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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between instructor friendliness and student learning. Although students tend to rate friendly instructors as more effective than less friendly instructors, whether teacher friendliness impacts student learning remains unclear. The theory of communicative responsibility was used to further explain the relationship between teacher friendliness and student learning as well as help to reconcile the previous findings. Instructor friendliness was predicted to increase perceptions of common ground and influence judgments of communicative responsibility. And as students increase their perception of personal communicative responsibility, they should engage in behaviors that promote student learning. As predicted, as perceptions of instructor friendliness increased, perceptions of homophily, communicative responsibility, and affective learning increased. In addition, the more students felt responsible for their learning in the classroom, the more students reported experiencing cognitive learning. This study provides support for the notion that instructor friendliness is related to student perceptions of learning and might help contribute to theory building about learning.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

Imagine entering a classroom and being greeted by a teacher with a warm smile and an inviting voice, a teacher who calls you by your first name and takes an interest in your personal life. Imagine sitting in that classroom and listening to your teacher lecture as your teacher creates eye contact with you and engages in hand gesturing and head nodding. Imagine that your teacher speaks to you as a peer, not as a superior, encourages questions, and praises your accomplishments. Would you be more apt to learn from the friendly teacher described above? The purpose of this study is to offer part of a theoretical explanation for the potential relationship between perceived teacher friendliness and student learning. Understanding the relationship between teacher friendliness and student learning is important for at least two reasons. First, several studies have shown that students tend to rate friendly teachers as being more effective than less friendly teachers (Greimel-Fuhrmann & Geyer, 2003; Kierstead, D'Agostino, & Dill, 1988; Voss, Gruber, & Szmigin, 2007). And second, in general, teachers want to be evaluated as friendly and might engage in impression management strategies to appear likeable to their students (Sur, 2009).

The first reason instructor friendliness needs to be further examined is because of the potential impact friendliness has on student evaluations of instructors. Many instructors consider student evaluations to be essential to their own professional success, and many administrators use student evaluations to judge teaching effectiveness (Chacko, 1983; Dowell & Neal, 1982) and to make promotion decisions (Adams, 2003; Kennedy, 1997). Ideally, student evaluations of teaching should measure teaching effectiveness (i.e., student learning), however in reality student evaluations are susceptible to many outside influences that might not be directly related to being an effective teacher (Neath, 1996).

One variable that might affect student ratings of teaching effectiveness is perceived instructor friendliness. There is a long-standing interest in the relationship between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and student evaluations of teaching. In 1934, Hart found that a large majority of high school students considered the teacher whom they liked the best as their best teacher.
Among the most frequently mentioned reasons for liking the teacher were: friendly/companionable, good-natured/sense of humor, and helpful. In 1940, Brookover found a strong positive relationship between student perceptions of teacher friendliness and student ratings of teacher ability. Brookover (1940) found that the more teachers were seen as friendly (i.e. congenial, pleasant disposition, engages in friendly chats, treats the student as an equal), the more students tended to rate that teacher as being able to stimulate intellectual curiosity, having better presentation of subject matter, having a pleasant and cheerful attitude towards teaching, and having a courteous and considerate attitude towards students.

More recently, researchers have investigated student-proclaimed attributes of good teachers, as well as students’ perceptions of instructional quality, in both actual and hypothetical situations. These studies continue to support the positive relationship between teacher friendliness and student perceptions of instructional quality. Voss, Gruber, and Szmigin (2007) found that students prefer instructors who are friendly, knowledgeable, enthusiastic, and approachable. When Greimel-Fuhrmann and Geyer (2003) asked students to characterize a good teacher, students described a good teacher’s personality as friendly, patient, and humorous. And while investigating student perceptions of actual instructional quality, Greimel-Fuhrmann and Geyer (2003) found that student perceptions of instructor friendliness were associated with student ratings of teaching ability. Although the aforementioned studies found a range of effect sizes, there appears to be at least a moderately strong correlation between student ratings of teaching ability and instructor friendliness.

