Testing the neutralizing effects of nonverbal teacher immediacy cues on offensive teacher misbehaviors in higher education classrooms

Claudia Esther Martinez
University of Texas-Pan American

TESTING THE NEUTRALIZING EFFECTS OF NONVERBAL TEACHER IMMEDIACY

CUES ON OFFENSIVE TEACHER MISBEHAVIORS IN

HIGHER EDUCATION CLASSROOMS

A Thesis

by

CLAUDIA ESTHER MARTINEZ

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Texas-Pan American
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

December 2010

Major Subject: Communication Studies

TESTING THE NEUTRALIZING EFFECTS OF NONVERBAL TEACHER IMMEDIACY

CUES ON OFFENSIVE TEACHER MISBEHAVIORS IN

HIGHER EDUCATION CLASSROOMS

A Thesis
by
CLAUIDA ESTHER MARTINEZ

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Dr. Jessica Parker-Raley
Chair of Committee

Dr. Timothy Mottet
Committee Member

Dr. Dora Saavedra
Committee Member

December 2010

ABSTRACT

Martinez, Claudia E., <u>Testing the Neutralizing Effects of Nonverbal Teacher Immediacy Cues on</u>

<u>Offensive Teacher Misbehaviors in Higher Education Classrooms</u>. Master of Arts (MA),

December, 2010, 66 pp., 3 tables, references, 87 titles.

The purpose of this study was to determine if the use of nonverbal teacher immediacy

cues can neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on student

perceptions of teacher credibility, affective learning, and motivation. The sample included a total

of 140 participants enrolled in various undergraduate communication and theater courses from a

southwestern university. Three one-way ANOVA tests were conducted to test the three

hypotheses which proposed that nonverbal teacher immediacy cues may neutralize the negative

impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on students' perception of teacher credibility,

affective learning, and motivation. Ultimately, findings revealed that teacher immediacy

behaviors might not have the power to override the negative effects caused by offensive teacher

misbehaviors on overall student perceptions of teacher credibility. However, findings suggested

that an offensive teacher who uses nonverbal immediacy cues in their college classroom may still

be able to positively impact student affective learning and motivation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge and thank my knowledgeable advisors and loving family, for they made my success possible. First, I would like to thank Dr. Raley for her unconditional help, patience, and friendship. With her I have learned to be a better student, researcher, and I have learned to better manage my time. Much thanks to Dr. Saavedra, for you ingrained in me the idea that I was graduate school material; being the first college graduate in my family I did not think that breaking the boundary was possible. To Dr. Mottet because through him I am able to understand that in order to produce high quality graduates we must not lower our standards and expectations.

Secondly, I would like to thank my family and friends. To my parents, Elizabeth, Jose Manuel, Mary, Sandra, Brisa Martinez, who have always believed in my abilities and encouraged me to pursue more than what meets the eye. To my daughter and husband, Emmy and Martin Cerda, thank you for your patience and unconditional love. To my grandparents, Petra and Florencio Gonzalez, because I know that they have always been proud of my achievements. Lastly, to my family-in-law and friends thank you for the occasional words of encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION & RATIONALE

In 2008 the nation lost 3.1 million jobs followed by an estimated loss of 4 million jobs in

2009 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2010; Wolf, 2009). Since the collapse of the nation's

economy, which began in December of 2007, the number of unemployed Americans has reached

its highest in 26 years, with a national unemployment rate of 10.2 % (Mason-Draffen, 2009).

According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010), layoffs and discharges are the largest

contributors to the economic struggles Americans are currently facing.

Given the current economic situation, more people are going back to college (Foderaro,

2009; Jordan, 2009). Americans are returning to college because they have been laid off or wish

to protect themselves from losing their current employment positions (Foderaro, 2009; Spencer,

2009). In 2008, immediately following high school completion 69% of graduates enrolled in

either a 2- or 4-year college (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). As a result,

Universities have reported increases in student enrollment throughout the nation. For example,

thirteen Minnesota State Colleges and Universities reported a 10% increase for the Fall of 2009

(Spencer, 2009) and thousands of potential college students in New York were denied

acceptance to universities because New York City's community colleges were forced to abandon

their all-welcome admissions policy due to large enrollment increases (Foderaro, 2009, p.27).

Further, South Texas College of the Rio Grade Valley reported enrollment increases of 23% over the Fall 2008 semester (STC, 2009). In addition, enrollments of three public colleges in Rhode Island hit a record high for the fall of 2009, with 43,412 students attending the University of Rhode Island, Rhode Island College and the Community College of Rhode Island (Jordan, 2009). Finally, by the year 2019 it is projected that undergraduate enrollment will be 19 million students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010).

Although an increase in college graduates may lead to better employment opportunities or job security for Americans, it may be added stress for college teachers. Colleges are being pressured to make room for more students but are not given adequate funding to hire new professors due to budget cutbacks across the nation. Thirty one states made midyear budget cuts for the fiscal year ending in June 2009 and at least 28 states proposed a budget cut for the fiscal year proceeding June 2009 (De Vise, 2009). Specifically, Florida's Community Colleges were advised by the governor's budget office to anticipate 4 to 10 percent cut from base funding for the 2009-2010 budget year (Holden, Johnson & Stephenson, 2009). This budget cut was anticipated along with the combined enrollment of over 76,000 students for the 2009-2010 school year (Holden et al., 2009). In addition, because state funding for higher education is eroding in Maryland, The University of Maryland Baltimore County cut positions and froze eight faculty positions (De Vise, 2009). Furthermore, Governor Rick Perry requested that state agencies of Texas: "Submit a plan to identify savings in priority increments totaling 5 percent of the general revenue-dedicated appropriations for the 2010-2011 biennium" (Perry, Dewhurst & Straus, 2010. In short, college enrollment has dramatically increased around the nation however proper funding to support this sudden increase in enrollment has declined.

Consequently, college teachers are pressured to teach more courses at larger capacities to accommodate the sudden increase in student enrollment and the lack of funds available to hire more university teachers. For example, Winston-Salem State University in North Carolina asked faculty to teach extra courses after an increase in enrollment that topped the 2005 enrollment by hundreds (Marklein, 2008). Full-time faculty members of Montgomery County's college in Philadelphia taught extra courses without compensation for the 2009 fall semester after a 24% enrollment increase and classes are loaded to capacity (Snyder, 2009). Bucks County Community College enlisted full-timers to teach more courses after enrollment increased (Snyder, 2009).

When professors are asked to teach several courses with large amounts of students, they are obligated to spend more time teaching, mentoring, preparing for class, and grading. Taken together, these demands eventually wear down teachers and lead to teacher burnout (Miller, Stiff, & Ellis, 1988). Teacher burnout is a condition characterized by emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a loss of personal accomplishment (Shields-Kole, Goldberg & Hutchinson, 1983). Teacher burnout can be defined as feeling overwhelmed, frustrated, angry and cynical (Avtgis & Rancer, 2008). Behaviors associated with teacher burnout include being absent from school, experiencing alcoholism, and/or personal health problems (i.e. ulcers, headaches, depression and high blood pressure), feeling detached from teaching, using nonimmediate language or incongruent communication with students, or even experiencing laziness (Shields-Kole et al., 1983). Ultimately, University budget cutbacks have led to an increase in the demands placed on teacher and teacher burnout.

Teacher burnout is problematic because teachers who are overworked and exhausted are more prone to commit offensive teacher misbehaviors such as yelling, name calling, cursing, or

3

embarrassing students in the classroom (Avtgis & Rancer, 2008; Teven, 2007c;). For example, Avtgis & Rancer (2008) investigated the relationship between verbal aggressiveness and teacher burnout concluding that teachers' levels of verbal aggressiveness were related to their reports of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment. "Teachers experiencing negative emotions at work and who have lost interest in their jobs may be less caring and experience emotional exhaustion" (Teven, 2007c, p. 385). In addition, when teachers experience burnout, they may harbor negative attitudes toward work and students and even dehumanize their students (Teven, 2007c). Ultimately, when a teacher is a victim of teacher burnout, he or she might have a tendency towards verbal aggression. In short, teacher burnout may lead to offensive teacher misbehaviors.

While many professors can relate to the teacher burnout that college instructors are experiencing, there is another group of scholars who claim that college instructors have light teaching loads and few responsibilities. This group of scholars believes that the American higher education system has lost sight of its primary mission (Hacker & Dreifus, 2010). Since the late 90's, higher education teachers have been scrutinized for their dedication to research. Some claiming that such dedication is an effort to "fob off" their commitment to teaching and that such research is "essentially worthless and only busywork" (Kelly, 1990, p. 4D). However, according to Mottet , Parker-Raley, Beebe & Cunningham (2007), regardless of the escalating expectations for research productivity, some higher education teachers have managed to resist the "college lite". This means that regardless of all the mentioned research responsibilities some college professors have managed to retain high standards for teaching. Specifically, many higher education instructors produce quality research in addition to teaching three to four well organized and challenging courses a semester. While some professors may have light teaching

loads, the majority of higher education instructors are experiencing increased teaching demands due to college enrollment increases and budget cuts.

Hence, it is important to examine offensive teacher misbehaviors that may occur in the classroom due to teacher burnout. It is necessary to redirect the negative energy surrounding higher education and focus on what behaviors teachers can use in their classrooms if they happen to offend their students. In short, focusing on the college instructors who are not committed to quality teaching does not offer many benefits, however examining how negative teacher classroom behaviors may be neutralized or minimized can provide important feedback for college instructors who may one day offend students in their classrooms.

College instructors who are experiencing teacher burnout may be prone to committing offensive teacher misbehaviors such as yelling, name calling, cursing, or embarrassing students in their classrooms (Avtgis & Rancer, 2008; Teven, 2007c). This type of behavior is problematic for three reasons. First, offensive teacher misbehaviors lead to decreases in students' perceptions of teacher credibility (Banfield, Richmond & McCroskey, 2006). "Attacking students personally is unlikely to build or sustain any level of student/ teacher trust" (Banfield et al., 2006, p. 70). More importantly, when a teacher attacks a student personally, he or she has minimal impact on the student (McCroskey, 1971). Second, when college students are offended by their teachers, they report lower levels of affective learning (Banfield et al., 2006; Goodboy & Bolkan, 2009). For example, according to Goodboy & Bolkan (2009), students who dislike their teacher often dislike the course material and are less willing to participate in class which further interferes with affective learning. Third, Delfabbro, Winefield, Trainor, Dollard, Anderson, Metzer & Hammarstrom (2006), note that students who get along poorly with, and are bullied by their teachers, are less motivated to learn. In addition, Goodboy & Bolkan (2009) report that students

5

who interact in a hostile environment lack the confidence to offer comments, questions, or suggestions, which, in turn, impacts the student's motivation to learn. Thus, students who are offended by their teachers are less likely to study, read, or take notes during class. Taken together, offensive teacher misbehaviors interfere with effective teaching and learning.

