationship will benefit if affinity is enhanced. As the semester progresses, the personalities of the teacher and the students emerge. It seems to make sense that if the student is attracted to the teacher’s personality or likes the teacher, then the student will fare better in the classroom. A number of research studies have investigated the frequency of affinity-seeking usage by teachers at various education levels.

McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) investigated the extent of affinity-seeking strategy usage and the frequency of use of *each* affinity-seeking strategy in elementary and secondary schools. The extent of usage was measured by adapting Bell and Daly’s (1984) original typology to the teacher-student relationship context. To measure the extent to which teachers use each strategy, teachers were asked to circle “yes” or “no” in

relation to whether they had observed the strategy being used. Following this, frequency of use was measured by asking teachers to indicate how often they had observed other teachers using each strategy. Frequency of use was measured on the following scale: rarely = 1; occasionally = 2; often = 3; very often = 4. If teachers circled “no” in response to observing the use of a strategy, the frequency of use was set at zero.

The nature of the scale permitted the researchers to rank affinity-seeking usage into high and low frequency categories. High usage was defined as 2.5 or higher and low usage was defined as lower than 1.5. Strategies that were reported to be highly used were physical attractiveness, sensitivity, elicit other’s disclosure, and listening. In addition, each of these strategies was perceived as being used by over 90 percent of the respondents. Strategies reported as low use were inclusion of other, self-inclusion, reward association, concede control, influence perceptions of closeness, similarity, openness, present interesting self, and supportiveness.

To further investigate the use of affinity-seeking strategies across education levels, McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) compared the results of their data to the data of Bell and Daly (1984). According to McCroskey and McCroskey, “The high rank-order correlation obtained suggests the possibility that a general hierarchy of strategy use may exist across communicators and communication contexts” (p. 165). It should be noted that Bell and Daly’s study was conducted in reference to a social setting and the McCroskey and McCroskey study in the task context. In the former study, concede control, assume equality, and inclusion of other were more likely to be used than in the latter study. The use of these three strategies in the task setting may function to reduce the status of the teacher and would not be appropriate. Dynamism, however, was

reported to be used more in the teacher-student context. This result seems natural given that the teacher must maintain the attention of the students and doing so by conceding control, assuming equality, and inclusion of other could be detrimental in this context.

Another study related to the frequency of affinity-seeking usage asked teachers to create lists of strategies that they use to increase student affinity for themselves and for their subject matter. This study also examined the proportional use of various affinity-seeking strategies across grade levels (Gorham, Kelley, and McCroskey, 1989). As in the McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) study, this study compared the use of affinity-seeking strategies to not only the Bell and Daly (1984) study, but also to McCroskey and McCroskey. This comparison indicated that the Bell and Daly typology could be used successfully to classify teacher-generated affinity-seeking strategies.

Gorham, Kelley, and McCroskey (1989) asked teachers the following questions: “how difficult is it for you to get the students in your class to like you as a teacher?” and “how difficult is it for you to get the students to like the subject matter you teach?” Each teacher was asked to provide at least five examples of their attempts to get students to like them and the subject matter being taught.

The results of this research indicated that four strategies tended to be used more as the grade level increased: trustworthiness, sensitivity, self-inclusion, and elicit disclosures. The strategies that were reported to be used less as grade level rose were facilitate enjoyment, nonverbal immediacy, and self-concept confirmation. In relation to the difficulty for teachers to get students to like them and the subject matter, teachers reported overall that it is easier to get students to like them than the subject matter. However, satisfaction in gaining personal affinity diminished as grade level increased.

While the Bell and Daly (1984), McCroskey and McCroskey (1986), and Gorham, Kelly and McCroskey (1989) studies established that affinity-seeking techniques are used in the classroom, the effects of this usage were not established. Subsequent studies have indicated that affinity-seeking usage in the classroom results in effects similar to immediacy. Several variables that have been measured in relation to both immediacy and affinity-seeking techniques are motivation, affective learning, and cognitive learning. These findings are discussed in the rationale.

Teacher Misbehaviors

The original research on teacher misbehaviors conceptualized teacher misbehaviors as “those behaviors that interfere with instruction and thus, learning” (Kearney, Plax, Hays, and Ivey, 1991). Research prior to Kearney et al. (1991) focused on student misbehaviors that interfered with instruction and learning. The research conducted by Kearney et al. was interested solely in teacher misbehaviors. The research involved a two-part study where Kearney et al. posed several research questions. Study one addressed the following question: What do college teachers say and do that students perceive as misbehaviors? Study two addressed two research questions: How frequently do students report their college teachers engaging in each misbehavior type? and What meaningful factor structure underlies misbehavior categories?

The purpose of study one was to inductively determine what students perceive as teacher misbehaviors. College students were asked to complete an open-ended questionnaire recalling “specific instances where teachers had said or done something that had irritated, demotivated, or substantially distracted them in an aversive way during a course” (Kearney et al., 1991). Students were given examples of misbehaviors (i.e.

“Not showing up for class”) to stimulate recall. Students generated 1762 teacher misbehavior descriptions, an average of 6.9 per student. These misbehaviors were coded (Alpha = .91) and categorized. After classification was completed, a 28-item measure of teacher misbehaviors was compiled.

Study two was conducted to validate the categories of teacher misbehaviors obtained in study one and to determine if a meaningful factor structure existed in the 28 categories. Subjects were asked to complete the 28-item measure assessing misbehaviors of the teacher in the class preceding the class in which the student was currently present. Students were asked to rate on a 0-4 scale “how frequently your teacher in that class exhibits the same or similar behaviors” (Kearney et al., 1991) with 0 = never and 4 = very often. Results indicated that while not all teachers engaged in all misbehaviors, all misbehaviors were present across classrooms.

Factor analysis revealed three categories of misbehaviors. These were labeled incompetence, offensiveness, and indolence. Incompetence included nine items: confusion/unclear lectures, apathetic to students, unfair testing, boring lectures, information overload, does not know subject matter, foreign or regional accents, inappropriate volume, and bad grammar/spelling. Offensiveness included six items: Sarcasm/put-downs, verbally abusive, unreasonable/arbitrary rules, sexual harassment, negative personality, and shows favoritism/prejudice. Six misbehavior categories were included in a third category and labeled indolence: Absent, tardy, unprepared/disorganized, deviates from syllabus, late returning work, and information underload.

Other research in the area of teacher misbehaviors utilized the measurement developed by Kearney et al. (1991) with only minor changes. Dolin (1995), in questioning the face validity of the misbehavior items, split several of the original 28 items so that there were six additional items. One original item, “lets class out early, rushes material to get done early,” was split to make two categories. Frymier (1994) explains that if a teacher completes his/her material before it is time to dismiss class and detains the class anyway, then nonimmediacy may be created and would probably negatively impact state motivation. In other words, dismissing a class early is not always a misbehavior.

The purpose of Dolin’s (1995) research was to examine the relationship of teacher misbehaviors to cognitive learning, affective learning, and student resistance. The research also investigated trait-like communication variables as possible predictors of misbehaviors. The results of Dolin’s (1995) research indicate that teachers do not misbehave on a regular basis, but when they do the impact is significant. On a scale of 0-4, teachers were reported as misbehaving at an average of less than two. Although the frequency of misbehaviors may be minimal, it is the impact that is of great concern. Students reported that they believed they were learning less in the classroom with a teacher that is misbehaving. It was also found that students have less affective learning with teachers who misbehave. Dolin’s (1995) research indicates that students are less likely to engage in behaviors recommended in the classroom with an instructor that misbehaves. Students also indicated that the likelihood of taking additional courses in the same content area is diminished if a teacher is misbehaving. Another finding was that

teacher immediacy is inversely related to the amount of misbehavior. Dolin (1995) purports that misbehaviors are actually nonimmediate behaviors.

Other results of Dolin's (1995) research indicate that some trait-like communication variables impact teacher misbehaviors. Communication apprehension was shown to predict a higher likelihood of misbehaving. Students indicated that teachers who were tense misbehaved more and reported that teachers who were interesting were less likely to misbehave. Misbehavior was also predictable based on perceived teacher responsiveness. The more responsive a teacher is perceived to be, the less likely it is that the teacher will misbehave. The other dimension of the socio-communicative style, assertiveness, was shown to have a negative relationship to teacher misbehaviors, but the association is not strong.

Credibility

The impact of speaker credibility is a concept that has been scrutinized since the time of Aristotle. Aristotle referred to credibility as *ethos* and suggested that it consisted of three dimensions: intelligence, character, and good will. He believed that the three dimensions of credibility were perceptual sources of influence on a receiver. Andersen and Clevenger (1963) in a meta-analysis of *ethos* defined *ethos* as "the image held of a communicator at a given time by a receiver - either one person or a group" (p. 59). While this definition does not account for the dimensions of credibility, it is not dissimilar to Aristotle's belief that credibility influences the receiver. Overall, Andersen and Clevenger (1963) concluded, "the *ethos* of a source is in some way related to the impact of the message" (p. 78). McCroskey and Young (1981) in an analysis of *ethos* and credibility stated, "contemporary research generally has supported the proposition that

source credibility is a very important element in the communication process, whether the goal of the communication effort be persuasion or the generation of understanding” (p. 24). McCroskey, in subsequent studies, refers to the dimensions of credibility as competence, trustworthiness, and caring.

This generation of understanding is most relevant to the effects of credibility in the classroom. The goal of the teacher is to spark understanding in the minds of the students. Understanding would seem to be most related to affective learning, but the limited amount of research on credibility in the classroom has been related to recall which is best described as related to cognitive learning.

Rationale

Immediacy is an excellent predictor of affective learning (Thomas, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1994). It follows that immediacy can be a powerful tool in the classroom. In a study conducted by Thweatt and McCroskey (1998), it was found that immediacy significantly impacted all three dimensions of teacher credibility. Other research has indicated that teachers who are more immediate can use both prosocial and antisocial behavior alteration techniques (BATs) (Plax, Kearney, McCroskey & Richmond, 1986). Overall the research of Plax et al. (1986) suggest that immediacy is a more important predictor of affect than BAT use. This implies that affective learning is much more likely if immediacy is present in the classroom despite the compliance gaining techniques employed by the instructor.

Another study investigating BATs also lends support to the power of immediacy in the classroom. This study indicates that no difference was seen in the use of prosocial and antisocial BATs with an immediate teacher (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorensen,

1988). Antisocial BATs are those behavior alteration techniques that punish the student in some way. This indicates that students do not differentiate between anti-social and prosocial behaviors of an immediate teacher. This finding suggests they may also be insensitive to some misbehaviors of immediate teachers. This was demonstrated in a study conducted by Thweatt and McCroskey (1996). The results of this study indicated that students perceived teachers significantly more positively when the teacher was high in immediacy and misbehaved than when the teacher was not immediate and was not misbehaving.

Another area of research involving student resistance indicates that teacher use of immediacy is a strong predictor of student resistance strategy. Student resistance is defined as “either constructive or destructive oppositional behavior” (Kearney et al., 1991). Students choose different resistance strategies or behaviors based on who they feel created the specific problem. If the student feels that he/she created a problem then resistance strategies will more likely be constructive if the problem was perceived to be teacher owned the resistance strategy would likely be destructive. Results also indicated that students would be more likely to take ownership of a problem with a teacher high in immediacy. Kearney et al. (1991) stated, “a generalized nonverbal approach/avoidance orientation of immediacy serves to guide or frame students’ perception of any isolated and/or subsequent behavior” (p. 328). The implication of this statement is that immediacy can overcome most any behavior in the classroom, possibly even misbehaviors.

Although learning outcomes have not been tested in relation to the interaction of teacher affinity-seeking behaviors and teacher misbehaviors, research does show that

affinity-seeking behaviors in the classroom have similar effects to immediacy in the classroom. In a study conducted by Richmond (1990), it was found that affinity-seeking strategies are significantly related to motivation, affective learning, and cognitive learning. The design of this study allowed Richmond to compare the effects of affinity-seeking and immediacy behaviors to teachers' use of power/behavior alteration techniques (BATs). The results indicated that affinity-seeking techniques and immediacy created more variance in cognitive and affective learning than did power/BAT use. Roach (1991) conducted another study confirming the relationship between affinity seeking and cognitive and affective learning.