Another reason why instructor friendliness is an important variable to investigate is because many teachers have impression management goals in the classroom. According to impression management theorists people have specific impressions they wish to convey and constantly manage their impressions in order to achieve their goals (Goffman, 1959). For instance, when a teacher enters the classroom, they might want to establish and maintain the impression that they are friendly, knowledgeable, hard working, and committed. In fact, in a pilot study that investigated the impression management goals of new college teachers, Sur (2009)
found that teachers self-reported that they wanted to be evaluated as likeable (e.g. friendly, approachable, nice), competent, and dedicated.

Teacher friendliness is clearly a necessary variable to investigate. Many teachers are likely engaging in impression management strategies to appear friendly to their students and students evaluations of teachers are being impacted by those behaviors. Although students tend to rate friendly instructors as more effective than less friendly instructors, whether teacher friendliness operates with student learning remains unclear. Studies on the relationship between teacher friendliness and student learning have found contradictory results. Some studies have found positive relationships, other studies have found negative relationships, and some studies have found no relationship at all (Andersen & Andersen, 1987; Fisher & Waldrip, 1999). Although these studies highlight the importance of the study of teacher friendliness, these contradictory results suggest that additional research, and possibly a new theoretical framework, is needed to further understand how instructor friendliness operates in the classroom. Thus, the purpose of this study is to offer a clearer conceptualization of teacher friendliness and to offer part of a theoretical explanation for the hypothesized relationship between teacher friendliness and student learning.

**Instructor Friendliness**

In the interpersonal communication literature, friendly communicators are people who recognize others in a positive way and are generally considered to be kind and caring (Norton, 1978). Specifically, friendliness is the degree to which individuals express admiration for others, acknowledge other’s contributions, and are encouraging (Norton, 1978). In the impression management literature, friendly is conceptualized as likeable, approachable, and nice (Leary & Kowalski, 1990).

Sometimes, friendly behaviors can be misinterpreted as flirting (Abbey, 1982). Abbey (1982) conducted a study in which cross-gender pairs conversed for five minutes while a hidden cross-gender pair observed the interaction. Abbey (1982) found that the male interactant rated the female interactant as being more flirty, promiscuous, and seductive than the female interactant rated herself. In addition, Abbey found that the male observer rated the same female interactant as
being more flirty, promiscuous, and seductive than the female observer rated the female interactant. This led Abbey (1982) to conclude, that in some circumstances, men have a slight tendency to misinterpret women’s friendly behaviors as flirtatious behaviors, however, it is important to note that the mean scores for flirtatious, seductive, and promiscuous behaviors were all below the midpoint of the scale. Although men tended to perceive the situations as more sexual than the females did, Shortland and Craig (1988) found that both sexes are able to differentiate between sexually interested and friendly behavior. Understanding the distinction between friendly behaviors and flirtatious behaviors is important because if teachers wish to convey friendliness, they should be careful that their behaviors are perceived as friendly and not flirty.

According to Peeters and Lievens (2006), friendly communicators create eye contact, and engage hand gesturing and head nodding. Argyle, Alkema, and Gilmore (1971) found that friendly communicators display nonverbal signals of warmth, have a soft tone of voice, open smile, and relaxed posture. According to Shortland and Craig (1988), when flirting, individuals use more long and less short eye contact, more short smiling, more forward and less backward movement. In addition, individuals use a voice with a low volume, indicate verbally that the other person was noticed previously, ask questions, and offer to be helpful (Shortland & Craig, 1988). When being friendly, Shortland and Craig (1988) found that individuals still use these behaviors, however, to varying degrees. Shortland and Craig (1988) found that compared to flirting, when being friendly, individuals use significantly less eye contact, less short smiling, less movement, less question asking, provide more long answers, make fewer offers to be helpful, do less of the talking, and make fewer mentions of noticing the other person before.