Due to the increase in college enrollment throughout the nation, it is inevitable that a number of college teachers may experience higher teaching demands and teacher burnout. As a result, burned out professors may be more prone to commit offensive teacher misbehaviors in their classrooms. Thus, it is important to understand how teachers can minimize the negative impact offensive teacher misbehaviors may have on students' perceptions of instructor credibility, affective learning, and motivation to learn.

Thweatt and McCroskey (1998) reported that teachers who commit moderate teacher misbehaviors such as assigning excessive homework or delivering boring or unclear lectures can protect their credibility in the classroom be remaining nonverbally immediate. Specifically, teachers who smile frequently, use vocal variety, gestures, and movement are seen as more credible than teachers who refrain from using immediacy misbehaviors even when they commit teacher misbehaviors. In other words, teacher immediacy tends to soften or neutralize the negative impact of moderate teacher misbehaviors on students' perceptions of teacher credibility. As such, teachers who occasionally commit moderate misbehaviors can preserve their credibility in the classroom.

Although Thweatt and McCroskey (1998) found that teacher immediacy can neutralize the negative impact of moderate teacher misbehaviors, researchers have yet to determine if teacher immediacy can soften or neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on students perceptions' of teacher credibility. In addition, scholars have

failed to discover how teachers who commit offensive misbehaviors may preserve student affective learning and motivation to learn in their classrooms. Therefore, the goal of this study was to examine if teacher immediacy can neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on students' perceptions of teacher credibility, student affective learning, and student motivation.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher Misbehaviors

Student misbehaviors in the classroom occur frequently even at the college level. Student misbehaviors may arise due to a number of reasons such as low motivation to learn, laziness, socioeconomic backgrounds, and personal problems. Many times students are not even aware that their behaviors are inappropriate for the classroom environment (McCroskey, Richmond, & McCroskey, 2006). However, student misbehaviors are not the only problems that interfere with learning in college classrooms. College teachers are also capable of engaging in teacher misbehaviors.

Kearney, Plax, Hays & Ivey (1991) were among the first scholars to investigate how teachers misbehave in college classrooms rather than focusing on student misbehaviors. Specifically, Kearney et al. (1991) focused on what teachers "say and do" that create instructional and/or motivational problems in the classroom. First, Kearney et al. (1991) obtained students' reports of teacher misbehaviors. Students identified 28 different categories of teacher misbehaviors. Next, Kearney and colleagues (1991) proceeded with a second study which revealed that the 28 previously identified teacher misbehavior categories that could meaningfully

and reliably be reduced to three factors of teacher misbehaviors which included incompetence, indolence, and offensiveness.

Incompetent teacher misbehaviors.

The profile of incompetent teacher misbehaviors reflects a lack of teaching skills (Kearney et al., 1991). Incompetence is the act of engaging in behaviors that indicate to the student that the teacher does not care about the student or the course. For example, a teacher who assigns excessive work and rushes through lectures as a means to get everything done is viewed as engaging in the misbehavior of incompetence (Kearney et al., 1991). "The profile of incompetence is extended further to those teachers who are unenthused about material, speak in a monotone, enunciate poorly (or speak with a difficult to understand foreign or regional accent), and talk too loudly (or softly)" (Kearney et al., 1991). Furthermore, students claimed that incompetent teachers are unable to answer questions in the classroom, provide incorrect information that demonstrates their lack of knowledge in the subject area, and even present vague and confusing lectures where they contradict themselves or fail to communicate effectively.

Indolent teacher misbehaviors.

Aside from incompetent teacher misbehaviors, indolent teachers are also distracting and disappointing to students. Teachers who engage in indolent misbehaviors are absentminded, miss class, arrive late, and forget test dates or due dates (McCroskey et al., 2006; Thweatt et al., 1998). For example, an indolent teacher may fail to show up for class or arrive late for class, and if he or she is late, the excuse offered for their behavior is poor. Indolent teachers may also return papers and exams late. Teachers who are categorized as indolent may also forget test dates and fail to collect or grade homework (Kearney et al. 1991). Furthermore, in a study conducted by

Kearney et al (1991) students complained that indolent teachers underwhelmed them with information by making tests and class too easy. Thus, students did not feel they learned as much as they should have from indolent teachers.

Offensive teacher misbehaviors.

Although students complained about incompetent and indolent teachers, they were the most impacted by offensive teacher misbehaviors (Banfield et al., 2006). Teachers who engage in offensive misbehaviors are classified as mean, cruel, and/or ugly (Kearney et al., 1991). Students complained that offensive teachers engaged in sexual harassment, prejudice, sarcasm, verbal abuse, and were often unreasonable, rude, self-centered and moody.

Furthermore, researchers have also reported that offensive teachers publicly humiliate, insult, and embarrass students, and they may even use profanity, become angry, yell, or scream as a means of intimidating students. McPherson, Kearney, & Plax (2003) claimed that while the feeling of anger is a normal feeling that teacher's experience, it is the way in which anger is expressed that can have a positive or negative outcome in the classroom. Aside from public displays of anger and aggression, teachers are also classified as offensive when they make chauvinistic or sexual remarks and/or flirt with students (Kearney et al. 1991). Lastly, teachers are also considered offensive when they play favorites or punish the whole class for one student's infraction.

In sum, indolent, incompetent, and offensive teacher misbehaviors all negatively impact student learning, however students agree that offensive teacher misbehaviors are the most disturbing and hurtful. In general, students are offended when their instructors humiliate, embarrass, or insult them (Banfield, Richmond, & McCroskey, 2006). Such offensive teacher misbehaviors damage the overall classroom environment and interfere with learning (Kearney et

al., 1991; Myers & Rocca, 2001; Rocca, 2002). Furthermore, teachers who engage in verbally aggressive messages such as humiliation or embarrassment are perceived as unsupportive and unapproachable. As a result, offensive teachers create a defensive classroom climate that stifles student participation, motivation, and learning (Myers & Rocca, 2001). Lastly, Rocca (2004) suggested that an inverses relationship exists between student perceptions of teacher verbal aggression and student attendance. Consequently, the more teachers offend students, the less likely students are to come to class.

To determine how often offensive misbehaviors are used in the college classroom, Myers & Knox (1999) asked college students to indicate how frequently behaviors such as: character attacks, competence attacks, background attacks, physical appearance attacks, teasing, ridicule, threats, swearing, and nonverbal emblems (i.e., gritting teeth, making snarling facial expressions), were being used by college teachers. Findings suggested that students perceived college teachers as rarely engaging in most of the verbally aggressive behaviors, however, the verbally aggressive messages identified most often were character attacks. Myers & Knox (1999) explained their findings by suggesting that students might not be paying attention to their teachers' communication. Although past research demonstrated that offensive teacher misbehaviors occur infrequently it is possible that currently teachers are offending students more often due to recent increases in teacher demands and teacher burnout. In addition, it is possible that incompetent and indolent teacher misbehaviors are occurring more frequently. For example, Kearney et al.,(1991) conducted a content-analysis of students' reports of specific instances in which their teacher misbehaved and reported the following as the most commonly cited types of misbehaviors: sarcasm, putdowns, early dismissal, straying from the subject, unfair testing,

boring lectures, unclear lectures, unresponsive to students' questions, foreign or regional accent, and unreasonable/ arbitrary rules.

Most of the research concerning teacher misbehaviors and the negative impact on student learning outcomes was conducted in the late 90's. Thus, researchers are already aware of the negative impact caused by the incompetent, indolent, and offensive teacher misbehaviors. However, few researchers have identified behaviors teachers can engage in to minimize or override the negative impact that misbehaviors have on students in their classrooms. Because teacher misbehaviors are occurring in college classrooms, it is important to explore how teachers who engage in incompetent, indolent, and offensive misbehaviors may minimize the negative impact these misbehaviors have on student learning outcomes.

The Negative Impact of Offensive Teacher Misbehaviors

Student perceived teacher credibility.

Although the three types of teacher misbehaviors negatively impact students perceptions of teacher credibility, offensive teacher misbehaviors have been found to negatively influence students' perceptions of teacher credibility the most (Banfield et al., 2006). Specifically, Banfield et al. (2006) examined the negative impact that teacher misbehaviors have on the three components of teacher credibility (i.e. caring, trustworthiness, and competence) and found that the offensive teacher was perceived to be the least caring and perceived to show the least concern for students' feelings. Additionally, Banfield et al. (2006) reported that offensive teacher misbehaviors reduce the level of trust between students and teachers. For example, when teachers use verbal aggression in the classroom such as student humiliation or character attacks students' perceptions of teacher credibility decrease (Schrodt, 2003a).

Students' perceptions of teacher credibility are important because they significantly influence student learning (Teven, 2007b). According to McCroskey (1971), "If you have credibility with an audience, you will influence that audience; if you do not have credibility with them, you tend to have a relatively minimal impact" (p. 24). Thus, the effectiveness of teacher messages are somewhat dependent on students' perceptions of source credibility (McCroskey, Holdridge, & Toom, 1974; McCroskey, & Teven, 1999).

In addition, students' perceptions of teacher credibility influence student affective learning (Pogue & Ah Yun, 2006). Affective learning is a type of learning which concerns students' attitudes, beliefs, and values towards the course content (McCroskey et al., 2006) and is consistent with teacher evaluation and course content (Myers, 2002). In a study conducted by Pogue & Ah Yun (2006) respondents associated higher levels of student affective learning with highly credible and less immediate teachers than with teachers who were perceived as highly immediate and less credible. Furthermore, students reported the greatest affective learning levels when exposed to highly immediate and credible teachers than with the less immediate and highly credible teacher (Pogue & Ah Yun, 2006). In short, student affect learning is greatest when teachers are perceived as highly credible and highly immediate.

Student affective learning.

Aside from negatively influencing students' perceptions of teacher credibility, offensive teacher misbehaviors have also been found to negatively influence student affective learning. In fact, offensive teacher misbehaviors negatively influence student affective learning more than indolent and incompetent teacher misbehaviors (Banfield et al., 2006). The affect domain of learning regards the student's attitudes, beliefs, and values toward the learned behavior, skill, subject, teacher or course (McCroskey et al., 2006). In other words, when students experience

some sort of liking for the teacher, course, and/or course content, the student will experience high levels of affective learning. Although some teachers may believe that it is not important for students to like them or their course, recent research suggests that the level of students' affect for their teachers and course content directly influence students' motivation to learn (Delfabbro et al., 2006).