Affinity-seeking has also been found to impact student perceptions of teacher credibility (Frymier & Thompson, 1991). Credibility has a positive impact on learning, but as noted by Frymier and Thompson (1992), there is little research that offers advice that would help teachers increase their perceived credibility. In an endeavor to provide teachers with such advice, Frymier and Thompson (1991) investigated the effects of affinity-seeking behaviors on perceptions of teacher credibility. It was found that affinity-seeking behaviors were positively and significantly related to students' perceptions of teacher competence and character. Using a regression model, Frymier and Thompson (1991) found that affinity seeking behaviors, as a whole, accounted for 33 percent of the variance in perceptions of teacher character and 13 percent of the variance in perceptions of teacher competence.

Not only is credibility impacted by immediacy and affinity-seeking behaviors, it may have some of the same effects of immediacy and affinity-seeking in relation to affective learning. A series of studies reported in the 1970s clearly established the

importance of source credibility in the learning process (Wheless, 1971, 1974a, 1974b, 1975; Andersen, 1973; Dempsey, 1975). Wheless (1975) found that perceived competence of a source, along with four other variables, accounted for significant variance in immediate recall. Wheless (1975) found, in a regression model, competence along with four other variables accounted for 12% of the variance in immediate recall. When GPA was added to the model, an increase of 4% was observed in the variance accounted for in immediate recall. In another study conducted by Wheless (1974b), it was found that competence was the best predictor of selective exposure behavior. When the source was perceived to be competent, the likelihood of subsequent exposure to information was higher. From this conclusion it is viable to say that teachers who are more credible will produce higher affect for taking another class in the same content area, thus impacting affective learning.

In a carefully controlled experiment conducted in classroom conditions without students knowing they were in a research project, Andersen (1973) found that students exposed to other student's speeches learned substantially more from those presented by speakers they perceived as having higher credibility than they did from those they perceived as being less credible. From this research, it appears that teachers who are perceived to be more credible will produce more positive affect toward themselves and/or the content of the class and increase the likelihood a student will take another class in the same content area and/or with that teacher. It also indicates that the students' cognitive learning is related to their perceptions of their teachers' credibility--the higher the credibility, the higher the learning.

As noted previously, teacher immediacy and teacher affinity-seeking behaviors have a positive impact on teacher credibility while teacher misbehaviors have a negative impact. The impact of credibility on learning has been well established and knowledge related to variables increasing credibility should be sought. In addition, research related to the impact of affinity-seeking needs to be extended and research related to the impact of the interaction of affinity-seeking, immediacy, and misbehaviors on learner outcomes needs to be initiated. Finally, it has been established that misbehaviors have a negative impact in the classroom. Naturally, the best solution would be to eliminate teacher misbehaviors altogether. If misbehaviors cannot be eliminated then minimizing the effects would seem to be the best solution. If students do not perceive teachers as misbehaving then there cannot be a negative impact. Finally, evidence of the impact of affinity-seeking behaviors and the impact of the interaction of affinity-seeking behaviors, immediacy, and misbehaviors has not been established in an experimental design. Following this line of reasoning, several hypotheses are advanced and two research questions posed.

H1: Teachers who are immediate will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by being perceived as more credible than teachers who are not immediate.

H2: Teachers who engage in more affinity seeking strategies will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by being perceived as more credible than teachers who engage in less affinity seeking strategies.

H3: Teachers who do not engage in misbehaviors will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by being perceived as more credible than teachers who engage in misbehaviors.

H4: Teachers who engage in immediate behaviors will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by:

- A. More positive student evaluations of teachers' behaviors than teachers who are not immediate
- B. Students' affect toward the teacher in the scenario
- C. Students' affect toward enrollment with the teacher in the scenario

H5: Teachers who engage in more affinity seeking strategies will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by:

- A. More positive student evaluations of teachers' behaviors than teachers who engage in less affinity seeking strategies
- B. Students' affect toward the teacher in the scenario
- C. Students' affect toward enrollment with the teacher in the scenario

H6: Teachers who evidence misbehaviors will produce less positive outcomes as evidenced by:

- A. Less positive student evaluations of teachers' behaviors than teachers who do not evidence misbehaviors
- B. Students' affect toward the teacher in the scenario
- C. Students' affect toward enrollment with the teacher in the scenario

RQ1: Is there a significant interaction between teachers who engage in affinity-seeking behaviors, immediacy, and misbehaviors on student

evaluations of teachers' behaviors, students' affect toward the teacher in the scenario, and students' affect toward enrollment with the teacher in the scenario?

RQ2: Is there a significant interaction between teachers who engage in affinity-seeking behaviors, immediacy, and misbehaviors on perceived credibility?

Chapter 2

Methodology

This study was designed to investigate the relationship of teacher immediacy, teacher's use of affinity-seeking behavior, and teacher's misbehavior in the classroom with students' perceptions of teacher credibility, students' affect toward the teacher and his/her behavior, and students' desire to enroll in another class with a the teacher. The investigation was accomplished by the following procedures.

Design

In a 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design, subjects were exposed to one of eight scenarios. Teacher immediacy, teacher affinity-seeking behaviors, and teacher misbehaviors were manipulated in all eight scenarios. After reading a scenario, students were asked to complete scales measuring perceived teacher credibility, affect for enrollment in a similar course, evaluation of teacher behaviors, and affect toward the class in the scenario. This study included a built in replication (alternate operationalizations of the independent variable). Specific details regarding instruments, participants, research procedures, and statistical analyses are discussed below.

Procedure

In large lecture classes at West Virginia University, students were exposed to one stimulus behavior scenario (see Appendix B). After reading each scenario, students were asked to complete scales measuring perceived teacher credibility, affect toward enrollment in a similar class, evaluation of teacher behaviors, and affect toward the class in the scenario (see Appendix C).

Participants

Participants were undergraduate students enrolled in undergraduate communication classes at West Virginia University. All were given minimal course credit for participation.

Measures

Immediacy. Teacher immediacy was manipulated in the eight scenarios (study 1). There were six nonverbal behaviors that were either highly immediate or nonimmediate. Two levels of immediacy were created by varying the proportion of behaviors that were immediate. In the high immediacy condition, the teacher was immediate in all six nonverbal behaviors. In the low immediacy condition, the teacher engaged in no immediate behavior. Different immediacy behaviors were included in the replication (study 2) than in the original study.

Affinity-Seeking Techniques. Teacher affinity-seeking behaviors were also manipulated in all eight scenarios. There were six behaviors that are considered affinity-seeking behaviors or neutral in nature. In the affinity-seeking condition, all six behaviors manipulated were considered behaviors that function to increase student affinity. In the nonaffinity-seeking condition, all six behaviors manipulated were considered neutral. These neutral behaviors are behaviors that are considered to neither increase nor decrease student affinity. Different affinity-seeking behaviors were included in the replication than in the original study. The affinity-seeking behaviors chosen for manipulation were based on four of the five affinity-seeking behaviors that Richmond (1990) found to significantly predict affective and cognitive learning. Those behaviors include facilitate enjoyment, assume control, optimism, and self-concept confirmation.

Misbehavior. Teacher misbehavior was also manipulated in the eight scenarios. There were three behaviors that were considered either appropriate behavior or misbehavior. Varying the proportion of appropriate and inappropriate behaviors created two levels of behavior. In the misbehavior condition, all behaviors in which the teacher engaged were considered to be inappropriate. In the nonmisbehavior condition, the teacher engaged in all appropriate behaviors. Different misbehaviors were employed in the replication than in the initial study.

Teacher Credibility. The participant's perception of teacher credibility was measured using an 18-item scale developed by Teven & McCroskey (1997). Factor analysis in previous research has revealed three dimensions: Competence, Caring, and Trustworthiness (see Thweatt & McCroskey, 1998). Cronbach's Alpha for Competence, Caring, and Teacher Trustworthiness are .88, .92, and .85, respectively. Each dimension was measured with responses to six separate seven-point bipolar scales.

Affect Toward Enrollment with a Similar Teacher. Affect toward enrolling in a similar class (to the one in the scenario provided) was measured by the response to one statement on four bipolar, seven-step scales: Likely/Unlikely, Impossible/Possible, Probable/Improbable, and Would not/Would. The statement is "The likelihood that I would enroll in a class with this teacher, if I had a choice and my schedule permitted it:" Obtained reliabilities were .97.

Affect Toward Teacher. Affect toward teacher (the one in the scenario provided) was measured by the response to one statement on four bipolar, seven-step scales: Good/Bad, Worthless/Valuable, Fair/Unfair, and Positive/Negative. The statement is

“My attitude toward the teacher in the description I just read:” Obtained reliabilities were .92.

Evaluation of Teacher Behavior. Evaluations of teacher behaviors in the scenarios provided were also measured by the response to one statement on four bipolar, seven-step scales: Appropriate/Inappropriate, Good/Bad, Not valuable/Valuable, and Negative/Positive. The statement measuring students’ perceptions of the teacher’s behaviors is “The teacher’s behavior in this class is:” Obtained reliabilities were .95.

Manipulation checks

Subjects completed rating scales that measured perceived teacher immediacy, affinity-seeking techniques and behaviors. All items included two items with seven-point response formats (see Appendix D).

Subjects were given the following definition of immediacy: “Immediacy behaviors are those communication behaviors that reduce distance between people. Immediate behaviors may actually decrease the physical distance, or they may decrease the psychological distance. The more immediate a person is, the more likely he/she is to communicate at close distances, smile, engage in eye contact, use direct body orientations, use overall body movement and gestures, touch others, relax, and be vocally expressive. In other words, we might say that an immediate person is perceived as overtly friendly and warm.” The level of immediacy of the teacher in the scenario was measured with two adjective pairs: “very immediate/very nonimmediate” and “approachable/unapproachable.” Scores ranged from 2 to 14 with a higher score indicating a more positive answer. The obtained reliability was .77.

Teacher affinity-seeking was defined as follows for the subjects: “Affinity-seeking behaviors are those communication behaviors in which individuals engage to get other people to like and to feel positive toward them. The more an individual is trying to get others to like him/her, the more likely he/she is to communicate positivism, pleasantness, and inclusive behaviors. Also, the individual trying to get others to like him/her will do or say funny things and try to appear interesting.” The level of affinity-seeking behaviors in the scenario was measured by two adjective pairs: “Unpleasant/Pleasant” and “Likable/Not likable.” Scores ranged from 2 to 14 with a higher score indicating a more positive answer. The obtained reliability was .91.

Teacher misbehavior was defined as follows for the subjects: “those behaviors that interfere with instruction and thus, learning.” Perceived frequency of misbehavior was measured by responses to two adjective pairs: “never/very often” and “frequently/seldom.” Scores ranged from 2 to 14 with a higher score indicating more frequent misbehavior. The obtained reliability was .93.

Data Analyses

The dependent variables and manipulation checks were subjected to three-way analyses of variance. Appropriate post-hoc cell comparisons (as justified by hypotheses or research questions) were made if a significant interaction effect was observed. Alpha for all tests was set at .05.

Chapter Three

Results

The impact of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and misbehaviors on all dependent variables is reported in this section for the first study as well as the replication. Post hoc analyses were used to better understand the interaction effect of the independent variables on the dependent variables. The results of the manipulation checks are also included in this section. For the purpose of clarity, the dependent variables are examined in two sections: Credibility and Affect.