There are some caveats regarding the applicability of some of the specific nonverbal cues associated with friendliness since instructor friendliness generally occurs in a public communication setting rather than the typical interpersonal setting. For instance, although Arglye, Alkema, and Gilmore (1971) noted soft tone of voice and relaxed posture as indicators of friendliness, in the classroom environment, these nonverbal behaviors might not be applicable. Rather than
speaking in a soft tone of voice, teachers might elect to speak in a louder volume to ensure that their voice is loud enough for all of their students to hear. Also, teachers might avoid relaxing their posture and instead might strive to maintain good posture in order to convey confidence.

When the concept of friendliness was applied to the instructional setting, the term was combined with other variables such as helpful, understanding, concern, and respect. For instance, in Fisher and Waldrip’s (1999) study on teacher-student interactions and student outcomes, Fisher and Waldrip combined friendly with helpful. Fisher and Waldrip (1999) defined a friendly/helpful teacher as a teacher who shows interest, behaves in a friendly or considerate manner, and inspires confidence and trust. Fisher and Waldrip (1999) captured instructor friendliness by asking about the extent to which the teacher helped the students with their work. While investigating the relationship between teacher communication behavior and student learning, She and Fisher (2000) combined friendly with understanding and equated teacher friendliness with the degree to which the teacher listens to the student. Feldman (2007) combined teacher friendliness with concern and respect and captured teacher’s friendliness, concern, and respect by examining whether the instructor seemed to have a genuine interest in and concern for students, took the students seriously, established good rapport with students, and was friendly toward all students. Waldeck (2007) examined the extent to which the student perceived the faculty member made an effort to become friends with the student, and the extent to which the teacher removed or lessened the power and status differential. Although Waldeck (2007) did not define teacher friendliness, the essence of teacher friendliness was captured through asking whether the teacher related to students as a friend on a personal level, rather than as a superior (Waldeck, 2007).

The aforementioned studies highlight the inconsistency in the conceptualization and measurement of instructor friendliness. Fisher and Waldrip (1999), She and Fisher (2000), and Feldman (2007) combined friendliness with several related but distinct concepts (e.g. helpful, showing concern and respect) and offered a definition that was too contextual and behavioral specific. For instance, Fisher and Waldrip (1999) combined friendly with helpful, but a teacher does not
have to be friendly to be helpful, nor does a teacher have to be helpful to be friendly. For example, a teacher can be aloof while still being helpful and providing assistance to a student. The concepts appear to have been combined for statistical purposes rather than conceptual reasons.

Although there are some applicability issues when the specific behaviors of friendliness are identified, the interpersonal communication literature appears to offer a more established and consistent conceptualization of friendliness. Within the interpersonal literature there seems to be more consensus and clarity regarding the definition of friendliness. Friendliness is not combined with other concepts and there is much overlap in the definition of friendliness. In general, the interpersonal communication scholars consider a friendly communicator as a person who recognizes others in a positive way and is considered to be kind and caring. Behaviorally, a friendly communicator displays nonverbal signals of warmth and an open smile, creates eye contact, and engages in hand gesturing and head nodding. Although there might be an actual power distance between individuals, friendly communicators should attempt to minimize the power differential and treat the other person like a peer. In essence, friendliness can be characterized as demonstrating liking and attempting to reduce perceptions of a power distance. Thus, for the purposes of this study, friendly will be conceptualized as communicating positive regard for a person you treat like a peer.