Unfortunately, offensive teacher misbehaviors decrease students' affect for the teacher (Banfield et al., 2006) and the course (Myers, 2002; Myers & Knox, 2000). For instance, students are less willing to take a class with an offensive teacher and almost always evaluate them negatively (Banfield et al., 2006). According to McPherson, Kearney & Plax (2006) students who believed their teacher intentionally embarrassed them or other classmates, liked the teacher less and were less willing to enroll in another course with that teacher.

In addition, Myers & Knox (1999) recorded that teacher verbal aggression is negatively related to student affective learning. When teachers use verbally aggressive messages student affective learning may decrease. Furthermore, Schrodt (2003a) claimed that an inverse relationship exists between teacher verbal aggressiveness and student perceived understanding. This means that, when instructors engage in verbally aggressive behaviors, such as using insults to respond to student disagreements, losing their temper, yelling, screaming, and/ or poking fun at students, students are likely to feel a sense of misunderstanding. In short, when a teacher offends students they are more likely to misunderstand material and dislike the course and the instructor.

Aside, from negatively impacting students affect toward the teacher, offensive misbehaviors such as verbal aggression (i.e. character attack, ridicule, teasing) negatively impact the outcomes in student affect towards the course content (Myers, 2002; Myers & Knox, 2000).

Thus, when a teacher engages in verbal aggression in the classroom, students are more likely to form negative attitudes towards the course content. In short, when teachers commit offensive misbehaviors they reduce student affective learning in their classroom and, as a result, reduce student motivation.

Student motivation.

Aside from negatively influencing perceptions of teacher credibility and student affective learning (Banfield et al., 2006), offensive teacher misbehaviors also negatively impact student motivation (McPherson et al., 2006). Student motivation is a predisposition toward learning and it is stimulated by several educational factors (i.e., the teacher). In addition, Student motivation positively impacts learning outcomes (Pogue & Ah Yun, 2006). According to Pogue & Ah Yun (2006), students who are motivated to learn are more likely to be involved in the complex process of learning. In other words, student motivation is directly associated with dedication to learning.

To date, researchers have discovered that Student motivation is negatively impacted by many factors including offensive teacher misbehaviors. For example, Goodboy & Bolkan (2009) found that "When negative student emotions and feelings towards the teacher are created, student learning and motivation are endangered" (p. 215). Particularly, students who dislike their teacher while interacting in a hostile environment lack the confidence to offer comments, questions, or suggestions which in turn stifles their motivation in the classroom and prevents them from learning (Goodboy & Bolkan, 2009). Furthermore, Delfabbro et al. (2006) found that students who get along poorly with and are bullied by their teachers are less motivated to dedicate themselves to their studies.

In addition, Myers & Rocca (2001) reported that an inverse relationship exists between perceived teacher verbal aggressive acts (i.e., character attacks, background attacks, competence attacks, physical appearance attacks, malediction, teasing, ridicule, threats, swearing and nonverbal emblems) and student motivation. Also, Myers, Edwards, Wahl & Martin (2007), found a negative relationship between students' reports of teacher verbal aggressiveness and students willingness to communicate in and out of class. Even those students who are normally inclined to interact with their teacher might limit or eliminate interaction with verbally aggressive teachers. In short, students are less likely to establish a teacher-student relationship, seek more learning, showcase learning, and willingly communicate with verbally aggressive teachers. Therefore, student motivation is compromised when teachers engage in offensive teacher misbehaviors.

Thus far, researchers have investigated the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on students' perceptions of teacher credibility, student affective learning, and student motivation. What has not been studied is how teachers who commit an offensive misbehavior may be able to soften the blow or minimize students' negative perceptions of credibility, student affective learning and student motivation. In other words, researchers have yet to examine how teachers may neutralize the negative impact that results from offensive misbehaviors in the college classroom.

Neutralizing the Negative Impact of Offensive Teacher Misbehaviors

To address this gap in the literature, the present study attempted to discover if teachers can minimize the negative impact of offensive teacher misbehaviors by remaining nonverbally immediate in their classrooms. Specifically, the researcher set out to determine if teachers who

embarrass students can use nonverbal immediacy behaviors to neutralize the negative impact the offensive misbehaviors may have on students in their classroom.

Teacher immediacy behaviors.

Teachers may be able to commit an offensive misbehavior without diminishing credibility, student affective learning, and student motivation by routinely engaging in immediacy behaviors when interacting with their students. Immediacy behaviors are nonverbal or verbal communication behaviors that communicate liking, pleasure, and closeness (Mehrabian, 1972). When teachers use immediacy cues in their classrooms they are communicating feelings of liking, pleasure, and closeness to their students and, in turn, their students have a positive regard or liking for them. As such, teachers who use immediacy behaviors may be able to commit an offensive misbehavior in the classroom without completely diminishing their credibility and students' affective learning and student motivation.

"Immediacy behaviors have been primarily used to describe and understand the teacher-student relationship" (Frymier & Houser, 2000). Teacher immediacy behaviors can be displayed both verbally and nonverbally. McCroskey & McCroskey (1986) studied the extent to which different affinity-seeking strategies are used, concluding that one of the commonly used strategies was nonverbal immediacy. This means that a teacher might be able to increase influence and motivation by engaging in nonverbal immediacy behaviors as a strategy to develop a student-teacher relationship. The following nonverbal immediacy behaviors have been shown to enhance the teacher-student relationship: teacher appearance, gesture and movement, facial behavior, eye behavior, vocal behavior, and appropriate use of space, touch, environment, scent, and time (Frymier & Houser, 2000; Richmond, 2002; Thweatt & McCroskey, 1996).

17

Specifically, students perceive teachers who dress casually, smile, and maintain eye contact; as friendly, outgoing, receptive, flexible, and fair.

Conversely, students perceive teachers who refrain from using gestures and vocal variety as boring and stiff. In addition, teachers who hold an open body position are perceived by students as receptive and likable (Richmond, 2002). On the other hand, teachers who display dull facial expressions often fail to interest students in course content. Furthermore, teachers who display positive facial expressions and use positive head nods in response to students' comments are perceived as friendly and concerned about students. In short, nonverbal teacher immediacy behaviors are behaviors displayed by a teacher that if used appropriately, can prompt student perceptions of teacher friendliness, animation, closeness, and approachability.

Aside from students' perceptions of approachability and friendliness, the use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors in the classrooms often enhances students' perceptions of the teacher-student relationships. According to Watzlawick, Bavelas, & Jackson (1967), nonverbal messages convey emotional or relational aspect of communication; therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that immediacy behaviors work as a tool to create a teacher- student relationship. In addition, according to Frisby & Myers (2008) the use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors leads to increases in student perceptions of rapport.

It is important to enhance students' perceptions of the teacher-student relationship because "In order to maximize learning, it is essential for teachers to develop a good relationship with their students, because the rapport established between teachers and students, in part, determines the interest and performance level of the students" (Teven, 2001 p. 159). In other words it is important for a teacher to develop a relationship with his or her students because the bond developed between the teacher and the student partially determines the student's interest,

performance level, and maximizes student learning. According to McCroskey & McCroskey (1986), effective teaching in the classroom depends on how effective the teacher-student communication is. For example, Frymier & Houser (2000), found that a positive relationship between teacher and student facilitates student affective learning. In short, when students have favorable perceptions of the teacher-student relationship their affect for the teacher and course increases, and as a result, they are more motivated to learn. Ultimately, perceptions of the teacher-student relationship are enhanced when teachers engage in nonverbal immediacy cues. As such, students may be more willing to forgive immediate teachers who commit offensive misbehaviors because they believe they have a close relationship with that teacher.

Verbal teacher immediacy behaviors are often used in conjunction with nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Verbal immediacy behaviors include teachers' use of verbal communication to convey humor, praise, and an overall willingness to communicate and give feedback to students in and out of the classroom (Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Comadena, Hunt & Simonds, 2007; Frymier, Wanzer & Wojtaszczyk, 2008). Additionally, common forms of verbal immediacy include the following: teacher self-disclosure, the use of inclusive pronouns (i.e., "we", "us", "our"), asking student feedback concerning assignments, due dates, and course content (Gorham, 1988; Richmond , Lane & McCroskey., 2006, p. 170). According to Richmond (2002) one of the most important ways to convey verbal immediacy in a student-teacher relationship is to encourage students to communicate. For example, Richmond (2002) suggests the following comments, "I see what you mean; Tell me more, Please continue, That is a good idea, etc." Basically, a teacher would want to use comments that encourage student participation and feedback to establish immediacy. Additionally, calling or addressing an individual by the name they prefer is more likely to yield immediacy than calling them by something such as "Hey

you" (Richmond, 2002, 68). In sum, verbal immediacy behaviors evoke humor, student praise and participation, and provide opportunities for teacher disclosure.

Although immediacy is established by teachers using a combination of both verbal and nonverbal cues, in most cases, it is the nonverbal cues which are most important (Richmond, 2002). Nonverbal cues are essential to enhance students' perceptions of the teacher-student relationship. According to Richmond (2002), the reason why nonverbal behaviors are an important component in communication is because nonverbal messages have the capacity of existing independently of verbal behaviors but verbal messages are usually displayed in combination with various nonverbal behaviors. Thus, if a verbal immediacy messages is accompanied by a contradicting nonverbal immediacy message, receivers tend to disregard the verbal message and respond to the nonverbal message (Richmond, 2002).

Furthermore, teacher verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors that are used in the classroom serve two different primary functions. Verbal messages function to enhance student learning and participation through lecturing; while, the primary function of nonverbal behaviors is to increase student affect for the subject, teacher, class, and to enhance perceptions of the teacher-student relationship (Richmond et al., 2006). In short, teacher verbal behaviors practiced in the classroom, such as giving lecture or explaining the content of a course, merely serve to facilitate cognitive learning. However, it is through teacher nonverbal behaviors that student affective learning and student motivation is enhanced. Specifically, when teachers use nonverbal immediacy behaviors in their classrooms, students like their teachers more, and feel closer to them (Richmond, 2002). As a result, students like the course material more and are more motivated to complete assignments and participate in class. In other words, students' perceptions of the student-teacher relationship predicts the interest and performance level of students (Bell &

Daly, 1984). For example, a student is most likely to be influenced by his/ her teacher and dedicate more time on learning tasks if he or she has high affinity (e.g., liking, positive regard) for his/her teacher (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986). Thus, if students like their teacher they are more likely to feel positively influenced and motivated to learn.