Manipulation Checks

Immediacy. Analyses of variance for the manipulation check for immediacy indicated the inductions in both studies were successful. In Study One, the overall model was significant ($F\{7,457\} = 134.97, p < .0001, R^2 = .67$). The highly immediate teacher was perceived as significantly more immediate ($F\{1,457\} = 375.36, p < .001, R^2 = .27$) than the less immediate teacher, $m = 9.69$ and $m = 5.61$ respectively. In Study Two, the highly immediate teacher ($m = 10.04$) also was perceived as significantly more immediate ($F\{1,448\} = 300.71, p < .0001, R^2 = .33$) than the teacher low in immediacy ($m = 5.84$). (see Table 1, pg. 73)

In study two, the overall model was significant ($F\{7, 448\} = 67.67, p < .0001, R^2 = .51$). Not surprisingly, the interaction of immediacy and affinity-seeking had a significant impact on immediacy ($F\{1, 448\} = 6.71, p < .01, R^2 = .01$). The teacher who was highly immediate and engaging in affinity seeking behaviors ($m = 11.89$) was perceived to be more immediate than all other teachers. The teacher who was immediate, but not engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors ($m = 8.19$) was perceived to be more immediate

than the teacher who was not immediate, but did engage in affinity seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 7.07$) and the teacher who was not immediate and not engaging in affinity seeking behaviors ($\underline{m}=4.62$). Finally, the teacher who did not engage in immediate behaviors, but did engage in affinity seeking behaviors was perceived to be significantly more immediate than the teacher who was not immediate and who did not engage in affinity seeking behaviors. The behavior manipulation did not have a significant impact on immediacy in either study. (see Table 2, pg. 75)

Affinity Seeking. Analyses of variance for the manipulation check for affinity seeking indicated the inductions in both studies were successful. In Study One, the overall model was significant ($\underline{F}\{7, 457\} = 76.04, \underline{p}<.0001, \underline{R}^2 = .54$). The teacher engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors was perceived to be engaging in those behaviors significantly more than the teacher engaging in less affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{F}\{1,457\} = 408.95, \underline{p} < .0001, \underline{R}^2 = .41$), $\underline{m} = 11.27$ and $\underline{m} = 5.92$ respectively. In Study Two, the overall model was significant ($\underline{F}\{7, 448\} = 43.08, \underline{p}<.0001, \underline{R}^2 = .40$). The teacher engaging in more affinity seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 10.86$) also was perceived as engaging in these behaviors significantly more ($\underline{F}\{1,448\} = 231.28, \underline{p} < .0001, \underline{R}^2 = .31$) than the teacher not engaging in affinity seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 6.76$). (see Table 1, 73)

In both studies, immediacy had a significant impact on the perceived amount of affinity-seeking behaviors used by the teachers. In study one, the teacher who was high in immediacy was reported to engage in significantly ($\underline{F}\{1, 457\} = 111.06, \underline{p} < .0001, \underline{R}^2 = .11$) more affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 9.99$) than the teacher who was not immediate ($\underline{m} = 7.20$). In study two, the teacher high in immediacy was perceived to be engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors ($m = 9.92$) significantly more than the teacher

who was low in immediacy ($m = 7.70$)($F\{1, 67.74\} = 67.74, p < .0001, R^2 = .09$)

Misbehaviors did not have a significant impact on affinity seeking in either study. (see Table 1, pg. 73)

Misbehaviors. Analyses of variance for the manipulation check for teacher misbehaviors indicated the inductions in both studies were successful. In Study One, the overall model was significant ($F\{7, 457\} = 17.50, p < .0001, R^2 = .21$). The teacher engaging in fewer misbehaviors was perceived to be engaging in fewer of those behaviors ($m = 6.47$) than the teacher engaging in more misbehaviors ($m = 8.86$) ($F\{1, 457\} = 54.67, p < .0001, R^2 = .10$). In study two, the teacher not engaging in misbehaviors was perceived to be engaging in fewer misbehaviors ($m = 6.83$) than the teacher engaging in more misbehaviors ($m = 9.85$) ($F\{1, 448\} = 91.74, p < .0001, R^2 = .16$). (see Table 1, pg. 73)

In both studies, immediacy had a significant impact on the perception of teacher misbehaviors. In study one, the teacher reported to be more immediate was perceived to be engaging in less misbehavior ($m = 6.46$) than the teacher reported to be less immediate ($m = 8.87$) ($F\{1, 457\} = 56.34, p < .0001, R^2 = .10$). In study two, the teacher who was perceived to be more immediate was reported to misbehave less ($m = 7.42$) than the teacher who was perceived to be less immediate ($m = 9.26$) ($F\{1, 448\} = 33.76, p < .0001, R^2 = .10$). Affinity seeking did not have a significant impact on perceptions of misbehaviors in either study. (see Table 1, pg. 73)

In study one, the interaction effect of immediacy and misbehaviors had a significant impact on student perceptions of teacher misbehaviors ($F(1, 457) = 4.42, p < .04, R^2 = .01$). The teacher who was high in immediacy and not misbehaving was

perceived to be misbehaving less ($\underline{m} = 4.93$) than the teacher high in immediacy and misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 7.98$), the teacher low in immediacy and not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 8.03$), and the teacher low in immediacy and misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 9.73$). The teacher high in immediacy and engaging in misbehaviors was perceived to be misbehaving less than the teacher low in immediacy and who engaged in misbehaviors, but not the teacher low in immediacy who was not misbehaving. (see Table 2, pg. 75)

Study One

Credibility

Competence. For dependent variable “Teacher Competence” the overall model was significant ($F\{7, 457\} = 16.78, p < .0001, R^2 = .20$). Significant main effects were present for all independent variables. Participants found the teacher to be significantly ($F\{1, 457\} = 46.08, p < .0001, R^2 = .08$) more competent ($\underline{m} = 30.74$) when the teacher was high in immediacy than when the teacher was lower in immediacy ($\underline{m} = 26.61$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) The analysis also revealed that when the teacher engaged in more affinity seeking behaviors the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 457\} = 11.48, p < .0008, R^2 = .02$) more competent ($\underline{m} = 29.71$) than when the teacher did not engage in affinity seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 27.64$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) Conversely, when the teacher engaged in misbehaviors, the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 457\} = 46.79, p < .0001, R^2 = .08$) less competent ($\underline{m} = 26.59$) than when the teacher did not engage in misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 30.76$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

Interaction effects were also present for dependent variable “Teacher Competence.” The interaction of teacher immediacy and teacher misbehaviors had a significant impact on students’ perceptions of teacher competence ($F\{1, 457\} = 6.13,$

$p < .01$, $R^2 = .010$). The teacher high in immediacy and low in misbehaviors was perceived to be significantly more competent ($\underline{m} = 33.58$) than the teacher high in immediacy and high in misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 27.90$), the teacher low in immediacy and not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 27.94$), and the teacher low in immediacy who was misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 25.27$). The teacher high in immediacy and misbehaving was perceived to be more competent than the teacher low in immediacy who was also misbehaving, but not the teacher who was low in immediacy and misbehaving. (see Table 6, pg. 79)

The interaction effect of teacher affinity-seeking and teacher misbehaviors also had a significant impact on dependent variable “Teacher Competence” ($F(1, 457) = 4.64$, $p < .03$, $R^2 = .01$). The teacher high in immediacy who was not misbehaving was perceived to be significantly more competent ($\underline{m} = 32.44$) than the teacher engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors and misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 26.96$), the teacher who did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors, but did not misbehave ($\underline{m} = 29.06$), and the teacher who did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors, but did engage in misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 26.21$). The teacher who engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors and misbehaviors was perceived to be significantly more competent than the teacher who did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors and misbehaved, but not the teacher who did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors or misbehaviors. (see Table 8, pg. 81)

Caring. For dependent variable “Teacher Caring” the overall model was significant ($F\{7, 452\} = 70.08$, $p < .0001$, $R^2 = .52$). Significant main effects were present for all independent variables ($p < .05$). The analysis of variance revealed that when the teacher was high in immediacy, the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 452\} = 116.78$, $p < .0001$, $R^2 = .12$) more caring ($m = 25.96$) than when the teacher was less

immediate ($\underline{m} = 18.79$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) When the teacher engaged in affinity seeking behaviors, the teacher was also perceived to be significantly ($\underline{F}\{1, 452\} = 347.65$, $p < .0001$, $\underline{R}^2 = .37$) more caring ($m = 28.57$) than when the teacher was not engaging in affinity seeking behaviors ($m = 16.19$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) As expected, the teacher reported to be misbehaving was perceived to be significantly ($\underline{F}\{1, 457\} = 5.59$, $p < .02$, $\underline{R}^2 = .01$) less caring ($\underline{m} = 21.59$) than the teacher who was not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 23.16$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

The interaction effect of immediacy and affinity-seeking had a significant impact on student perceptions of teacher caring ($\underline{F}\{1, 452\} = 9.67$, $p < .002$, $\underline{R}^2 = .01$). The teacher high in immediacy engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 33.19$) was perceived to be significantly more caring than the teacher high in immediacy who did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 18.74$), the teacher low in immediacy who engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 23.95$), and the teacher low in immediacy who did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 13.62$). The immediate teacher engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors was perceived to be significantly more caring than the teacher who was low in immediacy and not engaging in immediacy behaviors, but significantly less caring than the teacher who was low in immediacy and engaging in affinity-seeking. Finally, the teacher low in immediacy who engaged in affinity seeking behaviors was perceived to be significantly more caring than the teacher low in immediacy who was not engaging in affinity-seeking. (see Table 7, pg. 80)

Trustworthiness. For dependent variable “Teacher Trustworthiness” the overall model was significant ($\underline{F}\{7, 450\} = 18.09$, $p < .0001$, $\underline{R}^2 = .22$). Main effects for all independent variables were present. The highly immediate teacher was reported to be

significantly ($F\{1, 450\} = 42.43, p < .0001, R^2 = .07$) more trustworthy ($\underline{m} = 29.66, p < .0001$) than the teacher low in immediacy ($\underline{m} = 26.02$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) Also, when the teacher engaged in affinity seeking behaviors, the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 450\} = 53.01, p < .0001, R^2 = .09$) more trustworthy ($\underline{m} = 29.87$) than the teacher who did not engage in affinity seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 25.81$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) Finally, when the teacher was reported to engage in misbehaviors, the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 450\} = 24.20, p < .0001, R^2 = .04$) less trustworthy ($\underline{m} = 26.47$) than the teacher who was not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 29.21$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

Affective Learning

Affect Toward Enrollment. The overall model for dependent variable “Affect Toward Enrollment” was significant ($F\{7, 452\} = 47.02, p < .0001, R^2 = .42$). Main effects were present for all independent variables. When the teacher was high in immediacy affect toward enrollment ($\underline{m} = 16.99$) was significantly ($F\{1, 452\} = 113.19, p < .0001, R^2 = .14$) higher than when the teacher was low in immediacy ($\underline{m} = 10.87$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) Affect toward enrollment ($\underline{m} = 17.26$) was also significantly ($F\{1, 452\} = 133.56, p < .0001, R^2 = .17$) higher when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 10.60$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) Conversely, affect toward enrollment ($\underline{m} = 12.05$) was significantly ($F\{1, 452\} = 42.65, p < .0001, R^2 = .05$) lower when the teacher engaged in misbehaviors than when the teacher did not engage in misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 15.81$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

The interaction of immediacy and misbehavior had a significant impact on dependent variable “Affect Toward Enrollment” ($F\{1, 452\} = 17.16, p < .0001, R^2 = .02$). The teacher high in immediacy and not misbehaving created significantly higher affect

toward enrollment ($\underline{m} = 20.07$) than the teacher high in immediacy who was misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 13.92$), the teacher low in immediacy who was not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 11.55$), and the teacher low in immediacy who was misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 10.18$). When the teacher was high in immediacy and misbehaving, affect toward enrollment was significantly higher than when the teacher was low in immediacy and not misbehaving and when the teacher was low in immediacy and misbehaving. Finally, affect toward enrollment was significantly higher when the teacher was low in immediacy and not misbehaving than when then teacher was low in immediacy and misbehaving. (see Table 6, pg. 79)

The interaction of affinity seeking and misbehavior also had a significant impact on dependent variable “Affect Toward Enrollment” ($F\{1, 452\} = 22.13, p < .0001, R^2 = .03$). When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and was not misbehaving, affect toward enrollment was significantly higher ($m = 20.49$) than when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and misbehaved ($m = 14.02$), when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and did not misbehave ($m = 11.13$) and when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and did misbehave ($m = 10.08$). When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and misbehaviors, affect toward enrollment was significantly higher than when the teacher did not seek affinity or misbehave and when the teacher did not seek affinity and did misbehave. (see Table 8, pg. 81)

Attitude Toward Teacher. For dependent variable “Attitude Toward Teacher” the over all model was significant ($F\{7, 453\} = 56.50, p < .0001, R^2 = .47$). Main effects were present for all independent variables. Attitude toward class with a teacher high in immediacy ($\underline{m} = 18.23$) was significantly ($F\{1, 453\} = 115.52, p < .0001, R^2 = .14$) more positive than when the teacher was low in immediacy ($\underline{m} = 13.14$). (see Table 3, pg. 76)

When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors, attitude toward this teacher ($\underline{m} = 19.05$) was significantly ($F\{1, 453\} = 203.02, p < .0001, \underline{R}^2 = .24$) more positive than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 12.32$). (see Table 4, 77) Finally, when the teacher engaged in misbehaviors, attitude toward this teacher ($\underline{m} = 14.13$) was significantly ($F\{1, 453\} = 43.00, p < .0001, \underline{R}^2 = .05$) less positive than when the teacher did not misbehave ($\underline{m} = 17.24$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