**Instructor friendliness and homophily.** Studies indicate that individuals tend to form friendships with others who are similar to them in various attributes, such as, background, interests, goals, and attitudes (Knapp & Vangelisti, 2005). In a study of developing friendships among previously unacquainted men, Newcomb (1961) found that the men’s closest friendships were formed between the housemates whom the men had the most in common with. Lazarsfeld and Merton (1954) introduced the term homophily to refer to the tendency for people to affiliate with other people who are similar to them. According to the homophily principle, contact between similar people occurs at a higher rate than contact between dissimilar people (McPherson et al., 2001). Not only do we have more interactions with similar others, we also tend to like individuals who are similar to us more than
those who are dissimilar to us. Byrne (1997) investigated the relationship between similarity and liking using the phantom-other technique. The phantom-other technique is a survey method in which participants review a survey that was supposedly completed by another participant, however, the participant does not really exist. Byrne (1997) had participants complete questionnaires that were either similar or dissimilar to the participant’s own attitudes and beliefs on a variety of issues. When asked to indicate how much the participant liked the phantom-other, participants expressed greater liking for the phantom-other that had greater similarity with the participant's own opinions (Byrne, 1997).

The relationship between similarity and liking extends to the classroom environment. Elliot (1979) investigated the relationship between student perceptions of student-instructor homophily and affect towards the course and the course instructor. Elliot (1979) found that student perceptions of homophily were related to perceptions of positive affect toward the course instructor, which in turn, increased student affect toward the course. In other words, the greater the perceptions of attitudinal and behavioral similarity between the student and the instructor, the greater the degree of positive affect students experienced toward their instructor and the course. In addition, Fisher and Waldrip (1999) found that with a friendly/helpful teacher students perceived equity between themselves and their teacher. Since previous research has found a positive relationship between student perceptions of homophily and positive affect, we expect to find that instructor demonstrations of friendliness toward their students is related to student perceptions of homophily between teachers and students. Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

H1: There is a positive relationship between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and student perceptions of perceived homophily with the instructor.

**Student Learning**

There are two main views of the learning process. Behaviorists regard learning as a process of forming connections between stimuli and responses, with motivation to learn coming from basic drives such as hunger (Bransford et al.,
On the other hand, cognitivists consider learning an internal mental process that includes insight, information processing, memory, and perception (Bransford et al., 2004). In essence, learning is the process of acquiring new knowledge, skills, behaviors, values, or understanding (Bransford et al., 2004).

In 1956, Benjamin Bloom and a group of educational psychologists published a classification of the goals of the learning process. According to Bloom (1956), there are three learning domains: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. The cognitive domain refers to intellectual capacity, the affective domain refers to feelings, emotions, and behavior, and the psychomotor domain refers to manual and physical skills (Bloom, 1956). Although there are three learning domains, the cognitive and affective domains are the most utilized determinants of learning and will be used to evaluate student learning for this study.

**Cognitive learning.** The cognitive learning domain refers to intellectual capacity, or knowledge and the development of intellectual skills (McCroskey et al., 2006). In the cognitive learning domain, Bloom (1956) identified six categories, arranged by ascending levels of difficulty. The levels of cognitive learning are knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation (Bloom, 1956). Knowledge refers to the ability to recall or recognize the information. Comprehension refers to the ability to understand and explain the information. Application refers to the ability to apply the knowledge and put the theory into practice. Analysis refers to the ability to deconstruct elements of the message and distinguish between facts and inferences. Synthesis refers to the ability to develop new structures, systems, approaches, or ideas. And evaluation refers to the ability to review, justify, or assess the information (Bloom, 1956).

**Affective learning.** The affective learning domain refers to feelings, emotions, and behavior and is concerned with students’ attitudes, beliefs, and values (McCroskey et al., 2006). Bloom (1956) identified five categories in the affective learning domain, arranged by ascending levels of difficulty: receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and internalizing values. Receiving refers to the awareness of the new information. Responding refers to the active participation of the student (e.g., class participation, questioning of concepts) upon receiving the
information. Valuing refers to the worth or value the student applies to the information. Organization refers to the prioritization of different values. Internalizing values refers to the integration of values into the student’s life (Bloom, 1956). Regarding learning in the classroom, Bloom, Krathwohl and Masia (1956) conceptualized affective learning to include the lower order levels of students’ attitudes toward the (a) course, (b) subject matter, and (c) instructor, as well as higher order levels of students’ behavioral intentions of (d) engaging in behaviors taught in the class, and (e) taking additional classes in the subject matter.