In sum, immediacy behaviors work to decrease the actual physical distance or the psychological distance between students and teachers (Thweatt et al, 1996). In short, teachers can engage in nonverbal verbal immediacy behaviors to construct perceptions of closeness and approachability between themselves and their students. Ultimately, students feel closer to highly immediate teachers and, as a result, may be more forgiving if their teacher commits an occasional offensive misbehavior.

Although both verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors can be used to enhance student learning, the present study was designed to determine if nonverbal teacher immediacy behaviors may neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on students' perceptions of teacher credibility, student affective learning, and student motivation. Given that the use of teacher nonverbal immediacy behaviors have been shown to enhance student affective learning and motivation, the present study will strictly focus on the use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors in the classroom. Consequently, the researcher will examine if teachers who use nonverbal immediacy behaviors in the classroom but offend their students may experience less of a negative impact on students' perceptions of teacher credibility, student affective learning, and student motivation than teachers who offend students but refrain from engaging in nonverbal immediacy cues.

Maintaining student perceptions of teacher credibility.

Teachers may be able to commit an occasional offensive misbehavior without experiencing a loss of credibility by remaining immediate in their classroom. Thus far, researchers have found that high immediate individuals are perceived as more credible than low immediate individuals (Mottet et al., 2007; Thweatt et al., 1998 ;). Specifically, Mottet and colleagues (2007) examined the effects of a teacher's nonverbal immediacy behaviors and course-workload demands on students' perceptions of teacher credibility and student higher-order affective learning and concluded that immediate teachers preserved teacher credibility even when they violated student course workload expectations. In other words, immediate teacher who assigned a large course workload were perceived as more credible than the non-immediate teacher who assigned a large course workload.

Additionally, Teven (2007a) studied the impact of several variables (i.e., supervisor biological sex, power use, and nonverbal immediacy) on perceptions of the supervisors' credibility and concluded that supervisors are perceived as more credible if they attempt to be more nonverbally immediate. Given these findings, the following hypothesis is put forth:

H1: Teachers who use nonverbal immediacy behaviors and commit offensive teacher misbehaviors will be perceived as more credible than nonimmediate teachers who commit offensive teacher misbehaviors.

Maintaining student affective learning.

In addition to avoiding loss of credibility, teachers who commit the occasional offensive misbehavior may be able to avoid negatively influencing student affective learning by engaging in verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors when communicating with their students. Specifically, researchers have determined that immediacy behaviors have the potential to impact

22

student affective learning (Comadena et al. , 2007; Richmond, McCroskey, Plax & Kearney, 1986; Mottet et al., 2007). For example, Comadena et al. (2007) examined the effects of teacher clarity, teacher immediacy, and teacher caring on student motivation, student affective learning, and cognitive learning and concluded that individually teacher immediacy has the potential to increase student affective learning. However, it is important to point out the level (high or low) of teacher immediacy plays an important role in enhancing student affective learning (Comadena et al., 2007). In addition, some teacher behaviors might be more important than others, for example, teacher caring seems to have a role in affective leaning but not more than teacher immediacy (Comadena et al., 2007, p. 247).

Additionally, Richmond et al. (1986) examined whether training in nonverbal immediacy behaviors would generate student affective learning and found that teachers who were trained in nonverbal immediacy cues generated more student affective learning Specfically, students reported higher affective learning scores when they were taught by teachers who were trained to perform nonverbal immediate behaviors. Additionally, Mottet and colleagues (2007) concluded that high levels of teacher immediacy behaviors "preserved student perceptions of their affective learning, even when the teacher violated student expectations for course-workload demands" (p. 161). In addition students perceived that they better internalized the learning with a highly immediate teacher than with a teacher who was less immediate. In sum, teachers who engage in nonverbal immediacy behaviors positively influence student affective learning. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

> H2: Teachers who use nonverbal immediacy behaviors and commit offensive teacher
> misbehaviors will positively influence student affective learning more than teachers who
> do not use nonverbal immediacy behaviors and commit offensive teacher misbehaviors.

Maintaining student motivation.

Aside from avoiding diminished credibility and student affective learning, teachers who commit an offensive misbehavior may also avoid negatively impacting student motivation by engaging in routine immediacy behaviors when interacting with students (Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Comadena et al., 2007; Frymier, 1993). Past research suggests that student motivation can be positively impacted by teacher immediacy (Frymier, 1993). According to Christophel & Gorham (1995) positive behaviors (i.e. inspirational lectures, being student-centered, or being available) are central in motivating a student to learn while negative behaviors (i.e. being self-centered or being unavailable) are central in demotivating a student to learn.

Although a student's initial motivation (low/ high) to learn is found to be the biggest predictor of their motivation to learn during the semester, teacher immediacy behaviors do have an impact on students' state motivation to study (Frymier, 1993). These findings suggest that teacher nonverbal and verbal immediacy play an important role in students' motivation at mid-semester and at the end-of-the-semester. In addition, Frymier (1993) concluded that students who start the semester with low motivation but experience an immediate teacher will have higher levels of motivation during mid-semester or end-of-the-semester. Lastly, it is important to note that highly motivated students reported observing more immediate teachers (Christophel, 1990). Given this, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: Teachers who use nonverbal immediacy behaviors and commit offensive teacher misbehaviors will positively influence student motivation more than teachers who do not use nonverbal immediacy behaviors and commit offensive teacher misbehaviors

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter examines the methodology that was used to test the hypotheses. Specifically, this chapter will review participants, research design, procedures, and survey instrumentation. For a review of survey instrumentation please see Appendix A-D.

Participants

This study included a total of 140 (86 females, 54 males) participants enrolled in various undergraduate communication and theater courses from a southwestern university. Twenty-three participants were freshmen, 28 participants were sophomores, 52 were juniors, and 37 were seniors. Given the demographics of South Texas 89.3% ($n = 125$) of participants were Hispanic, while only 7.1% ($n = 10$) were white, 2.9% ($n = 4$) were black and only .7% ($n = 1$) labeled themselves as other. Both the immediate and the nonimmediate groups included a total of 70 participants, however, a total of 11 participants left some unanswered items. These unanswered items were labeled as missing data. In addition, all participants received extra credit from their respective teachers for their time and efforts.

Research Design

The present study used a posttest only experimental design to test three hypotheses. A communication laboratory was used to collect data in an attempt to eliminate the influence of

extraneous variables and to keep control over what participants were and were not exposed to. One independent variable and three dependent variables were used in the experiment. In addition, all participants were exposed to the offensive teacher misbehavior scenario. The independent variable was nonverbal teacher immediacy. This independent variable had two levels; the offensive nonimmediate teacher and the offensive immediate teacher. The three dependent variables were: student perceptions of teacher credibility, student affective learning and student motivation

Procedure

To determine if teacher immediacy behaviors can neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on perceived teacher credibility, student affective learning, and student motivation, participants' exposure to teacher immediacy was controlled (Frey, Botan & Kreps, 2000; Keyton, 2006). The first 70 participant who volunteered were assigned to the immediate group, while the second halve of students were assigned to the nonimmediate group. The immediate group watched video one which portrayed a teacher delivering a lecture using immediacy behaviors, while the nonimmediate group watched video two which depicted the same teacher delivering the same lecture without using immediacy behaviors.

Before respondents participated in the study they were told that they would be asked to watch a video, read a scenario, and then fill out three surveys. They were also reminded that their participation was strictly voluntary and that they could stop participating in the study at any time. After agreeing to participate in the study, participants watched either video one (immediate teacher) or video two (nonimmediate teacher), and then were asked to read a scenario that depicted the teacher from their video engaging in a number of offensive misbehaviors including name calling, student embarrassment, and verbal aggression (see Appendix D). After watching

26

the video and reading the offensive scenario, all participants were asked to complete the source

credibility scale (McCroskey & Teven,1999), perceived affective learning measure (Mottet &

Richmond, 1998), and student state motivation measure (Christophel,1990), while keeping in

mind the teacher they just watched on the video and read about in the offensive teacher

misbehavior scenario.

Stimulus one: Teacher immediacy

Video one depicted a female teacher who was highly immediate. The teacher smiled

frequently, used forward body leans, gestured effectively; used direct eye contact, head nods,

vocal inflections, and maintained an open body position. Video two depicted the same teacher

lecturing over the same content but she lacked all of the nonverbal immediacy behaviors.

Specifically, the teacher maintained a closed body position and avoided: smiling, direct eye

contact, and vocal inflections. She never gestured or engaged in any forward body leans while

speaking to her students. Both video one and video two were used by Mottet and colleagues

(2006) for a study which examined the neutralizing effect of teacher immediacy on student

course workload expectancy violations and tolerance for teacher unavailability. In order to create

these videos, a graduate student was trained to create two videotapes that depicted both high and

low nonverbal immediacy.

Manipulation check: Stimulus one

Once the videotapes were created, Mottet and his colleagues conducted a manipulation

check of the nonverbal immediacy variable to ensure that the variable was manipulated correctly.

Sixty- nine student volunteers from a required introductory communication course were

randomly assigned to either the condition of high or low nonverbal teacher immediacy.

Participants were then asked to complete a nonverbal immediacy scale, which yielded a mean of

22.68 (SD=14.53) and an Alpha of .94. According to Mottet and colleagues, participants perceived significantly more nonverbal immediacy behaviors in video one than they did when viewing video two. In other words, the results of the manipulation check indicated that the high and low immediacy conditions were manipulated correctly.

Stimulus two: Offensive teacher misbehavior

The offensive scenario opened with a teacher asking a question about an upcoming assignment (see Appendix D). A student answered the teacher's question incorrectly. Next, the teacher became angry due to the incorrect response and proceeded to embarrass the student that answered her question, by name calling, yelling, and using a sarcastic tone. Last, the teacher showed favoritism, by calling on a student who always has the right answer. In sum, the offensive teacher misbehavior scenario included name calling, sarcasm, embarrassment and favoritism which are the teacher misbehaviors that students find the most offensive (Banfield et al., 2006; Kearney et al., 1991; McPherson et al., 2003; Pogue & Ah Yun, 2006).