The interaction effect of immediacy and misbehavior had a significant impact on dependent variable “Attitude Toward Teacher” ($F\{1, 453\} = 7.45, p < .007, \underline{R}^2 = .01$). When the teacher was high in immediacy and not misbehaving, the impact on students attitude toward ($\underline{m} = 20.42$) the teacher was significantly more positive than when the teacher was high in immediacy and misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 16.03$), when the teacher was low in immediacy and not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 14.05$), and when the teacher was low in immediacy and misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 12.24$). The teacher high in immediacy who was misbehaving had a significantly more positive effect on student attitude toward the teacher than the teacher low in immediacy and not misbehaving, and the teacher low in immediacy and misbehaving. The teacher low in immediacy who was not misbehaving had a significantly more positive impact on student attitude toward the teacher than the teacher low in immediacy and misbehaving. (see Table 6, pg. 79)

The interaction effect of affinity-seeking behaviors and misbehaviors also had a significant impact on dependent variable “Attitude Toward Teacher” ($F\{1, 453\} = 15.96, p < .0001, \underline{R}^2 = .02$). The teacher engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors and not misbehaving had a significantly more positive impact on student attitude toward teacher ($\underline{m} = 21.55$) than the teacher engaging in affinity-seeking who was misbehaving ($\underline{m} =$

16.55), the teacher not engaging in affinity-seeking or misbehavior ($\underline{m} = 12.92$), and the teacher not engaging in affinity-seeking, but who was misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 11.71$). The teacher engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors who was also misbehaving had a significantly more positive impact on student attitude toward teacher than the teacher who was not affinity-seeking or engaging in misbehaviors and the teacher who was not engaging in affinity-seeking, but was perceived to be misbehaving. Finally, the teacher not engaging in affinity-seeking or misbehaving had a significantly more positive impact on student attitude toward teacher than the teacher who was not engaging in affinity-seeking, but was misbehaving. (see Table 8, pg. 82)

Evaluation of Teacher Behavior. For dependent variable “Evaluation of Teacher Behavior” the overall model was significant ($F\{7, 454\} = 56.17, p < .0001, R^2 = .46$). When the teacher was high in immediacy, the evaluation of the teacher’s behavior ($m = 18.87$) was significantly ($F\{1, 454\} = 187.42, p < .0001, R^2 = .22$) higher than when the teacher was low in immediacy ($\underline{m} = 12.01$). (see Table Three) The evaluation of the teacher’s behavior was also significantly ($F\{1, 454\} = 144.47, p < .0001, R^2 = .17$) higher when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 18.46$) than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 12.43$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) Conversely, when the teacher engaged in misbehaviors, evaluations of the teacher’s behavior ($\underline{m} = 13.96$) were significantly ($F\{1, 454\} = 34.68, p < .0001, R^2 = .04$) lower than when the teacher engaged in misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 16.92$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

The interaction of immediacy and misbehavior had a significant impact on dependent variable “Evaluation of Teacher Behavior” ($F\{1, 454\} = 14.25, p < .0002, R^2 = .02$). The teacher high in immediacy who was not misbehaving received significantly

more positive evaluations ($\underline{m} = 21.29$) than the teacher high in immediacy who was perceived to be misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 16.45$), the teacher low in immediacy who was not perceived to be misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 12.54$), and the teacher low in immediacy who was perceived to be misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 11.48$). The teacher who was high in immediacy and perceived to be misbehaving had significantly more positive evaluations than the teacher low in immediacy who was not perceived to be misbehaving, and the teacher low in immediacy who was perceived to be misbehaving. Finally, the teacher low in immediacy who was misbehaving received significantly more positive evaluations than the teacher low in immediacy who was perceived to be misbehaving. (see Table 6, pg. 79)

Study Two

Credibility

Competence. For dependent variable “Teacher Competence” the overall model was significant ($F\{7, 448\} = 32.72, p < .0001, R^2 = .34$). Significant main effects were present for all independent variables. Participants found the teacher to be significantly ($F\{1, 448\} = 36.55, p < .0001, R^2 = .05$) more competent ($\underline{m} = 28.39$) when the teacher was high in immediacy than when the teacher was lower in immediacy ($\underline{m} = 24.57$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) The analysis also revealed that when the teacher engaged in more affinity-seeking behaviors the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 448\} = 27.07, p < .0001, R^2 = .04$) more competent ($\underline{m} = 28.12$) than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 24.84$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) Conversely, when the teacher engaged in misbehaviors, the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 448\} = 163.84, p < .0001, R^2 = .24$) less competent ($\underline{m} = 22.44$) than when the teacher did not engage in misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 30.52$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

Caring. For dependent variable “Teacher Caring” the overall model was significant ($F\{7, 444\} = 49.61, p < .0001, R^2 = .44$). Significant main effects were present for all independent variables. The analysis of variance revealed that when the teacher was high in immediacy, the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 444\} = 162.68, p < .0001, R^2 = .21$) more caring ($\underline{m} = 26.78$) than when the teacher was less immediate ($\underline{m} = 18.68$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors, the teacher was also perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 444\} = 159.86, p < .0001, R^2 = .20$) more caring ($\underline{m} = 26.74$) than when the teacher was not engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 18.72$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) As expected, the teacher reported to be misbehaving was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 444\} = 13.71, p < .0002, R^2 = .02$) less caring ($\underline{m} = 21.55$) than the teacher who was not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 23.90$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

The interaction of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and misbehaviors had a significant impact on dependent variable “Teacher Caring” ($F\{1, 444\} = 7.00, p < .008, R^2 = .009$). When the teacher was high in immediacy, engaging in affinity-seeking behaviors and not misbehaving, the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($p < .0001$) more caring than all other types of teachers. (see Table 9, pg. 82)

Trustworthiness. For dependent variable “Teacher Trustworthiness” the overall model was significant ($F\{7, 447\} = 21.66, p < .0001, R^2 = .25$). Main effects for all independent variables were present. The highly immediate teacher was reported to be significantly ($F\{1, 447\} = 27.61, p < .0001, R^2 = .05$) more trustworthy ($\underline{m} = 28.36$) than the teacher low in immediacy ($\underline{m} = 25.52$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) Also, when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors, the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1,$

447} = 49.77, $p < .0001$, $R^2 = .08$) more trustworthy ($\underline{m} = 28.84$) than the teacher who did not engage in affinity seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 25.03$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) Finally, when the teacher was reported to engage in misbehaviors, the teacher was perceived to be significantly ($F\{1, 447\} = 65.46$, $p < .0001$, $R^2 = .11$) less trustworthy ($\underline{m} = 24.75$) than the teacher who was not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 29.12$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

The interaction of immediacy and misbehaviors had a significant impact on dependent variable “Teacher Trustworthiness” ($F\{1, 447\} = 4.40$, $p < .04$, $R^2 = .01$). When the teacher was high in immediacy and not misbehaving, perceived teacher trustworthiness was significantly higher ($\underline{m} = 31.11$) than when the teacher was high in immediacy and misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 25.61$), when the teacher was low in immediacy and not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 27.14$) and when the teacher was low in immediacy and misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 23.90$). When the teacher was low in immediacy and not misbehaving, perceived teacher trustworthiness was significantly higher than when the teacher was high in immediacy and misbehaving and when the teacher was low in immediacy and misbehaving. Finally, when the teacher was high in immediacy and misbehaving the teacher was perceived to be significantly more trustworthy than when the teacher was low in immediacy and misbehaving. (see Table 6, pg. 79)

The interaction of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and misbehaviors had a significant impact on dependent variable “Teacher Trustworthiness” ($F\{1, 447\} = 4.15$, $p < .04$, $R^2 = .01$). The teacher high in immediacy, affinity-seeking, and not misbehaving was perceived to be significantly more trustworthy than all other teacher types. (see Table 9, pg. 82)

Affective Learning

Affect Toward Enrollment. The overall model for dependent variable “Affect Toward Enrollment” was significant ($F\{7, 446\} = 34.49, p < .0001, R^2 = .35$). Main effects were present for all independent variables. When the teacher was high in immediacy affect toward enrollment ($\underline{m} = 18.68$) was significantly ($F\{1, 446\} = 128.65, p < .0001, R^2 = .19$) higher than when the teacher was low in immediacy ($\underline{m} = 11.66$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) Affect toward enrollment ($\underline{m} = 17.94$) was also significantly ($F\{1, 446\} = 79.80, p < .0001, R^2 = .17$) higher when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 12.41$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) Conversely, affect toward enrollment ($\underline{m} = 13.61$) was significantly ($F\{1, 446\} = 25.25, p < .0001, R^2 = .04$) lower when the teacher engaged in misbehaviors than when the teacher did not engage in misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 16.73$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

The interaction of affinity-seeking and misbehaviors had a significant impact on dependent variable “Affect Toward Enrollment” ($F\{1, 446\} = 6.20, p < .01, R^2 = .01$). When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and did not misbehave, student affect toward enrollment with that teacher was significantly higher ($\underline{m} = 20.27$) than when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and was misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 15.61$), when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and was not misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 13.19$), and when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and was misbehaving ($\underline{m} = 11.62$). When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and misbehaved, student affect toward enrollment was significantly higher than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and did not misbehave, and when the teacher was not seeking affinity, but was misbehaving.

Finally, when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and did not misbehave, student affect toward enrollment was significantly higher than when the teacher did not seek affinity, but did misbehave (see Table 8, pg. 81).

Attitude Toward Teacher. For dependent variable “Attitude Toward Teacher” the over all model was significant ($F(7, 448) = 33.41, p < .0001, R^2 = .34$). Main effects were present for all independent variables. Attitude toward class with a teacher high in immediacy ($m = 18.39$) was significantly ($F(1, 448) = 80.27, p < .0001, R^2 = .12$) more positive than when the teacher was low in immediacy ($m = 13.74$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors, affect toward this teacher ($m = 18.56$) was significantly ($F(1, 448) = 92.56, p < .0001, R^2 = .14$) more positive than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors ($m = 13.57$). (see Table 4, pg. 77) Finally, when the teacher engaged in misbehaviors, attitude toward this teacher ($m = 14.27$) was significantly ($F(1, 448) = 48.22, p < .0001, R^2 = .07$) less positive than when the teacher did not misbehave ($m = 17.87$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

The interaction of immediacy and misbehavior had a significant impact on dependent variable “Attitude Toward Teacher” ($F(1, 448) = 7.30, p < .007, R^2 = .01$). When the teacher was high in immediacy and did not misbehave, student attitude toward the teacher was significantly more positive ($m = 20.89$) than when the teacher was high in immediacy and misbehaving ($m = 15.89$), when the teacher was low in immediacy and not misbehaving ($m = 14.84$), and when the teacher was low in immediacy and misbehaving ($m = 12.64$). When the teacher was high in immediacy and misbehaving, student attitude toward the teacher was significantly more positive than when the teacher was low in immediacy and misbehaving, but not when the teacher was low in immediacy

and not misbehaving. Finally, when the teacher was low in immediacy and not misbehaving, student attitude toward the teacher was significantly more positive than when the teacher was low in immediacy and misbehaving. (see Table 6, pg. 79)

The interaction of affinity-seeking and misbehavior also had a significant impact on dependent variable “Attitude Toward Teacher” ($F\{1, 448\} = 6.30, p < .01, R^2 = .01$). When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and did not misbehave, student attitude toward the teacher was significantly more positive ($\bar{m} = 21.02$) than when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and misbehaved ($\bar{m} = 16.11$), when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and did not misbehave ($\bar{m} = 14.72$), and when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and did misbehave ($\bar{m} = 12.42$). When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and misbehaved, student attitude toward the teacher was significantly more positive than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and did misbehave, but not when the teacher didn’t engage in affinity-seeking or misbehaviors. Finally, when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking or misbehaviors, student attitude toward the teacher was significantly more positive than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking, but did misbehave. (see Table 7, pg. 80)