**Instructor Friendliness and Student Learning**

There has been a long-standing interest in the relationship between cognitive and affective learning and teacher communication behaviors. Many studies, although they did not directly examine teacher friendliness, investigated the relationship between teacher immediacy and student learning. Friendliness and immediacy are closely related concepts. Mehrabian (1969) defined immediacy as a set of behaviors that create a perception of physical or psychological closeness between communicators. According to Andersen, Norton, and Nussbaum (1981) the enactment of friendliness is partly due to immediacy behaviors. Because friendliness is partially a result of immediacy behaviors, knowing how immediacy operates is useful to the understanding of the relationship between friendliness and learning.

Numerous studies have investigated the relationship between perceived teacher immediacy and student cognitive and affective learning (Allen, Witt, Wheeless, 2006; Andersen, 1979; Andersen, Norton, & Nussbaum, 1981; Comstock, Rowell, & Waite-Bowers, 1995). Andersen (1979) found that although perceived teacher immediacy was a positive predictor of student affective learning, perceived teacher immediacy did not significantly predict cognitive learning. Similarly, Andersen, Norton, and Nussbaum (1981) reported a positive correlation between student perceptions of instructor immediacy and student affect for the instructor, course, and course content. Comstock, et al. (1995) conducted an experimental study that manipulated three levels of teacher nonverbal immediacy. Comstock, Rowell, and Waite-Bowers (1995) found that immediacy has a curvilinear
relationship with cognitive, affective, and behavioral learning. The results from the study by Comstock, et al. (1995) suggest that moderately high teacher immediacy is more effective in helping students learn than either excessively high or low immediacy.

To help reconcile the range of findings, Allen et al. (2006) conducted a meta-analysis to test correlations between teacher immediacy, student cognitive learning, and student affective learning. Allen et al. (2006) utilized the cognitive-affective learning model developed by Rodriguez, Plax, and Kearney (1996) to explain the relationship between teacher immediacy and student learning. According to the cognitive-affective learning model, teacher immediacy functions to increase the motivation of a student to learn and thus causes an increase in the student’s cognitive mastery of the material (Rodriguez, Plax, and Kearney, 1996). Allen et al. (2006) analyzed the data from eight studies (Adkins, 1998; Andersen, 1979; Comstock, et al., 1995; Frymier & Houser, 1998, 2000; Hess & Smythe, 2001; McDowell & McDowell, 1990; Messman, et al., 1998; Witt & Wheless, 2001) that investigated teacher immediacy and student cognitive and affective learning, \( n = 1449 \). Results from the meta-analysis found support for the cognitive-affective learning model. According to Allen et al. (2006) perceived teacher immediacy impacts student positive affect towards the instructor, course, and course content, which in turn, appears to function to increase the student’s motivation to learn, and thus increases the student’s cognitive learning.

Similar to teacher immediacy research, investigations of the relationship between student cognitive and affective learning and teacher friendliness have yielded various results. Andersen and Andersen (1987) found that students learn most from teachers who are perceived to be friendly, warm, immediate, approachable, affiliative, and fostering of close, professionally appropriate personal relationships. Andersen, Norton, and Nussbaum (1981) conducted a series of studies that explored the relationship between perceived teacher communication behaviors and student learning and found a positive relationship between teacher friendliness and affective learning, and a nonsignificant relationship between teacher friendliness and cognitive learning.
She and Fisher (2000) utilized a systems approach to investigate the relationship between teacher friendliness and student learning. According to She and Fisher (2000), the behavior of the students influences the behavior of the teacher, and in turn, the behavior of the teacher influences the behavior of the students. She and Fisher (2000) hypothesized that the friendly attitude of the teacher influences the students to be more motivated in school and thus increases student learning. As predicted, She and Fisher (2000) found that students’ cognitive achievement scores were higher when students perceived their teacher as being more friendly and understanding, as giving more nonverbal support, and as using more challenging questions.