Verification check: Stimulus two

The researcher conducted a verification check for the offensive teacher misbehavior scenario to determine if students perceived the scenario as offensive. The purpose of conducting a verification check is to ensure that participants do indeed regard the independent variable in the correct and intended manner (Keyton, 2006). In order to conduct the verification check the researcher asked 50 college students to read the offensive teacher misbehavior scenario and then complete a 7 point semantic differential scale which asked them to estimate how offensive, cruel, hateful, mean, insulting, and aggressive the teacher was in the given scenario (Banfield et al., 2006; Kearney et al., 1991; McPherson et al., 2003; Pogue & Ah Yun, 2006). Results from the verification check revealed that on average students found the teacher in the given scenario to be

offensive $M =6.4$ ($SD = 1.4$), cruel $M= 6.1$ ($SD = 1.4$), hateful $M= 5.8$ ($SD = 1.1$), mean $M = 6.2$ ($SD = 1.4$), insulting $M = 6.3$ ($SD = 1.5$), and aggressive $M = 6.2$ ($SD = 1.2$). In sum, students felt strongly that the teacher in the given scenario was offensive.

Survey Instrumentation

Student perceived teacher credibility.

To measure students' perceptions of teacher credibility participants were asked to complete an adapted version of McCroskey & Teven's (1999) Source Credibility Scale (see Appendix A). This instrument is composed of all three dimensions of source credibility: competence, trustworthiness, and goodwill (caring) and includes six 7-point bipolar scales per dimension. The Alpha reliability of this measure is .94 (McCroskey, & Teven, 1999).

Student affective learning

To measure students' perceptions of affective learning participants were asked to complete an adapted version of Mottet & Richmond's (1998) Revised Affective Learning Measure (see Appendix B). The revised instrument includes four items which measure high levels of affective learning such as, the likelihood of students using the learning in "real life" situations, "actually enjoying" discussing the learning outside the classroom, developing an "appreciation" for the course, and keeping "abreast" with the material (Mottet & Richmond, 1998).

Student motivation

To measure students' motivation to learn, respondents were asked to complete an adapted version of Christophel's (1990) State Motivation Scale (see Appendix C). This instrument includes twelve bipolar adjectives that were adapted and expanded from a previous motivation instrument (Christophel, 1990). According to Christophel (1990) the reliability of the

current scale "ranges from .91 to .96. For a complete list of all measurements, means, standard

deviation, and ranges refer to the tables below.

Table 1: Student Perceived Teacher Credibility

Source Credibility	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range (Min-Max)	Alpha
Nonimmediate	54.56	17.53	21-102	.906
Immediate	58.71	20.820	24-107	.906

Table 2: Student Affective Learning

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range (Min-Max)	Alpha
Nonimmediate	136.73	44.36	49-253	.963
Immediate	165.64	50.13	49-261	.963

Table 3: Student Motivation

	Mean	Standard Deviation	Range (Min-Max)	Alpha
Nonimmediate	27.17	13.44	10-62	.921
Immediate	37.39	13.28	10-67	.921

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

This chapter reviews the results that tested the projected hypotheses for this thesis. Hypothesis one predicted that immediate teachers who commit offensive teacher misbehaviors will be perceived as more credible than nonimmediate teachers who commit offensive teacher misbehaviors. Results from a one-way ANOVA revealed partial support for hypothesis one F (1, 132) = 4.6, p <.05, w = .17. Students perceived immediate teachers to be more competent (M = 24.12, SD = 8.50) than nonimmediate teachers (M = 21.25, SD = 7.14); however, there were no significant differences found between students' perceptions of caring F (1, 138) = .465, p >.05, w = .06 and trustworthiness F (1, 136) = .146, p >.05, w = .1. Taken together, immediate teachers who commit offensive misbehaviors may not be able to regain full credibility in the classroom. Specifically, teachers who engage in offensive teacher misbehaviors may still be perceived as competent by students but may be unable to regain positive perceptions of trustworthiness and caring after offending students.

Hypothesis two predicted that nonimmediate teachers who commit offensive misbehaviors will negatively influence student affective learning more than immediate teachers who engage in offensive teacher misbehaviors. Results from a one-way ANOVA conveyed support for hypothesis two F (1, 135) = 12.74, p< .01, w = .09. Students who viewed the

immediate teacher had significantly higher affective learning scores ($M = 166$, $SD = 50.13$) than students who viewed the nonimmediate teacher ($M = 137$, $SD = 44.4$). Such a finding suggests that immediate teachers who engage in offensive teacher misbehaviors may be able to retain high levels of affective learning in their classrooms while nonimmediate teachers who engage in offensive teacher misbehaviors may not.

Hypothesis three predicted that nonimmediate teachers who commit offensive teacher misbehaviors will negatively influence student motivation more than immediate teachers who commit offensive teacher misbehaviors. Results from a one-way ANOVA revealed support for hypothesis three $F (1, 137) = 20.30$, $p<.01$, $w = .4$. Immediate teachers who commit offensive teacher misbehaviors may be able to motive students more ($M = 37.40$, $SD = 13.28$) than nonimmediate teachers who offend students ($M = 27.17$, $SD = 13.44$). These findings suggest that even if immediate teachers engage in offensive misbehaviors they may still have the ability to motivate students while nonimmediate teachers who offend students may not. For a complete review for all results for this study refer to the tables below.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Due to high rates of teacher burnout (Miller et al., 1988) it is likely that teachers may offend students in their classrooms (Avtgis & Rancer, 2008; Teven, 2007c). This is problematic because past research demonstrates that when teachers offend students they perceive their teacher as less credible and report lower levels of affective learning and motivation (Banfiled et al., 2006; Kearney et al., 1991; McPherson et al., 2006; Myers, 2002; Myers & Rocca, 2001; Pogue & Ah Yun, 2006; Rocca, 2002; Schrodt, 2003a). Thus, the purpose of this study was to determine if immediacy can neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on student perceptions of teacher credibility, student affective learning, and motivation. Results from several one-way ANOVA tests confirmed that teachers can use immediacy to neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on student affective learning and student motivation. However, teacher immediacy may not have the ability to neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on students' perceptions of teacher credibility.

Student Perceived Teacher Credibility

Teacher credibility refers to students' perceptions of teacher competence, trustworthiness, and caring. Results from this study indicate that offensive immediate teachers may not have the

ability to fully regain positive perceptions of trustworthiness and caring. Such findings are consistent with previous research, for example, Edwards & Myers (2007) noted that any form of teacher verbal aggressiveness or offensive behavior lowers students' perceptions of teacher character (trustworthiness) and caring. Nevertheless, findings from this study revealed that immediacy may neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on students' perceptions of teacher competence. Results from this study suggest that offensive immediate teachers are still seen as competent.

Perhaps when an immediate teacher is offensive, students are willing or able to separate the teacher's internal character from their knowledge level. In particular, students may be able to see that their teacher is an unpleasant person but a knowledgeable and/or experienced teacher (Semlak & Pearson, 2008). As such, immediate teachers who are offensive may be disliked by their students and unable to obtain referent power in the classroom; however their use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors such as eye contact, posture, vocal fluency, gestures, and professional dress may enable them to cultivate expert power in their classroom despite their offensive behavior. Teacher's ability to influence students is related to the relational power that students yield to their teacher (Plax & Kearney, 1992). Research suggests that when teachers obtain referent and expert power they are more effective at enhancing student motivation and learning (Plax & Kearney, 1992). Although offensive immediate teachers may not attain referent power from students, they still may be able to cultivate expert power in their classrooms by remaining nonverbally immediate. Ultimately, if teachers offend students but remain nonverbally immediate they may still achieve optimum levels of instructional influence in their classrooms.

An additional reason that students may see offensive immediate teachers as competent is because they may believe that offensive teacher misbehaviors are the norm for college

classrooms. For example, Semlak & Pearson (2008) suggested that even though students may dislike offensive teachers, they may believe that offensive teacher misbehaviors are an appropriate and/or acceptable way to manage a college classroom. In particular, students are open to the use of embarrassment if they believe it is being used effectively as a classroom management strategy (McPherson et al., 2006). Thus, students may not like offensive immediate teachers but they may believe that they are competent because they are capable of effectively managing their classroom.

Student Affective Learning

Findings from the present study indicate that offensive immediate teachers may be able to retain high levels of affective learning in their classrooms. Specifically, respondents who experienced the offensive immediate teacher yielded higher affective learning scores than participants who experienced the offensive nonimmediate teacher. Furthermore, participants who viewed the offensive immediate teacher indicated that regardless of the offensive behavior there was a strong likelihood that they would use the learned material in "real life" situations, "actually enjoy" discussing the learning outside the classroom, develop an "appreciation" for the course, and keep "abreast" with the material. In short, offensive immediate teachers who offend students may be able to preserve student's perceptions of affective learning while offensive nonimmediate teachers might not have the same ability.

Past research has indicated that student perceptions of teacher credibility influence student affective learning (Pogue & Ah Yun, 2006). Thus, it is possible that students who experienced the offensive immediate teacher that was offensive reported higher levels of affective learning because they saw the offensive immediate teacher as competent and as a result, yielded expert power. When teachers gain expert power in the classroom they have the ability to

35

create long term instructional influence which enables teachers to reach their affective learning objectives (Mottet, Frymier & Beebe, 2006).

Findings from this study regarding affective learning are consistent with previous research regarding teacher immediacy and affective learning. For example, Comadena et al. (2007) indicated that "the energy level exhibited by an immediate teacher appears to play an important role in enhancing student affective evaluation of the course and the teacher "(p. 247). In addition, Mottet et al. (2007) found that teacher immediacy positively impacted affective learning even when course workload demands were perceived to be high by students. In sum, findings from the present study are consistent with past research which demonstrates that immediacy may neutralize factors that might negatively impact affective learning.

However, it is important to note that the low omega square ($w = .09$) test revealed that teacher nonverbal immediacy may not be the only variable that may help to neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on affective learning. In fact, there may be other variables (e.g., biological sex, clarity, teacher credibility, etc) that help teachers who are offensive obtain high levels of affective learning in their classroom. For example, Mottet et al. (2007), indicated that despite findings that students reported higher levels of affective learning from a nonverbally immediate teacher such findings only accounted for 13% of the variance of students perceptions of affective learning.

Student Motivation

Past research suggests that students are less likely to establish a teacher-student relationship, seek more learning, showcase learning, and willingly communicate with teachers who are offensive; however findings from the present study conflict with such conclusions. Specifically, students who experienced the offensive immediate teacher reported higher levels of

motivation than students who viewed the offensive nonimmediate teacher. According to Frymier (1993) regardless of a student's initial motivation level (e.g. high or low) teacher immediacy impacts student motivation and if used appropriately (teacher immediacy) average students are likely to display an increase in student motivation. This means that when present, teacher immediacy behaviors have the potential to increase or maintain student motivation. Thus, offensive immediate might be able to preserve student motivation despite their offensive behavior.