Evaluation of Teacher Behavior. For dependent variable “Evaluation of Teacher Behavior” the overall model was significant ($F\{7, 447\} = 39.62, p < .0001, R^2 = .38$). When the teacher was high in immediacy, the evaluation of the teacher’s behavior ($m = 18.20$) was significantly ($F\{1, 447\} = 132.32, p < .0001, R^2 = .18$) higher than when the teacher was low in immediacy ($m = 11.98$). (see Table 3, pg. 76) The evaluation of the teacher’s behavior was also significantly ($F\{1, 447\} = 68.06, p < .0001, R^2 = .10$) higher when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors ($\bar{m} = 17.32$) than when the

teacher did not engage in affinity seeking behaviors ($\underline{m} = 12.86$). (see Table 4, pg. 77)
Conversely, when the teacher engaged in misbehaviors, evaluations of the teacher's behavior ($\underline{m} = 12.84$) were significantly ($F\{1, 447\} = 68.91, p < .0001, R^2 = .10$) lower than when the teacher did not engage in misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 17.34$). (see Table 5, pg. 78)

The interaction of affinity-seeking and misbehaviors had a significant impact on dependent variable "Evaluation of Teacher Behavior" ($F\{1, 447\} = 5.77, p < .02, R^2 = .01$). When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and did not misbehave, student evaluations of the teacher's behavior were significantly more positive ($\underline{m} = 20.22$) than when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and misbehaved ($\underline{m} = 14.43$), when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking or misbehaviors ($\underline{m} = 14.46$), and when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking, but did misbehave ($\underline{m} = 11.27$). When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking and misbehaved, student evaluations of the teacher's behavior were significantly more positive than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking and misbehaved, but not when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking or misbehaviors. Finally, when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking or misbehaviors, student evaluations of the teacher's behavior were significantly more positive than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking, but did misbehave. (see Table 8, pg. 81)

Chapter Four

Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the mediating effect of immediacy and teacher affinity-seeking behaviors on teacher misbehaviors. In order to conduct this investigation, six hypotheses were generated and two research questions posed. Each hypothesis dealt with the main effects of the separate independent variables on the dependent variable. These hypotheses served to replicate previous findings. The first and second hypotheses predicted that teachers who engaged in more affinity-seeking strategies and immediacy behaviors would be perceived as more credible. The third hypothesis predicted that teachers who did not engage in misbehaviors would be perceived as more credible. The fourth and fifth hypotheses predicted that teacher affinity-seeking behaviors and teacher immediacy behaviors, respectively would have a positive impact on student evaluations of teachers' behaviors, students' affect toward the teacher in the scenario and students' affect toward enrollment with the teacher in the scenario. The final hypothesis, hypothesis six, predicted that teachers who engaged in misbehaviors would have a negative impact on student evaluations of teachers' behaviors, students' affect toward the teacher in the scenario, and students' affect toward enrollment with the teacher in the scenario. The research questions served to investigate the impact of the interaction effect of immediacy, affinity-seeking strategies, and misbehaviors on the dependent variables. Searching for answers to these questions was an attempt to add new knowledge to the field of instructional communication.

Manipulation checks for teacher immediacy, affinity-seeking strategies, and misbehaviors were included in the instrument to ensure that the hypotheses and research

questions could be properly investigated. As expected, participants were able to differentiate between the teacher high in immediacy and low in immediacy, the teacher using affinity-seeking strategies and the teacher not engaging in affinity-seeking strategies, and the teacher who was misbehaving and the teacher who was not misbehaving. In some cases, the other independent variables significantly impacted students' perceptions of teacher immediacy, teacher affinity-seeking behaviors, and teacher misbehaviors.

In both studies, affinity-seeking had a significant impact on student perceptions of teacher immediacy. When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking behaviors, the teacher was perceived to be more immediate than the teacher who did not engage in affinity-seeking behaviors. An interesting finding is that the affinity-seeking manipulation accounted for 12% more variance in perceptions of immediacy than did the immediacy manipulation in study one. However, the immediacy manipulation accounted for 15% more variance in perceptions of immediacy than did the affinity-seeking manipulation in study two. These differences in variance accounted for may be a direct result of the types of affinity-seeking that the teacher engaged in. The teacher affinity-seeking strategies in study one included behaviors such as introducing the students to friends when appropriate and making the student feel like one of the group. Engaging in these behaviors alone, without engaging in any immediacy behaviors, could produce perceptions of physical and psychological closeness leading the student to perceive the teacher to be immediate. These results indicate that teacher immediacy and teacher affinity-seeking behaviors cannot be manipulated independently.

Although affinity-seeking either enhanced or detracted from perceptions of immediacy in both studies, misbehavior affected immediacy in study two only. However, the variance accounted for was only one percent. The impact of misbehavior is so slight when immediacy and affinity-seeking are present that it was not detectable in study one and was inconsequential in study two. This result indicates that if a teacher is both immediate and engaging in affinity-seeking it is quite improbable that students would perceive the teacher's behaviors as interfering in learning.

While the main effect of affinity-seeking significantly impacted immediacy, immediacy also significantly impacted perceptions of affinity-seeking, in both studies. When the teacher was high in immediacy, the teacher was perceived to be engaging in more affinity-seeking than when the teacher was low in immediacy. Teachers who engage in affinity-seeking are perceived to be immediate and vice versa. This result also supports the assertion that affinity-seeking and immediacy cannot be manipulated independently. Conversely, misbehaviors can be manipulated independently of affinity-seeking behaviors. In both studies, misbehaviors failed to impact perceptions of teacher affinity-seeking behaviors.

Likewise, in study one, teacher affinity-seeking did not have a significant impact on student perceptions of teacher misbehaviors. Although the impact of affinity-seeking on perceptions of teacher misbehaviors was significant in study two, the variance accounted for was only two percent. This indicates that the impact of affinity-seeking is negligible in relation to perceptions of teacher misbehaviors. Whether the teacher is seeking affinity is irrelevant. Teacher affinity-seeking neither positively nor negatively impacts students' perceptions of teacher misbehaviors.

In contrast, teacher misbehaviors cannot be manipulated independently of teacher immediacy. The main effects of the immediacy and misbehavior manipulations indicated that students detect misbehaviors when the teacher is low in immediacy or when the teacher is high in misbehaviors. Interestingly, in study one, the interaction of immediacy and misbehaviors also indicates that immediacy and misbehaviors cannot be manipulated independently. When a teacher is low in immediacy and not misbehaving, that teacher is reported to misbehave as much as a teacher high in immediacy who is misbehaving. This indicates that whether misbehaviors are present, if the teacher is low in immediacy then the teacher is perceived to be misbehaving. This finding supports previous research by Thweatt and McCroskey (1996). In the present study and in the Thweatt and McCroskey study, the variance accounted for by the interaction of immediacy and misbehavior was three percent or less indicating that the main effects of these two variables are more important than the combined effects.

In all cases, the results of the manipulation checks indicate that the main effect of each independent variable is more important than the interaction of these variables. Student perceptions of teacher immediacy, affinity-seeking, and misbehaviors are impacted more when a teacher is immediate, engages in affinity-seeking, or misbehaves respectively. Perceptions of the level of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and misbehaviors are not acutely changed by the interaction of immediacy and affinity-seeking, immediacy and misbehaviors, or affinity-seeking and misbehaviors. The significance of these main effects indicated a successful manipulation of the independent variables leading to the investigation of the hypotheses and research questions.

Credibility.

Two dependent variables were used to test the main and interaction effects of the independent variables: Credibility and Affective learning. Credibility includes three dimensions: competence, caring and trustworthiness. Hypothesis one predicted that teachers who are immediate will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by being perceived as more credible than teachers who are not immediate. This hypothesis was confirmed for all three dimensions of credibility in study one and study two. In all cases, the teacher high in immediacy was perceived to be more credible than the teacher low in immediacy. When the teacher engaged in immediate behaviors, the teacher was perceived to be more competent, more caring and more trustworthy.

Although immediacy significantly impacted all three dimensions of credibility, immediacy accounted for more variance in teacher caring (Study One = 12%, Study Two = 21%). This finding is intuitive in that it is assumed that students perceive teachers who create physical and psychological closeness to do so intentionally. Intentionally creating perceptions of immediacy would seem to indicate that the teacher is concerned with the learning environment and thus “cares” about the student’s well-being. While immediacy strengthens perceptions of competence and trustworthiness, it would seem that other teacher behaviors (e.g. knowledge of content and integrity) might have a larger impact on these two variables.

Hypothesis two predicted that teachers who engage in more affinity seeking strategies will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by being perceived as more credible than teachers who engage in less affinity-seeking strategies. This hypothesis was also confirmed for both studies. Teachers who seek the affinity of their students are

perceived to be more competent, caring and trustworthy than teachers who do not seek the affinity of their students.

Again, in study one and two, affinity-seeking created more variance in perceptions of teacher caring than teacher competence and trustworthiness. Variance accounted for in teacher caring was 37% and 20% respectively. Students perceive teachers who want them to like them to care more than teachers who are not concerned with their liking. Aside from accounting for a large amount of variance in teacher caring, teacher affinity-seeking impacted teacher trustworthiness more strongly than teacher competence. Variance accounted for was 9% and 8% in study one and study two respectively. Teacher affinity-seeking only accounted for 2% and 4% of the variance in teacher competence in study one and study two respectively. Teacher affinity-seeking affects student perceptions of teacher competence only slightly.

Hypothesis three predicted that teachers who do not engage in misbehaviors will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by being perceived as more credible than teachers who engage in misbehaviors. This hypothesis was also confirmed for both studies. Teachers who do not engage in misbehaviors are perceived to be more competent, caring and trustworthy than teachers who engage in misbehaviors.

Unlike immediacy and affinity-seeking, teacher misbehaviors impact perceptions of teacher competence more than teacher caring and teacher trustworthiness. In study one, the variance accounted for was 8% and in study two, 24%. Interestingly, one of the misbehaviors included in study two was lack of familiarity with the subject matter. While a solid conclusion cannot be drawn about the individual misbehaviors manipulated, it can be speculated that being unfamiliar with the subject matter may have accounted for the

16% difference in variance accounted for in teacher competence. The misbehaviors in study one were not in anyway related to the teacher's level of knowledge.

Affect.

The second dependent variable used to test the hypotheses and research questions was affective learning. For the purposes of this study, affective learning included three dimensions: Desire to Enroll, Attitude Toward the Teacher, and Evaluation of Teacher Behavior. Hypothesis four predicted that teachers who engage in immediate behaviors will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by more positive student evaluations of teachers' behaviors than teachers who are not immediate, students' affect toward the teacher in the scenario, and students' affect toward enrollment with the teacher in the scenario. This hypothesis was confirmed for both studies. When the teacher was high in immediacy, students affect toward enrollment was higher than when the teacher was low in immediacy. Also, when the teacher was high in immediacy, students' attitudes toward the teacher were more positive than when the teacher was low in immediacy. Finally, when the teacher was high in immediacy, student evaluations of the teacher were more positive than when the teacher was low in immediacy.

The fifth hypothesis predicted that teachers who engage in affinity-seeking strategies will produce more positive outcomes as evidenced by more positive student evaluations of teachers' behaviors than teachers who engage in less affinity seeking strategies, students' affect toward the teacher in the scenario, and students' affect toward enrollment with the teacher in the scenario. When the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking, student desire to enroll in a class with that teacher was higher than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking. Also, when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking,

students' attitudes toward the teacher were more positive than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking. Finally, when the teacher engaged in affinity-seeking, student evaluations of the teachers' behavior were more positive than when the teacher did not engage in affinity-seeking.

The final hypothesis, hypothesis six, predicted that teachers who evidence misbehaviors will produce less positive outcomes as evidenced by less positive student evaluations of teachers' behaviors than teachers who do not evidence misbehaviors, students' affect toward the teacher in the scenario, and students' affect toward enrollment with the teacher in the scenario. This hypothesis was confirmed for both studies. When the teacher misbehaved, desired to enroll with the teacher was less than when the teacher did not misbehave. Also, when the teacher misbehaved, attitude toward the teacher was less positive than when the teacher did not misbehave. Finally, when the teacher misbehaved student evaluations of the teacher's behavior were less positive than when the teacher did not misbehave.

In both studies, variance accounted for by immediacy and affinity-seeking in dependent variables desire to enroll, attitude toward the teacher, and evaluation of teacher behavior ranged from 9% to 24%. However, variance accounted for by misbehavior in these three dependent variables was 7% or less in both studies. It would seem that positive teacher behaviors have more of an impact on student affect than negative behaviors. When a teacher misbehaves, it would seem that students are merely indifferent to these behaviors, but when a teacher behaves in a positive manner student awareness is heightened. Unfortunately, students may have become accustomed to misbehaviors in the classroom although they may be unconscious of this. Dolin (1995) reported that teacher

misbehavior is infrequent in the college setting, but when teachers do misbehave there is a negative impact. A different conclusion that might be drawn is that students are not aware enough of these behaviors because these behaviors are the norm. When students are aware, they do report negative outcomes. However, when these “normal” behaviors are not found in the classroom, but instead, the teacher is engaging positive behaviors, student expectations are violated. This violation of expectations is so unanticipated that student awareness is truly heightened and the effect is amplified. This amplification is manifested through a stronger desire to enroll, more positive attitudes toward the teacher, and stronger teacher evaluations. Otherwise, students may be indifferent or neutral toward these affect-related variables.

This is further supported by the fact that teacher misbehaviors accounted for only one percent and two percent of variance in teacher caring in study one and study two respectively. Again, if misbehaviors in the classroom are the expectation then it makes sense that the teacher who misbehaves is perceived to be neither caring nor uncaring. However, when the teacher engages in immediacy and affinity-seeking then that teacher is perceived to care. If the teacher is not interested in creating psychological and physical closeness or student liking then the teacher is not caring. Interfering in learning does not impact student perceptions of teacher caring and is perhaps the expectation in the college setting, at least in this study.

Conclusions

From the results, it is evident that it is not the mediating effect of immediacy and affinity-seeking on misbehaviors in relation to the dependent variables that is of importance. It is the direct or main effect of each independent variable on the dependent

variables that is the concern. This research conclusively indicates that the interaction of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and misbehaviors has a minimal impact on teacher credibility and student affect. The variance accounted for by the interactions that were significant was so small that discussing these interactions was of no value. However, discussing the lack of variance accounted for by these interactions is valuable and will be addressed in the future directions section of this manuscript.

The value of discussing the main effects of the independent variables lies in the variance accounted for by these variables. As was noted earlier, the largest amount of variance accounted for was in one dimension of the credibility variable: Teacher Caring. This variance was accounted for by immediacy and affinity-seeking. While these two variables enhance trustworthiness and competence, immediacy and affinity-seeking are stronger predictors of caring. While this would seem intuitive given caring is more affective in nature than competence and trustworthiness and affinity-seeking and immediacy are affective in nature, it is supported through data. Past research indicated that affinity-seeking behaviors, as a whole, accounted for 33 percent of the variance in perceptions of teacher character and 13 percent of the variance in perceptions of teacher competence (Frymier and Thompson, 1991). When this study was conducted, the third dimension of credibility had not been clarified. Caring was recently identified as the third dimension of credibility (Teven & McCroskey, 1997).

Implications

The findings of this study can easily be applied in the classroom environment. Teachers who use affinity-seeking strategies and immediacy behaviors are likely to produce perceptions of caring in their students. Also, teachers who seek affinity and are

immediate produce affective learning. Attaining this level of learning leads to long term interests in learning. Definitions of affinity-seeking and immediacy should be included within teacher education curricula. When students of education are thoroughly familiar with these two concepts, their knowledge should be broadened by including examples of affinity-seeking and immediacy behaviors. Finally, causing the prospective teacher to engage in these behaviors with classmates and then by teaching a lesson using these behaviors will allow them to incorporate these behaviors into their own repertoire of behaviors. One caveat that should be noted is that the teacher must be motivated to engage in these behaviors. However, if the teacher is a caring teacher then the motivation will be there.

Future Directions

The results of this research indicate that future researchers should focus only on the main effects of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and misbehaviors and not on the mediating effect of immediacy and affinity-seeking on misbehaviors. Perhaps, it is the mediating effect of teacher caring on immediacy and affinity-seeking that should be the focus. Also, research conducted before caring was identified as the third dimension of credibility indicated that credibility was a strong predictor of cognitive learning (Andersen, 1973 & Wheelless, 1975). Future researchers should focus on the caring dimension of credibility as a predictor of affective learning. Most research conducted in relation to credibility and learning was conducted before caring had been identified. The illusive nature of this third dimension may have crippled attempts to study credibility as a predictor of affective learning.

Finally, a replication of this study with a naturalistic design is in order. It is suggested that future researchers ask participants about actual teacher behaviors rather than manipulated teacher behaviors. It is suspected that immediacy and affinity-seeking will have the same impact on the dependent variables in a naturalistic design. Replicating these findings in a non-experimental design will only further support the importance of immediacy and affinity-seeking in instructional communication.

Limitations

The most obvious limitation of this research is the quasi-experimental design. While the design of this research allowed for the examination of immediacy, affinity-seeking and misbehaviors when these variables are extreme, these variables should be measured in a more naturalistic setting. Asking students about actual teacher behaviors rather than manipulating teacher behaviors will lead to understanding the impact of these variables at their natural level of existence.

Another limitation, that was brought to light, was the issue of measuring teacher misbehaviors through self-report. Dolin (1995) reported that misbehaviors are infrequent in the college setting. It may be that teacher misbehaviors are a norm and as such, students take it for granted that misbehaviors are among appropriate behaviors for college teachers. Students may not recognize teacher misbehaviors as interfering in learning, particularly if they have adapted to those behaviors. What we are then talking about is an issue of measurement. Self-report may not be the best method for determining teacher misbehaviors. Behavioral observation should be used to determine the frequency of teacher misbehaviors.

References

- Andersen, K. & Clevenger Jr., T. (1963). A summary of experimental research in ethos. Speech Monographs, 30, 59-78.
- Andersen, J. F. (1978). Teacher immediacy and teaching effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook, 3, (pp. 543-559). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Bell, R. A. & Daily, J. A. (1984). The affinity-seeking function of communication. Communication Monographs, 51, 91-115.
- Dolin, D. J. (1995). Ain't Misbehavin': A study of teacher misbehaviors, related to communication behaviors, and student resistance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Dempsey, R. E. (1975). Credibility, attention, and learning. M.A. thesis. Western Illinois University.
- Frymier, A. B. & Thompson, C. A. (1992). Perceived teacher affinity-seeking in relation to perceived teacher credibility. Communication Education, 41, 389-399.
- Frymier, A. B. (1993). The impact of teacher immediacy on student's motivation: Is it the same for all students? Communication Quarterly, 41, 454-464.
- Frymier, A. B. (1994). A model of immediacy in the classroom. Communication Quarterly, 42, 133-144.
- Gorham, J., Kelley, D. H., & McCroskey, J. C. (1989). The affinity-seeking of classroom teachers: A second perspective. Communication Quarterly, 37, 16-26.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., & Burroughs, N. F. (1991) An attributional analysis of college students resistance decisions. Communication Education, 40, 325-342.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Hays, E. R., & Ivey, M. J. (1991). College teacher misbehaviors: What students don't like about what teachers say and do. Communication Quarterly, 39, 309-324.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Smith, V. R. & Sorensen, G. (1988). Effects of teacher immediacy and strategy type on college student resistance to on-task demands. Communication Education, 37, 54-67.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., & Wendt-Wasco, N. J. (1985). Teacher immediacy for affective learning in divergent college classes. Communication Quarterly, 33, 61-74.

McCroskey, J. C. & McCroskey, L. L. (1986). The affinity seeking of classroom teachers. Communication Research Reports, 3, 158-167.

McCroskey, J. C. & Young, T. J. (1981). Ethos and credibility: The construct and its measurement after three decades. Central States Speech Journal, 32, 24-24.

McCroskey, J.C.& Wheelless, L. R. (1976). Introduction to human communication. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Mehrabian, A. (1969). Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. Behavioral Research Methods and Instruments, 1, 213-217.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. Communication Education, 35, 43-55.

Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. Communication Education, 39, 181-195.

Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.) Communication Yearbook 10, (pp. 574-590). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Richmond, V. P. & McCroskey J. C. (Eds.) (1992). Power in the classroom: Communication, control and concern (pp. 101-119). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., Plax, T. G., & Kearney P. (1986). Teacher nonverbal immediacy training and student affect. World Communication, 15, 181-194.

Roach, K. D. The influence and effects of gender and status on university instructor affinity-seeking behavior. Southern Communication Journal, 57, 73-80.

Teven, J. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation. Communication Education, 46, 1-9.

Thweatt, K. T. & McCroskey, J. C. (1996). Teacher Nonimmediacy and Misbehavior: Unintentional Negative Communication. Communication Research Reports, 13, 2, 198-204.

Thomas, C. E., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1994). The association between immediacy and socio-communicative style. Communication Research Reports, 11, 107-115.

Wheless, L. R. (1971). The effects of comprehension loss on persuasion. Speech Monographs, 38, 327-330.

Wheless, L. R. (1974). The relationship of attitude and credibility to comprehension and selective exposure. Western Speech, 38, 88-97. (a)

Wheless, L. R. (1974). The effects of attitude, credibility, and homophily on selective exposure to information. Speech Monographs, 41, 329-328. (b)

Wheless, L. R. (1975). Relationship of four elements to immediate recall and student-instructor interaction. Speech Monographs, 39, 131-140.

Appendix A

Affinity Seeking Typology

Altruism. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her tries to be of help and assistance to the student in whatever he/she is currently doing. For example, the person holds the door for the student, assists him/her with his/her studies, helps him/her get the needed materials for assignments, and helps run errands for the student. The teacher also gives advice when it is requested.

Assume Control. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as a leader, a person who has control over his/her classroom. For example, he/she directs the conversations held by students, takes charge of the classroom activities the two engage in, and mentions examples of where he/she has taken charge or served as a leader in the past.

Assume Equality. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as an equal of the other person. For example, he/she avoids appearing superior or snobbish, and does not play “one-upmanship” games.

Comfortable Self. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her acts comfortable with the student. He/she is relaxed, at ease, casual, and content. Distractions and disturbances in the environment are ignored. The teacher tries to look as if he/she is having a good time, even if he/she is not. The teacher gives the impression that “nothing bothers him/her.”

Concede Control. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her allows the student to control the relationship and situations surrounding the two. For example, he/she lets the student take charge of conversations and so on. The teacher attempting to be liked also lets the student influence his/her actions by not acting dominant.

Conversational Rule-Keeping. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her follows closely the culture’s rules for how people socialize with others by demonstrating cooperation, friendliness, and politeness. The teacher works hard at giving relevant answers to questions, saying the right thing, acting interested and involved in conversation, and adapting his/her messages to the particular student or situation. He/she avoids changing the topic too soon, interrupting the student, dominating classroom discussions, and making excessive self-references. The teacher using this strategy tries to avoid topics that are not of interest to his/her students.

Dynamism. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents him/herself as a dynamic, active, and enthusiastic person. For example, he/she acts physically animated and very lively while talking with the student, varies intonation and other vocal characteristics, and is outgoing and extroverted with the students.

Elicit other’s disclosures. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her encourages the student to talk by asking questions and reinforcing the student for talking. For example, the teacher inquires about the student’s interests, feelings, opinion, views, and so on. He/she responds as if these are important and interesting, and continues to ask more questions of the student.

Facilitate Enjoyment. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her seeks to make the situations in which the two are involved very enjoyable experiences. The

teacher does things the students will enjoy, is entertaining, tells jokes and interesting stories, talks about interesting topics, says funny things, and tries to make the classroom conducive to enjoyment. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her includes the student in his/her social activities and groups of friends. He/she introduces the student to his/her friends, and makes the student feel like “one of the group.”

Influence Perceptions of Closeness. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her engages in behaviors that lead the student to perceive the relationship as being closer and more established than it has actually been. For example, he/she uses nicknames of the students, talks about “we” rather than “I” or “you.” He/she also discusses any prior activities that included the student.

Listening. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her pays close attention to what the student says, listening very actively. They focus attention solely on the student, paying strict attention to what is said. Moreover, the teacher attempting to be liked demonstrates that he/she listens by being responsive to the student’s idea, asking for clarification of ambiguities, being open-minded, and remembering things the student says.

Nonverbal Immediacy. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her signals interest and liking through various nonverbal cues. For example, the teacher frequently makes eye contact, stands or sits close to the student, smiles, leans toward the student, uses frequent head nods, and directs gaze toward the student. All of the above indicate the teacher is very much interested in the student and what he/she has to say.

Openness. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her is open. He/she discloses information about his/her background, interests, and views. He/she may even disclose information about his/her background, interest, and views. He/she may even disclose very personal information about his/her insecurities, weaknesses, and fears to make the student feel special and trusted (e.g. “just between you and me”).