Immediacy has been linked with high levels of student motivation in past research. For example, Christophel (1990) found that students who perceived their teachers as more immediate reported higher levels of motivation than students who experienced nonimmediate teachers. In other words, high levels of student motivation have been linked with immediate teachers. Furthermore, Comadena et al. (2007) stated that teacher immediacy has the potential to individually increase student motivation. In short, past research suggests that teacher immediacy may preserve student motivation.

Nonetheless, it is important to note that a moderate omega square revealed that teacher nonverbal immediacy may not be the only variable that may help to neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors have on student motivation. It is possible, that other variables (e.g., biological sex, clarity, teacher credibility, etc) help teachers who are offensive retain student motivation in their classrooms. For example, Pogue & Ah Yun (2006) suggested that while immediacy and credibility interacted to positively impact student motivation ($w = .11$), neither immediacy nor credibility by themselves contributed more than 11% of the variance in motivation.

Teacher Implications

Given the findings of this study the following teacher implications were derived. Teachers who offend students should be aware that it may be impossible to regain high perceptions of credibility in their classrooms. Specifically, students may perceive offensive teachers as untrustworthy or uncaring. First, regardless of the offensive teacher misbehavior if a teacher remains immediate he or she has the potential to continue being perceived as competent by his or her students. Research suggests that out of the three dimensions of credibility (i.e. competence, trustworthiness, and caring) students from Western cultures believe that competent teachers are more persuasive than trustworthy or caring teachers. In short, if teachers accidentally offend their students they may still be viewed by students as competent. However, it is important to keep in mind that different students of diverse cultures appreciate different aspects of teacher credibility (Zhang, 2009).

Second, although other variables come into play, it is important to remember that by remaining immediate an offensive teacher may be able to positively impact student affective learning. According to Christophel (1990), students view immediate teachers as being positive and effective which leads to affect towards the teacher and course. Ultimately, regardless of the offensive misbehavior if a teacher remains immediate in the classroom students might be able to be willing to value or appreciate the teacher, class, or content, while others might be willing to register for another course with the same teacher or the similar content.

Third, if an offensive teacher is able to remain immediate students may still exhibit positive levels of motivation to dedicate themselves to the complex process of learning. According to Frymier (1993), "[i]mmediacy (verbal and nonverbal) is clearly a useful tool in the classroom for enhancing motivation" (p. 462), therefore, the use of nonverbal immediacy

behaviors in the classroom are recommended to enhance student motivation. It is possible that an offensive immediate teacher has the potential of motivating students to participate in class discussions, attend class, or seek learning.

Last, the energy level of an immediate teacher is important to positively impact student affective learning and motivation (Comadena et al., 2007). Specifically, students perceive teachers who dress casually, smile, and maintain eye contact; as friendly, outgoing, receptive, flexible, and fair (Richmond, 2002). Therefore, the positive perceptions built through teacher nonverbal immediacy and the energy level of teacher immediacy may positively impact student affective learning and student motivation.

Limitations & Future Research

Although results of this study are meaningful and significant to the growing body of research regarding instructional communication, there are a number of limitations that must be addressed. While experimental research has many advantages, it is important to note that the non-naturalistic settings utilized in experiments often prevent scholars from viewing the complex nature of communication between humans that occur spontaneously and/or sporadically (Keyton, 2006). In particular, the non-naturalistic setting used in this study prevented the researcher from viewing the natural classroom environment and teacher-student relationships that occur over time. For instance, students were asked to view a video which depicted a female teacher delivering a lecture using low or high immediacy cues. Next students were asked to read a scenario and imagine that the teacher they viewed in the video engaged in specific offensive teacher misbehaviors. Keeping in mind the video and scenario, students were then asked to assess the teacher's credibility, and their own affective learning and motivation. While this process was convenient for the researcher, it did not truly resemble the natural progression of

teacher-student relationships or classroom environment that occurs over time during a semester. As such, students' perceptions of credibility, student affective learning, and motivation were based on artificial experiences and limited information about the instructor and classroom environment.

In addition, the experiment may have been more realistic if the immediacy cues were not separated from the offensive teacher misbehavior scenario. Teacher misbehaviors usually occur in conjunction with other teacher behaviors such as high or low immediacy. Asking students to watch a video and then read a scenario may have created a disconnect for students when assessing the teacher's overall behavior. The immediacy behaviors and misbehavior were separated due to time constraints.

When studying these variables in the future, the researcher plans to create a video that depicts high or low immediacy behaviors in conjunction with the offensive teacher misbehaviors depicted in the scenario. Immediacy behaviors would be similar to the immediacy behaviors displayed in the original set of videos, however, offensive teacher misbehaviors identified by student as being the most offensive would be part of each video. Students have identified name calling, sarcasm, embarrassment and favoritism as the offensive teacher misbehaviors which are the most offensive (Kearney et al., 1991).

Aside from the unrealistic setting used in the experiment, the researcher only controlled for the use of teacher immediacy behaviors. Findings from the present study revealed that teacher immediacy neutralized the negative effects caused by offensive teacher misbehavior on students' perceptions of teacher competence, student affective learning and motivation; however, the omega square tests performed during data analysis revealed that teacher immediacy is not the only variable that may help to neutralize the negative impact that offensive teacher misbehaviors

have on teacher competence, student affective learning, and student motivation. Thus, in the future the researcher plans to control for other variables such as: teacher clarity, biological sex (teacher and student), student initial motivation level (high or low), and student verbal aggression level (high and low)

It is important to examine teacher clarity in the future because previous research has defined teacher clarity as "the process by which a teacher is able to stimulate the desired meaning of course content and processes in the minds of students through the use of appropriately-structured verbal and nonverbal messages" (Chesebro & McCroskey, 1998, p. 262 ; Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001, p. 62). According to Sidelinger & McCroskey (1997), clarity has been examined on a broad spectrum including behaviors such as "expressiveness, message clarity, explaining effectiveness, teacher explanation, structuring, direct instruction, explicit teaching, teacher elaboration message fidelity, task structuring, and coaching and scaffolding" (p. 1). In addition, According to Sidelinger & McCroskey (1997), a positive relationship exists between teacher clarity (oral and written form) and teacher immediacy. This means that if teacher clarity is present teacher immediacy is also perceived. Chesebro & McCroskey (2001) indicate that a positive relationship exists between teacher clarity and student motivation, and student affect for the course and teacher. In order to measure the impact of teacher clarity a questionnaire assessing for teacher clarity must be part of the packet. Ultimately, teacher clarity and teacher immediacy go hand-in-hand, therefore, in the future, it is important to examine teacher clarity in combination with teacher immediacy to asses the degree of variance of each independent variable.

In addition to teacher clarity, it is also important to examine participants' initial motivation level before asking them to watch the immediacy videotape. Research suggests that

students beginning a semester with low motivation report higher levels of motivation when exposed to a highly immediate teacher (Frymier, 1993). However, students beginning the semester with a high motivation level maintained a high motivation level regardless of the displayed teacher immediacy. Thus, in the future the researcher plans to assess participants' initial level of motivation before asking them to view the immediacy video. In short, it is important to assess student initial and final motivation level in order to determine to what extent teacher immediacy may neutralize the negative impact of offensive teacher misbehaviors.

Aside from their initial motivation level, participants level of verbal aggression should be measured in future studies. Student verbal aggression levels should be measured in order to determine whether students who score high on the verbal aggression variable are less offended by the teacher misbehavior than students who score low. It is possible that the sample used in the present study contained a lot of verbally aggressive students, and as a result, they may not have been as offended as students with low levels of verbal aggression. For example, research indicates that individuals with high verbal aggressiveness perceive verbally aggressive messages as justifiable and might not perceive verbally aggressive messages as verbally offensive (Martin, Horvath & Anderson, 1996). In addition, Schrodt (2003b) suggested that in the classroom students might respond differently to the same message depending on the personal tendencies of aggressive communication. Ultimately, in order to determine whether a respondent's initial verbal aggression level impacts findings, it is imperative to assess such a variable.

Future research should also examine the impact of student and teacher biological sex on dependent variables such as perceptions of teacher credibility, student affective learning, and student motivation. According to Myers, Martin & Mottet (2002) females and males differ in their motives to communication. For example, females communicate for functional reasons while

42

males communicate for relational reasons. Sandler (1991) notes that female and male professors tend to give "[…male] students the greater share of classroom attention"; however, they "unknowingly create a climate that subtly interferes with the development of women students' self-confidence, academic participation and career goals" (p. 6). Myers et al. (2002) suggest that the different ways in which male and females are treated might be an explanation for male and females motives to communicate. Chory-Assad & Paulsel (2004) suggest that male and female students have different styles of communication, for example, male students are more likely to engage in indirect aggression towards their teacher and resist their teacher by disrupting the class. Ultimately, male and female students have a different experience with the receiving and sending of communication messages. Thus, a student's perception might vary depending on their biological sex.

However, it is also important to determine whether a teacher's biological sex impacts student's perceptions of the teachers classroom behavior. For example, research indicates that both female and male students have gender-related expectations for female and male teachers. Female teachers are expected to be personal, supportive and motherly, while male teachers are expected to act in a strong and assertive manner (Sandler, 1991). In addition, if a female teacher diverts from the gender-related expectations she may be viewed as too masculine and students tend to expect female teachers to extend deadlines and may become angry when female teachers refuse to extend deadlines (Sandler, 1991). Lastly, Myers & Knox (1999) noted that male teachers are perceived by students to use swearing, teasing and the ridicule types of verbal aggressive messages more than the female teachers. Ultimately, both male and female students have gender-related expectations for both their male and female teachers, therefore, it is important to examine whether a teachers biological sex impacts students perceptions. This was

not examined in the present study. The videos depicted only a female teachers. Thus, in the future the researcher plans to create videotapes that depict both male and female teachers.