Optimism. The teacher attempting to get a student to like he/she presents self as a positive person – an optimist – so that he/she will appear to be a person who is pleasant to be around. He/she acts in a “happy-go-lucky” manner, is cheerful, and looks on the positive side of things. He/she avoids complaining about things, talking about depressing topics, and being critical of self and others.

Personal Autonomy. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as an independent, free-thinking person – the kind of person who stands on his/her own, speaks her/his mind regardless of the consequences, refuses to change her/his behavior to meet the expectation of others, and knows where he/she is going in life. For instance, if the teacher finds he/she disagrees with the student on some issue, the teacher states her/his opinion anyway, and is confident that her/his view is right, and may even try to change the mind of the student.

Physical Attractiveness. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her tries to look as attractive as possible in appearance and attire. He/she wears nice clothes, practices good grooming, shows concern for proper hygiene, stands up straight, and monitors appearance.

Present Interesting Self. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self to be a person who would be interesting to know. For example, he/she highlights past accomplishment and positive qualities, emphasizes things that make him/her especially interesting, expresses unique ideas, and demonstrates intelligence and knowledge. The

teacher may discretely drop the names of impressive people he/she knows. He/she may even do outlandish things to appear unpredictable, wild, or crazy.

Reward Association. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as an important figure who can reward the student for associating with him/her. For instance, he/she offers to do favors for the other, and gives the students information that would be valuable. The teacher's basic message to the student is "if you like me, you will gain something."

Self-Concept Confirmation. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her demonstrates respect for the student, helps the student feel good about how he/she views her/himself. For example, the teacher treats the student like a very important person, compliments the student, says only positive things about the student, and treats the things the student says as being very important information. He/she may also tell other teachers about what a great student the individual is, in hopes that the comment will get back to the student through third parties.

Self-Inclusion. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her sets up frequent encounters with the student. For example, the teacher will initiate casual encounters with the student, attempt to schedule future encounters, try to be physically close to the student, and puts him/herself in a position to be invited to participate in the student's social activities.

Sensitivity. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her acts in a warm, empathetic manner toward the student to communicate caring and concern. He/she also shows sympathy to the student's problems and anxieties, spends time working at understanding how the student sees her/his life, and accepts what the student says as an honest response. The message is "I care about you as a person."

Similarity. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her tries to make the student feel that the two of them are similar in attitudes, values, interests, preferences, personality, and so on. He/she expresses views that are similar to the views of the student, agrees with some things the student say, and points out the areas that the two have in common. Moreover, the teacher deliberately avoids engaging in behaviors that would suggest differences between the two.

Supportiveness. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her is supportive of the student and the student's positions by being encouraging, agreeable, and reinforcing to the student. The teacher also avoids criticizing the student or saying anything that might hurt the student's feelings, and sides with the student in disagreements he/she has with others.

Trustworthiness. The teacher attempting to get a student to like him/her presents self as trustworthy and reliable. For example, he/she emphasizes his/her responsibility, reliability, fairness, dedication, honesty, and sincerity. He/she also maintains consistency among her/his stated beliefs and behaviors, fulfills any commitments made to the student, and avoids "false fronts" by acting natural at all times.

Immediacy Behaviors

Leans Toward Students

Direct Eye Contact

Smiling

Gesturing

Faces Class Directly

Stands Near Students

Vocal Variety

Nods at Students

Walks Around the Classroom

Appendix B

Manipulations for Study One

Immediacy1/Affinity1/Appropriate1

You are taking a class with a teacher who smiles frequently, uses vocal variety and gestures. This teacher walks around the classroom, nods at students when they are speaking, and makes direct eye contact with students in the class. He/she tells jokes and interesting stories, talks about interesting topics, and says nice things. This teacher also introduces students to his/her friends when the occasion arises and makes the student feel like one of the group. Generally, he/she tries to make the classroom environment enjoyable and shows respect for students. He/she assigns a reasonable amount of homework, lectures in an organized manner, and is generally prepared for class.

Immediacy1/Affinity1/Inappropriate1

You are taking a class with a teacher who smiles frequently, uses vocal variety and gestures. This teacher walks around the classroom, nods at students when they are speaking, and makes direct eye contact with students in the class. He/she tells jokes and interesting stories, talks about interesting topics, and says nice things. This teacher also introduces students to his/her friends when the occasion arises and makes the student feel like one of the group. Generally, he/she tries to make the classroom environment enjoyable and shows respect for students. He/she assigns an unreasonable amount of homework, lectures in an unorganized manner, and does not follow the syllabus.

Immediacy1/Nonaffinity1/Appropriate1

You are taking a class with a teacher who smiles frequently, uses vocal variety and gestures. This teacher walks around the classroom, nods at students when they are speaking, and makes direct eye contact with students in the class. He/she rarely tells jokes or interesting stories and does not appear to make an effort to talk about interesting topics or say nice things. If the occasion arises, the teacher does not usually introduce students to his/her friends or display an effort to make the student feel like one of the group. Generally, the teacher is not concerned with how enjoyable the classroom environment is and behaves indifferently toward students. He/she assigns a reasonable amount of homework, lectures in an organized manner, and is generally prepared for class.

Immediacy1/Nonaffinity1/Inappropriate1

You are taking a class with a teacher who smiles frequently, uses vocal variety and gestures. This teacher walks around the classroom, nods at students when they are speaking, and makes direct eye contact with students in the class. He/she rarely tells jokes or interesting stories and does not appear to make an effort to talk about interesting topics or say nice things. If the occasion arises, the teacher does not usually introduce students to his/her friends or display an effort to make the student feel like one of the group. Generally, the teacher is not concerned with how enjoyable the classroom environment is and behaves indifferently toward students. He/she assigns an unreasonable amount of homework, lectures in an unorganized manner, and does not follow the syllabus.

NonImmediacy1/Affinity1/Appropriate1

You are taking a class with a teacher who lacks facial expression, has a monotone voice, and doesn't gesture. Moreover, this teacher stands behind the podium when lecturing, does not nod at students when they are speaking, and does not make direct eye contact with students in the class. He/she tells jokes and interesting stories, talks about interesting topics and says nice things. This teacher also introduces students to his/her friends when the occasion arises and makes the student feel like one the group. Generally, he/she tries to make the classroom environment enjoyable and shows respect for students. He/she assigns a reasonable amount of homework, lectures in an organized manner, and is generally prepared for class.

NonImmediacy1/Affinity1/Inappropriate1

You are taking a class with a teacher who lacks facial expression, has a monotone voice, and doesn't gesture. Moreover, this teacher stands behind the podium when lecturing, does not nod at students when they are speaking, and does not make direct eye contact with students in the class. He/she tells jokes and interesting stories, talks about interesting topics, and says nice things. This teacher also introduces students to his/her friends when the occasion arises and makes the student feel like one of the group. Generally, he/she tries to make the classroom environment enjoyable and shows respect for students. He/she assigns an unreasonable amount of homework, lectures in an unorganized manner, and does not follow the syllabus.

NonImmediacy1/Nonaffinity1/Appropriate1

You are taking a class with a teacher who lacks facial expression, has a monotone voice, and doesn't gesture. This teacher stands behind the podium when lecturing, does not nod at students when they are speaking, and does not make direct eye contact with students in the class. He/she rarely tells jokes or interesting stories and does not appear to make an effort to talk about interesting topics or say nice things. If the occasion arises, the teacher does not usually introduce students to his/her friends or display an effort to make the student feel like one of the group. Generally, the teacher is not concerned with how enjoyable the classroom environment is and behaves indifferently toward students. He/she assigns a reasonable amount of homework, lectures in an organized manner, and is generally prepared for class.

NonImmediacy1/Nonaffinity1/Inappropriate1

You are taking a class with a teacher who lacks facial expression, has a monotone voice, and doesn't gesture. This teacher stands behind the podium when lecturing, does not nod at students when they are speaking and does not make direct eye contact with students in the class. He/she rarely tells jokes or interesting stories and does not appear to make an effort to talk about interesting topics or say nice things. If the occasion arises, the teacher does not usually introduce students to his/her friends or display an effort to make the student feel like one of the group. Generally, the teacher is not concerned with how enjoyable the classroom environment is and behaves indifferently toward students. He/she assigns an unreasonable amount of homework, lectures in an unorganized manner, and does not follow the syllabus.

Manipulations for Study Two

Immediacy2/Affintiy2/Appropriate2

You are taking a class with a teacher who leans toward students when they are talking and frequently stands or sits near the students. This teacher looks at the class when teaching and faces the classroom directly when teaching. He/she shows a positive outlook on life, is pleasant to be around, and is generally cheerful. He/she avoids self-criticism, criticism of others, and complaining. This teacher also shows leadership in the classroom. He/she is usually on time for class, does not cancel class without notice, and is familiar with the subject matter.

Immediacy2/Affintiy2/Inappropriate2

You are taking a class with a teacher who leans toward students when they are talking and frequently stands or sits near the students. This teacher looks at the class when teaching and faces the classroom directly when teaching. He/she shows a positive outlook on life, is pleasant to be around, and is generally cheerful. He/she avoids self-criticism, criticism of others, and complaining. This teacher also shows leadership in the classroom. He/she is usually late for class, cancels class without notice, and does not know the subject matter.

Immediacy2/Nonaffintiy2/Appropriate2

You are taking a class with a teacher who leans toward students when they are talking and frequently stands or sits near the students. This teacher looks at the class when teaching and faces the classroom directly when teaching. He/she does not relate his/her outlook on life, is not necessarily unpleasant to be around, and generally does not display emotion. He/she occasionally criticizes him/herself and others and will complain on occasion. This teacher does not demonstrate leadership in the classroom. He/she is usually on time for class, does not cancel class without notice, and is familiar with the subject matter.

Immediacy2/Nonaffintiy2/Inappropriate2

You are taking a class with a teacher who leans toward students when they are talking and frequently stands or sits near the students. This teacher looks at the class when teaching and faces the classroom directly when teaching. He/she does not relate his/her outlook on life, is not necessarily unpleasant to be around, and generally does not display emotion. He/she occasionally criticizes him/herself and others and will complain on occasion. This teacher does not demonstrate leadership in the classroom. He/she is usually late for class, cancels class without notice, and does not know the subject matter.

NonImmediacy2/Affinity2/Appropriate2

You are taking a class with a teacher who leans away from students when they are talking and stands or sits at a distance from students. This teacher looks at the blackboard when teaching and generally does not face the classroom directly. He/she shows a positive outlook on life, is pleasant to be around, and is generally cheerful. He/she avoids self-criticism, criticism of others, and complaining. This teacher also shows leadership in the classroom. He/she is usually on time for class, does not cancel class without notice, and is familiar with the subject matter.

NonImmediacy2/Affinity2/Inappropriate2

You are taking a class with a teacher who leans away from students when they are talking and stands or sits at a distance from students. This teacher looks at the blackboard when teaching and generally does not face the classroom directly. He/she shows a positive outlook on life, is pleasant to be around, and is generally cheerful. He/she avoids self-criticism, criticism of others, and complaining. This teacher also shows leadership in the classroom. He/she is usually late for class, cancels class without notice, and does not know the subject matter.

NonImmediacy2/NonAffinity2/Appropriate2

You are taking a class with a teacher who leans away from students when they are talking and stands or sits at a distance from students. This teacher looks at the blackboard when teaching and generally does not face the classroom directly. He/she does not relate his/her outlook on life, is not necessarily unpleasant to be around, and generally does not display emotion. He/she occasionally criticizes him/herself and others and will complain on occasion. This teacher does not demonstrate leadership in the classroom. He/she is usually on time for class, does not cancel class without notice, and is familiar with the subject matter.

NonImmediacy2/NonAffinity2/Inappropriate2

You are taking a class with a teacher who leans away from students when they are talking and stands or sits at a distance from students. This teacher looks at the blackboard when teaching and generally does not face the classroom directly. He/she does not relate his/her outlook on life, is not necessarily unpleasant to be around, and generally does not display emotion. He/she occasionally criticizes him/herself and others and will complain on occasion. This teacher does not demonstrate leadership in the classroom. He/she is usually late for class, cancels class without notice, and does not know the subject matter.

Appendix C

Instruments

Credibility Scale

On the scales below please indicate your feelings about the instructor in this scenario. On the scales below, rate your perception of that teacher for each adjective pair. Please work quickly, there are no right or wrong answers.

Competence

Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unintelligent
Untrained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Trained
Expert	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inexpert
Competent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Incompetent
Stupid	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bright
Informed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninformed

Caring

Cares about me	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't care about me
Has my interest at heart	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't have my interest at heart
Insensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sensitive
Not understanding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Understanding
Unresponsive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Responsive
Understands How I feel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't Understand how I feel

Trustworthiness

Sinful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Virtuous
Dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Honest
Moral	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Immoral
High Character	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Low Character
Untrustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Trustworthy
Straight-forward	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Devious

Affect Scales

Affect toward Enrollment

My likelihood of enrolling in a class with this teacher, if I had a choice and if my schedule permitted:

Likely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unlikely
Impossible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possible
Probable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Improbable
Would not	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would

Affect Toward Teacher

My attitude toward the teacher in the description I just read:

Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
Worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Valuable
Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair
Positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Negative

Evaluation of Teacher Behavior

The teacher's behavior in this classroom is:

Appropriate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inappropriate
Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
Invaluable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Valuable
Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive

Appendix D

Manipulation Checks

Immediacy

Immediacy behaviors are those communication behaviors that reduce distance between people. Immediate behaviors may actually decrease the physical distance, or they may decrease the psychological distance. The more immediate a person is, the more likely he/she is to communicate at close distances, smile, engage in eye contact use direct body orientations, use overall body movement and gestures, touch others, relax, and be vocally expressive. In other words, we might say that an immediate person is perceived as overtly friendly and warm.

According to the description above, the teacher in the scenario is:

Very Immediate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very Nonimmediate
Unapproachable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Approachable

Affinity-Seeking Behavior

Affinity-seeking behaviors are those communication behaviors in which individuals engage to get other people to like and to feel positive toward them. The more an individual is trying to get others to like him/her, the more likely he/she is to communicate positivism, pleasantness, and inclusive behaviors. Also, the individual trying to get others to like him/her will do or say funny things and try to appear interesting.

According to the description above, the teacher in the scenario is:

Positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Negative
Unpleasant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Pleasant

Misbehavior

Teacher “misbehaviors” are defined as: “those behaviors that interfere with instruction and thus, learning” (Kearney et al., 1991).

By this definition, this teacher misbehaves:

Never	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Very often
Frequently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Seldom

Table One
Means for Main Effects of Manipulation Checks

Study One					
Dependent Variable	Independent Variable/Levels		F	p	V.A.
	Immediacy				
	High	Low			
Immediacy	9.69	5.61	375.36	.0001	.27
Affinity-Seeking	10.12	5.19	544.58	.0001	.39
Misbehavior	7.78	7.52	1.45	.1853	
	Affinity-Seeking				
	Yes	No			
Immediacy	9.99	7.20	111.06	.0001	.11
Affinity-Seeking	11.27	5.92	408.95	.0001	.41
Misbehavior	8.71	8.49	000.64	.4236	
	Misbehavior				
	Yes	No			
Immediacy	6.46	8.88	56.34	.0001	.10
Affinity-Seeking	7.46	7.87	1.61	.2050	
Misbehavior	6.47	8.86	54.67	.0001	.10

Study Two

Dependent Variable	Independent Variable/Levels		F	p	V.A.
	Immediacy				
	High	Low			
Immediacy	10.04	5.84	300.71	.0001	.33
Affinity-Seeking	9.48	6.40	161.69	.0001	.18
Misbehavior	8.26	7.62	6.87	.009	.01
	Affinity-Seeking				
	Yes	No			
Immediacy	9.92	7.70	67.74	.0001	.09
Affinity Seeking	10.86	6.76	231.28	.0001	.31
Misbehavior	9.04	8.58	2.96	.08	
	Misbehavior				
	Yes	No			
Immediacy	7.42	9.26	33.76	.0001	.06
Affinity-Seeking	7.83	8.85	10.34	.0014	.02
Misbehavior	6.83	9.85	91.74	.0001	.16

Table Two
Means for Interaction Effects for Manipulation Checks

Dependent Variable	Study No.	Manipulation Checks				F	p	V.A.
		Low Immediacy		High Immediacy				
		No Misbehavior	Misbehavior	No Misbehavior	Misbehavior			
Misbehavior	1	8.03 _a	9.73 _{abc}	4.93 _{abc}	7.99 _{bc}	4.42	.04	.01
Misbehavior	2	7.87	10.64	5.79	9.06	.64	.42	

Dependent Variable	Study No.	Low Immediacy		High Immediacy		F	p	V.A.
		A.S	Non A..S.	A.S.	Non A.S.			
Immediacy	1	7.93	3.29	12.30	7.10	1.76	.19	
Immediacy	2	7.07 _{abc}	4.62 _{abc}	11.89 _{abc}	8.19 _{abc}	6.71	.01	.01

Note: Means with the same subscript on the same dependent variable are significantly different at (at least) the .05 level.

Table Three
Means for Main Effects for Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	Study #	Immediacy		F	p	V.A.
		High	Low			
Competence	1	30.74	26.61	46.08	.0001	.08
	2	28.39	24.57	36.55	.0001	.05
Caring	1	25.97	18.79	116.78	.0001	.12
	2	26.78	18.68	162.68	.0001	.21
Trustworthiness	1	29.66	26.02	42.43	.0001	.07
	2	28.36	25.52	27.61	.0001	.05
Desire to Enroll	1	16.99	10.87	113.19	.0001	.14
	2	18.68	11.66	128.65	.0001	.19
Attitude Toward Teacher	1	18.23	13.14	115.52	.0001	.14
	2	18.39	13.74	80.27	.0001	.12
Evaluation of Teacher Behavior	1	18.88	12.01	187.42	.0001	.22
	2	18.20	11.98	132.32	.0001	.18

Table Four
Means for Main Effects for Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	Study #	Affinity-Seeking		F	p	V.A.
		Engaging	Not Engaging			
Competence	1	29.71	27.64	11.48	.0008	.02
	2	28.12	24.84	27.07	.0001	.04
Caring	1	28.57	16.19	347.65	.0001	.37
	2	26.74	18.72	159.86	.0001	.20
Trustworthiness	1	29.87	25.81	53.01	.0001	.09
	2	28.84	25.03	49.77	.0001	.08
Desire to Enroll	1	17.26	10.60	133.56	.0001	.17
	2	17.94	12.41	79.80	.0001	.12
Attitude Toward Teacher	1	19.05	12.32	203.02	.0001	.24
	2	18.56	13.57	92.56	.0001	.14
Evaluation of Teacher Behavior	1	18.46	12.43	144.47	.0001	.17
	2	17.32	12.86	68.06	.0001	.09

Table Five
Means for Main Effects for Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	Study #	Misbehaviors		F	p	V.A.
		Not Engaging	Engaging			
Competence	1	30.75	26.59	46.79	.0001	.08
	2	30.52	22.44	163.84	.0001	.24
Caring	1	23.16	21.59	5.59	.02	.01
	2	23.90	21.55	13.71	.0002	.02
Trustworthiness	1	29.21	26.47	24.20	.0001	.04
	2	29.12	24.75	65.46	.0001	.11
Desire to Enroll	1	15.81	12.05	42.65	.0001	.05
	2	16.73	13.62	25.25	.0001	.04
Attitude Toward Teacher	1	17.24	14.13	43.00	.0001	.05
	2	17.87	14.27	48.22	.0001	.07
Evaluation of Teacher Behavior	1	16.92	13.97	34.68	.0001	.04
	2	17.34	12.85	68.91	.0001	.10

Table Six
Means for Interaction Effects for Immediacy and Affinity-Seeking

Dependent Variable	Study No.	Low Immediacy		High Immediacy		F	p	V.A.
		Non-A.S	A.S	Non-A.S.	A.S.			
Caring	1	13.62 _{abc}	23.95 _{abc}	18.74 _{abc}	33.19 _{abc}	9.67	.002	.01
Caring	2	15.08	22.28	22.34	31.24	1.72	.19	

Note: Means with the same subscript on the same dependent variable are significantly different at (at least) the .05 level.

Table Seven
Means for Interaction Effects for Immediacy and Misbehavior

Dependent Variable	Study No.	Low Immediacy		High Immediacy		F	p	V.A
		No Misbehavior	Misbehavior	No Misbehavior	Misbehavior			
Competence	1	27.94 _{bc}	25.27 _{ca}	33.58 _{abc}	27.90 _a	6.13	.01	.01
Competence	2	28.44	20.70	32.61	24.17	.31	.57	
Trustworthiness	1	27.31	24.73	31.12	28.20	.09	.76	
Trustworthiness	2	27.14 _{bc}	23.92 _{ca}	31.11 _{abc}	25.61 _a	4.40	.04	
Affect Toward	1	11.55 _b	10.18 _c	20.07 _{abc}	13.92 _{abc}	17.16	.0001	.02
Enrollment	2	12.99	10.33	20.47	16.90	.53	.46	
Attitude Toward	1	14.05 _{abc}	12.24 _{abc}	20.42 _{abc}	16.03 _{abc}	7.45	.007	.01
Teacher	2	14.84 _{bc}	12.64 _{ac}	20.89 _{abc}	15.89 _a	7.30	.007	.01
Evaluation of	1	12.54 _b	11.48 _c	21.29 _{abc}	16.45 _{abc}	14.25	.0002	.02
Teacher	2	13.88	10.09	20.79	15.62 ₁	.61	.2055	

Note: Means with the same subscript on the same dependent variable are significantly different at (at least) the .05 level.

Table Eight
Means for Interaction Effects for Affinity-Seeking and Misbehaviors

Dependent Variable	Study No.	NonAffinity-Seeking		Affinity-Seeking		F	p	V.A
		No Misbehavior	Misbehavior	No Misbehavior	Misbehavior			
Competence	1	29.06 _{ac}	26.21 _c	32.44 _{abc}	26.96 _a	4.64	.03	.01
	2	28.62	21.05	32.42	23.83	.64	.4235	
Affect Toward Enrollment	1	11.13 _b	10.08 _c	20.94 _{abc}	14.02 _{abc}	22.13	.0001	.03
	2	13.19 _b	11.62 _c	20.27 _{abc}	15.61 _{abc}	6.20	.01	.01
Attitude Toward Teacher	1	12.92 _b	11.71 _c	21.55 _{abc}	16.55 _{abc}	15.96	.0001	.02
	2	14.72 _{bc}	12.42 _{ac}	21.02 _{abc}	16.11 _a	6.30	.01	.01
Evaluation of Teacher Behavior	1	13.41	11.46	20.43	16.48	4.03	.05	
	2	14.46 _{bc}	11.27 _{ca}	20.22 _{abc}	14.43 _a	5.77	.01	.01

Note: Means with the same subscript on the same dependent variable are significantly different at (at least) the .05 level.

Table Nine
Means for Interaction of Immediacy, Affinity-Seeking, and Misbehaviors

Dependent Variables		Independent Variables								F	p	V.A.
		1,1,1	1,1,2	1,2,1	1,2,2	2,1,1	2,1,2	2,2,1	2,2,2			
Caring	1	34.32	32.07	19.41	18.07	25.00	22.90	13.92	13.33	.05	.8233	
	2	33.91 _a	28.50 _{abc}	22.48 _{bfg}	22.21 _{cfg}	22.81 _{dfg}	21.74 _{efg}	16.41 _{abc}	13.76 _{abcdefg}	7.0	.01	.01
Trustworthiness	1	33.70 _{bcd}	30.32 _{defg}	28.53	26.09	29.46	26.02	25.17 _{defg}	23.44	.12	.7312	
	2	33.47 _a		28.74 _{bce}	24.02 _{cde}	28.26 _{dfg}	26.45 _{eg}	26.02 _{fg}	21.36 _{abcdefg}	4.15	.04	.01

Note: Means with the same subscript on the same dependent variable are significantly different at (at least) the .05 level.

- 1,1,1 High Immediacy, Affinity-Seeking, No Misbehavior
- 1,1,2 High Immediacy, Affinity-Seeking, Misbehavior
- 1,2,1 High Immediacy, NonAffinity-Seeking, No Misbehavior
- 1,2,2 High Immediacy, NonAffinity-Seeking, Misbehavior
- 2,1,1 Low Immediacy, Affinity-Seeking, No Misbehavior
- 2,1,2 Low Immediacy, Affinity-Seeking, Misbehavior
- 2,2,1 Low Immediacy, NonAffinity-Seeking, No Misbehavior
- 2,2,2 Low Immediacy, NonAffinity-Seeking, Misbehavior