Lastly, 89.3% participants included in the present study identified themselves as Hispanic. Given the homogenous nature of this sample findings may not be entirely generalized to members of other ethnic groups. Universities around America are composed of diverse cultures due to immigration or study aboard students; therefore, generalizing such findings to other universities might not be possible because the sample consisted of predominantly Hispanic students. Given the student body of this southwestern university, it was expected that a great percentage of the sample would identify themselves as Hispanic. It is important to consider ethnicity as a factor which can impact research results. For example, according to McCroskey, Richmond, Sallinen, Fayer & Barraclough (1995), a constant relationship exists between teacher nonverbal immediacy and culture, however, teacher nonverbal immediacy seems to be more important in some cultures than in others. In addition, Puerto Rican students (Spanish speaking) and U.S. students reported perceiving their teachers as more immediate than did the Australian and Finland students. Finnish teachers were perceived the least immediate by the Finnish students (McCroskey et al., 1995). Teacher immediacy is reported to be associated with increased affect toward the course content among Australian, Puerto Rican, Finnish & U.S. students; however, increased immediacy was associated with increase willingness to enroll in other class in the same subject matter only among Australian, U.S. and Finnish students (McCroskey, Fayer, Richmond, Sallinen & Barraclough, 1996). In a more recent study findings suggest that a strong relationship exists between teacher competence and student affective learning among the German students; however, the strongest relationship among the U.S. students exist between caring and student affective learning (Zhang, 2009). Findings suggest that

44

a strong relationship exist between teacher trustworthiness and student affective learning only among the Chinese students (Zhang, 2009). In short, ethnic culture impacts students' perceptions of teacher immediacy behaviors, student affective learning and credibility; therefore, the researcher plans to conduct a future study which examines participants of diverse ethnicities. Specifically, this study would take place among indivduals of various ethnic groups or culture groups whom have been "Americanized" due to the immigration or immigrating parents; therefore, a translation of text in different ethnic languages would not be necessary. However, it is expected that students from other countries find themselves studying abroad in the U.S but experience some sort fluency in the mainstream U.S language (English). The most convenient form of spreading these questionnaires among students of diverse ethnic and culture backgrounds is to network through colleagues whom are located or who were located in different universities around the country. For example, through networking the researcher could come in contact with large universities in Northern, Midwestern, Northeastern, and Southern regions of the United States. Ultimately, to ensure that the respondents are diverse in ethnicity and/ or culture the sample population must come from different parts of the country such as the above mentioned regions

REFERENCES

Avtgis, T. A., & Rancer, A. S. (2008). The relationship between trait verbal

aggressiveness and teacher burnout syndrome in K-12 teachers. *Communication

Research Reports, 25*, 86-89.

Banfield, S. R., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2006). The effect of teacher

misbehaviors on teacher credibility and affect for the teacher. *Communication

Education, 55*, 63-72.

Bell, R. A., & Daly, J. A. (1984). The affinity-seeking function of communication.

Communication Monographs, 51, 91-115.

Chesebro, J. L., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). The development of the teacher clarity short

inventory (TCSI) to measure clear teaching in the classroom. *Communication Research

Reports, 15,* 262-266.

Chesebro, J. L., & McCroskey, J. C. (2001). The relationship of teacher clarity and immediacy

with student state receiver apprehension, affect, and cognitive learning. *Communication

Education, 50,* 59-68.

Chory-Assad, R. M., & Paulsel, M. L. (2004). Classroom justice: Student aggression and

resistance as reactions to perceived unfairness. *Communication Education, 53,* 253-273.

Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationships among teacher immediacy behaviors,

student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education, 39,* 324-340.

Christophel, D. M., & Gorham, J. (1995).A test-retest analysis of student motivation, teacher

immediacy, and perceived sources of motivation and demotivation in college

classes. *Communication Education, 44*, 292-306

Comadena, M. E., Hunt, S. K., & Simonds, C. J. (2007). The effects of teacher clarity,

nonverbal immediacy, and caring on student motivation, affective and cognitive

learning. *Communication Research Reports, 24,* 241-248.

Delfabbro, P., Winefield, T., Trainor, S., Dollard, M., Anderson, S., Metzer, J., &

Hammasrstrom, A. (2006). Peer and teacher bullying/ victimization of South

Australian secondary school students: Prevalence and psychosocial profiles. *British*

Journal of Educational Psychology, 7, 71-90.

de Vise, D. (2009). Funding cuts leave area colleges gasping; Crammed classes, higher tuition

the norm. *The Washington Post,* p. A01.

Edwards, C., & Myers, S. A. (2007). Perceived instructor credibility as a function of instructor

aggressive communication. *Communication Research Reports, 24*, 47-53.

Foderaro, L. W. (2009). Two-year colleges, swamped, no longer welcome all. *The New York*

Times, p. 27-28.

Frey, L. R., Botan, C. H., & Kreps, G. L. (2000). *Investigating Communication: An Introduction*

to Research Methods (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Frisby, B. N., & Myers, S. A. (2008). The relationship between perceived instructor rapport,

student participation, and student learning outcomes. *Texas Speech Communication Journal,*

33, 27-34.

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., & Houser, M. L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education, 49*, 207-219.

Frymier, A. B., Wanzer, M. B., & Wojtaszczyk, A. M. (2008). Assessing students' perceptions of inappropriate and appropriate teacher humor. *Communication Education, 57*, 266-288.

Goodboy, A. K., & Bolkan, S. (2009). College teacher misbehaviors: Direct and indirect effects on student communication behavior and traditional learning outcomes. *Western Journal of Communication, 73,* 204-219.

Gorham, J. (1988). The relationship between verbal teacher immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education, 37*, 40-53.

Hacker, A. & Dreifus, C. (2010). Higher Education: How colleges are wasting our money and failing out kids-and what we can do about it. New York: Henry Holt & Company, LLC

Holden, E., Johnson, K. M., Stephenson, G. W. (2009). Budget cuts hurt students at Fla. community colleges. *St. Petersburg Times (Florida),* p. 2.

Jordan, J. D. (2009). Enrollments climb; Education. *Providence Journal-Bulletin,* p. 1.

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.

Kelly, D. (1990). Profs are under fire for abandoning the classroom. *USA Today*, p. 4D

Keyton, J. (2006). *Communication Research* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

McCroskey, J. C. (1971). Ethos, credibility and communication in the real world. *North Carolina Journal of Speech,* 4, 24-31.

McCroskey, J. C., Fayer, J. M., Richmond, V. P., Sallinen, A., & Barraclough, R. A. (1996). A multi-cultural examination of the relationship between nonverbal immediacy and affective

learning. *Communication Quarterly, 44*, 297-307.

McCroskey, J.C., Holdridge, W., & Toomb, J.K. (1974). An instrument for measuring the

source credibility of basic speech communication teachers. *The Speech Teacher, 23,*

26-33.

McCroskey, J. C., & McCroskey, L. L. (1986). The affinity-seeking of classroom teachers.

Communication Research Reports, 3, 158-167.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, L. L. (2006). *An introduction to*

communication in the classroom: The role of communication in teaching and training.

Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., Sallinen, A., Fayer, J. M., & Barraclough, R. A. (1995). A

cross-cultural and multi-behavioral analysis of the relationship between nonverbal immediacy

and teacher evaluation. *Communication Education, 44*, 281-291.

McCroskey, J. C., & Teven, J. J. (1999). Goodwill: A reeaxamination of the construct

and its measurement. *Communication Monographs, 66,* 90-103.

McPherson, M. B., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (2003). The dark side of instruction:

Teacher anger as classroom norm violations. *Journal of Applied Communication*

Research, 31, 76-90.

McPherson, M. B., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (2006). College teacher misbehaviors. In T.

P.   Mottet, V. P. Richmond & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of Instructional*

Communication: Rhetorical and Relational Perspectives (pp. 213- 234). Boston: Pearson

Education, Inc.

Marklein, M. B. (2008). Some colleges overbook freshman class; Swollen rolls force creative

work-arounds. *USA Today*, p. 3A.

Mason-Draffen, C. (2009). Unemployment rate hits 26-year high; U.S. rate jumps to 10.2%; 190,000 jobs lost; But temp industry turns, adding 34,000 jobs. *Newsday (New York),* p. A07.

Martin, M. M., Horvath, C. L., & Anderson, C. M. (1996). Feelings about verbal aggression: Justifications for sending and hurt from receiving verbally aggressive messages. *Communication Research Reports, 13,* 19-62

Miller, K. I., Stiff, J. B., & Ellis, B. H. (1988). Communication empathy as precursors to burnout among human service workers. *Communication Monographs, 55*, 250-265.

Mottet, T. P., Frymier, A. B., & Beebe, S. A. (2006). Theorizing about instructional communication. In T. P. Mottet, V. P. Richmond & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of Instructional Communication: Rhetorical and Relational Perspectives* (pp. 255-282). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Mottet, T. P. , Parker-Raley, J., Cunningham, C., Beebe, S. A., & Raffeld, P. C. (2006). Testing the neutralizing effect of teacher immediacy on student course workload expectancy violations and tolerance for teacher unavailability. *Communication Education, 55*, 147-166.

Mottet, T., Parker-Raley, J., Beebe, S., & Cunningham, C. (2007). Instructors who resist "College Lite": The neutralizing effect of instructor immediacy on students' course-workload violations and perceptions of instructor credibility and affective learning. *Communication Education, 56*, 145-167.

Mottet, T. P., & Richmond, V. P. (1998). New is not necessarily better: A reexamination of affective learning measurement. *Communication Research, 15,* 370- 378.

Myers, S. A. (2002). Perceived aggressive instructor communication and student state motivation, learning, and satisfaction. *Communication Reports, 15,* 113-121.

Myers, S. A., Edwards, C., Wahl, S. T., & Martin, M. M. (2007). The relationship between

   perceived instructor aggressive communication and college student involvement.

   Communication Education, 56, 495-508.

Myers, S. A., & Knox, R. L. (1999). Verbal aggression in the college classroom: Perceived

   instructor use and student affective learning. *Communication Quarterly, 47,* 33-45.

Myers, S. A., & Knox, R. L. (2000). Perceived instructor argumentativeness and verbal

   aggressiveness and student outcomes. *Communication Research Reports, 17*, 299-309.

Myers, S. A., Martin, M. M., & Mottet, T. P. (2002). Students' motives for communicating with

   their instructors: Considering instructor socio-communicative style, student socio-

   communicative orientation, and student gender. *Communication Education, 51,* 121-133.

Myers, S. A., & Rocca, K. A. (2001). Perceived instructor argumentativeness and verbal

   aggressiveness in the college classroom: Effects on student perceptions of climate,

   apprehension, and state motivation. *Western Journal of Communication, 65*, 113-137.

National Center for Education Statistics (2010, May). Deputy Commissioner Brief: The

   condition of education 2010. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gove/programs/coe

R. Perry, D. Dewhurst & J. Straus (State of Texas communication, January 15, 2010.)

Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1992). Teacher power in the classroom: Defining and advancing a

   program of research. In V. P. Richmond & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Power in the classroom:*

   Communication, control, and concern (pp. 67-84). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pogue, L. L., & AhYun, K. (2006). The effect of teacher nonverbal immediacy and

   credibility on student motivation and affective learning. *Communication Education,*

   55, 331-344.

Richmond, V. P. (2002) Teacher nonverbal immediacy: Use and outcomes. In J. L. Chesebro &

J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Communication for Teachers* (p.p. 65-82). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Richmond, V. P., Lane, D. R., & McCroskey, J. C. (2006). Teacher immediacy and the teacher-student relationship. In T. P. Mottet, V. P. Richmond & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of Instructional Communication: Rhetorical and Relational Perspectives* (pp. 167-193). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1986). Teacher nonverbal immediacy training and teacher immediacy. *Journal of the World Communication Association, 15*, 180-194.

Rocca, K. A. (2002). Verbal aggression in the classroom. *Communication Teacher, 16,* 3 & 15-16.

Rocca, K. A. (2004). College student attendance: Impact of instructor immediacy and verbal aggression. *Communication Education, 53,* 185-195.

Sandler, B. R. (1991). Women faculty at work in the classroom, or, why it still hurts to be a woman in labor. *Communication Education, 40*, 6-15.

Schrodt, P. (2003a). Students' appraisals of instructors as a function of students' perceptions of instructors' aggressive communication. *Communication Education 52,* 106-121.

Schrodt, P. (2003b). Student perceptions of instructor verbal aggressiveness: The influence of student verbal aggressiveness and self-esteem. *Communication Research Reports, 20*, 240-250.

Semlak, J. L., & Pearson, J. C. (2008). Through the years: An examination of instructor age and misbehavior on perceived teacher credibility. *Communication Research Reports, 25*, 76-85.

Shields-Kole, J. E., Goldberg, J., & Hutchinson, J. A. (1983). Rediscovering the joys of teaching. *Association of Communication Bulletin, 45*, 65-69.

Sidelinger, R. J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997) Communication correlates of teacher clarity in the

    college classroom. *Communication Research Reports, 14*, 1-10.

Spencer, A. (2009). The jobless are hitting the books as Minnesota colleges and universities

    report boosted enrollment. *St. Paul Pioneer Press (Minnesota),* p 1A.

Snyder, S. (2009). Community colleges caught between costs and enrollments. *The Philadelphia*

    Inquirer, p. B01.

STC. (2009). South Texas College enrollment surges as college preps workforce of tomorrow.

    South Texas College News.

Teven, J. J. (2001). The relationship among teacher characteristics and perceived caring.

    Communication Education, 50, 159-169

Teven, J. J. (2007a). Effects of supervisor social influence, nonverbal immediacy, and biological

    sex on subordinates' perceptions of job satisfaction, liking, and supervisor credibility.

    Communication Quarterly, 55, 155-177.

Teven, J. J. (2007b). Teacher caring and classroom behavior: Relationships with student

    affect and perceptions of teacher competence and trustworthiness. *Communication*

    Quarterly, 55, 433- 450.

Teven, J. J. (2007c). Teacher temperament: Correlates with teacher caring, burnout, and

    organizational outcomes. *Communication Education, 56,* 382-400.

Thweatt, K. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1996). Teacher nonimmediacy and misbehavior:

    Unintentional negative communication. *Communication Research Reports, 13*, 198-

    204.

Thweatt, K. S., & McCroskey, J.C. (1998). The impact of teacher immediacy and

    misbehaviors on teacher credibility. *Communication Education, 47*, 348-358.

U.S Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2010, January). *Hires and separation rates, November 2009*.

    Retrieved from www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2010/ted_20100115.htm.

Watzlawick, P., Bavelas, J. B., & Jackson, D. D. (1962). *Pragmatics of human communication:*

    A study of interactional patterns, pathologies, and paradoxes. W. W. Norton & Company.

Wolf, R. (2009). Obama puts renewed focus on job creation; Unemployment rate exceeds

    predictions, now topping 10%. *USA Today*, p. 1B.

Zhang, Q. (2009). Perceived teacher credibility and student learning: Development of a

    multicultural model. *Western Journal of Communication, 73*, 326-347

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

SOURCE CREDIBILITY MEASURE

Directions: After viewing the video and reading the scenario located on the first page of this packet please indicate your feelings about the teacher by circling one number for each item. Numbers 1 and 7 indicate a **very strong feeling**. Numbers 2 and 6 indicate a **strong feeling**. Numbers 3 and 5 indicate a **fairly weak feeling**. Number 4 indicates you are **undecided**.

Example: If after viewing the video and reading the scenario you feel **very strongly** that the teacher had your best interest at heart you would circle a 1. However if you feel **very strongly** that the teacher did not have your best interest at heart you would circle a 7.

Note: In some cases the most positive score is "1" while in other cases it is "7."

1.	Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unintelligent
2.	Untrained	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Trained
3.	Cares about you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't care about you
4.	Honest	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dishonest
5.	Has your best interest at heart	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Doesn't have your best interest at heart
6.	Untrustworthy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Trustworthy
7.	Inexpert	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Expert
8.	Self-centered	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not self-centered
9.	Concerned with you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not concerned with you
10.	Honorable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dishonorable
11.	Informed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninformed

12. Moral	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Immoral
13. Incompetent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Competent
14. Unethical	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Ethical
15. Insensitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Sensitive
16. Bright	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Stupid
17. Phony	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Genuine
18. Not understanding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Understanding

McCroskey, J. C., & Teven, J. J. (1999). Goodwill: A reexamination of the construct and

its measurement. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 90-10

APPENDIX B

REVISED AFFECTIVE LEARNING MEASURE

<u>Directions</u>: After viewing the video and reading the scenario located on the first page of this packet please indicate your feelings about the course and teacher by circling one number for each item. Numbers 1 and 7 indicate a **very strong feeling**. Numbers 2 and 6 indicate a **strong feeling**. Numbers 3 and 5 indicate a **fairly weak feeling**. Number 4 indicates you are **undecided**.

<u>Example</u>: If after viewing the video and reading the scenario you feel **very strongly** that the course was unfair you would circle a 1. However if you feel **very strongly** that the course was fair you would circle a 7. **Note:** In some cases the most positive score is "1" while in other cases it is "7."

Item 1: My Attitude about the content of this course:								
1. Bad	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Good
2. Valuable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Worthless
3. Unfair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Fair
4. Negative	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Positive
Item 2: I attend this class:								
5. Always	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Never
6. Infrequently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Frequently
7. Consistently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inconsistently
8. Irregularly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Regularly
Item 3: I pay attention in this class:								
9. Always	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Never

10. Infrequently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Frequently
11. Consistently	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inconsistently
12. Irregularly	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Regularly

Item 4: The likelihood of my developing an "appreciation" for the content/ subject matter:

13. Likely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unlikely
14. Impossible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possible
15. Probable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Improbably
16. Would Not	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would

Item 5: In "real life" situations, my likelihood of actually recalling and using some of the information form this class:

17. Likely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unlikely
18. Impossible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possible
19. Probable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Improbably
20. Would Not	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would

Item 6: Side the classroom, my likelihood of actually enjoying discussing some of what I have learned in class with others:

21. Likely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unlikely
22. Impossible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Possible
23. Probable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Improbably
24. Would Not	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would

Item 7: My likelihood of actually enrolling in another course of related content if I had the choice and my schedule permits: (If you are graduating, assume you would still be here.)

25. Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Likely
26. Possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Impossible

27. Improbably	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Probable
28. Would	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would Not

Item 8: At the end of the semester, my likelihood of actually enjoying keeping abreast off the issues in this academic field by voluntarily reading material related to this field of study:

29. Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Likely
30. Possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Impossible
31. Improbably	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Probable
32. Would	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would Not

Item 9: My attitude about the teacher of this course:

33. Good	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad
34. Worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Valuable
35. Fair	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unfair
36. Positive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Negative

Item 10: The likelihood of my taking another course with the teacher of this course, if I have a choice: (If you are graduating, assume you would still be here.)

37. Unlikely	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Likely
38. Possible	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Impossible
39. Improbably	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Probable
40. Would	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Would Not

Mottet, T. P., & Richmond, V. P. (1998). New is not necessarily better: A reexamination

of affective learning measurement. *Communication Research, 15*, 37

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

STATE MOTIVATION SCALE

<u>Directions</u>:

These items are concerned with how you feel about the communication course you just viewed on the video and read about in the scenario located on the first page of this packet. Please indicate your feelings about the course by circling one number for each item. Numbers 1 and 7 indicate a **very strong feeling**. Numbers 2 and 6 indicate a **strong feeling**. Numbers 3 and 5 indicate a **fairly weak feeling**. Number 4 indicates you are **undecided.**

<u>Example</u>:

If you were **very strongly** motivated by the communication course depicted in the video and scenario you would circle 1. If you were **very strongly** unmotivated by the communication course depicted in the video and scenario you would circle 7.

Note: In some cases the most positive score is "1" while in other cases it is "7."

1.	Motivated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Unmotivated
2.	Interested	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninterested
3.	Involved	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninvolved
4.	Not stimulated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Stimulated
5.	Don't want to study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Want to Study
6.	Inspired	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Uninspired
7.	Unchallenged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Challenged
8.	Uninvigorated	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Invigorated
9.	Unenthused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Enthused
10.	Excited	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Excited

Christophe, D. M. (1990). The relationship among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation and learning. *Communication Education, 39,* 323-340.

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

OFFENSIVE TEACHER MISBEHAVIOR

Directions: After viewing the video please read the scenario located below and imagine that the teacher you saw on the video is the same teacher in this scenario.

TEACHER: "Before we leave remind me what assignment we have due next week."

(Teacher chooses a student who raises hand to answer question)

STUDENT 1: "Assignment # 3…right?"

(Students response is wrong)

TEACHER: "No…what? Are you stupid? Where have you been, we are way passed that assignment!**

(Teacher chooses another student who raises her hand)

STUDENT 2: "The last assignment I turned in was assignment # 5, so next week we assignment # 6 is due right?"

(Students response is wrong)

TEACHER: You are wrong. Next time you decide to answer any questions in this class make sure you know the correct answer! Crystal I am sure you know the right answer you are the only one in this classroom who has half a brain and reads before coming to class."

(Crystal responds with the correct answer)

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Claudia Esther Martinez earned a Master of Arts in Communication with a concentration on Interpersonal Communication from the University of Texas-Pan American on December 2010, specifically, she concentrated on Instructional Communication. In addition, on August 2008 she completed a Bachelors of Arts in Communication from the University of Texas-Pan American. During her time as a graduate student, Martinez, worked as a Graduate Teaching Assistant in the Communication Studies Department, she taught the undergraduate Presentational Speaking Course and the Introduction to Communication Course. In closing, Martinez resides in Weslaco, Texas in 1914 Puerto Rico St.