In summary, although the current research on the relationship between perceived teacher friendliness and student learning have produced inconsistent results, the research tends to support a positive relationship between teacher friendliness and student learning. Most of the discrepancies of the results revolve around teacher friendliness and cognitive learning. Although friendliness might serve to increase student positive affect toward the instructor, course, and course content, there have been mixed results regarding the relationship between teacher friendliness and student cognitive learning. The theory of communicative responsibility might help to further explain the complex relationship between teacher friendliness and student learning as well as help to reconcile the previous findings.

**Theory of Communicative Responsibility**

The theory of communicative responsibility was developed by Aune (1998) and was based on Grice’s (1989) cooperative principle. Grice’s (1989) cooperative principle states among other things that individuals should make conversational contributions that fulfill the accepted purpose of the conversation. According to the theory of communicative responsibility, individuals make judgments regarding how responsible each party is for creating understanding during the communicative event (Aune et al., 2005). The judgments the individuals make affect communicative performance and the extent to which the communicators engage in implicature and inference making during communication. Aune et al. (2005) stated that as personal
judgments of communicative responsibility increase, speakers engage in less implicature and make fewer inferences. In other words, as communicative responsibility increases, individuals become increasingly explicit and redundant about what they are trying to communicate as well as increase requests for clarification (Aune et al., 2005). For example, as personal communicative responsibility increases, individuals increase repetition of information and try to create more associations between the information (Aune et al., 2005). In a conference paper, Fehrenbach et al. (2010) examined how message composition (e.g. length of message, redundancy of message, literal versus figurative language) is related to the extent to which the individual feels responsible for creating understanding in a direction-giving situation. In this study, participants were asked to create written descriptions of a series of abstract figures that a hypothetical communication partner would be able to use to correctly identify the abstract image from a larger set of comparable images (Fehrenbach et al., 2010). Fehrenbach et al. (2010) found that as personal communicative responsibility increases, the length and redundancy of the message increase, and more literal language and less figurative language is used.

In all communicative situations there are varying levels of source responsibility, resulting in communicative dyads demonstrating varying levels of symmetrical or asymmetrical communicative responsibility (Aune et al., 2005). According to Aune (1998) in any communicative situation, the shared meaning might reside asymmetrically or symmetrically in communicators. In asymmetrical communicative responsibility situations, the interactant who has meaning that he or she wishes to share with another holds more communicative responsibility (Aune et al., 2005). Typical asymmetrical communicative responsibility situations include instructing, teaching, giving directions, and explaining. For instance, in the instructional setting, if both the student and teacher believe that the teacher holds all the knowledge and that the student’s job is to attain that knowledge from the teacher, the relationship is asymmetrical and the teacher holds more communicative responsibility than the student.
Conversely, in symmetrical communicative responsibility, meaning resides equally in both parties and perceptions of communicative responsibility are more symmetrical (Aune et al., 2005). Two individuals arranging to meet at a mutually known place would be an example of symmetrical communicative responsibility (Aune et al., 2005). In symmetrical communicative responsibility, both participants can have high communicative responsibility, or both participants can have low communicative responsibility (Aune et al., 2005). Joint problem solving would be an example of high symmetrical communicative responsibility, in which both individuals think they are equally accountable for achieving communicative understanding. Small talk with young children could be an example of low symmetrical communicative responsibility, in which both individuals do not care or feel responsible for reaching a common understanding.

Levels of communicative responsibility are also influenced by perceptions of common ground. Aune et al. (2005) found that the greater perceptions of common ground, depicted by cultural similarity, resulted in more symmetrical views of communicative responsibility. With an increase in student perceptions of similarity between themselves and their teachers, teachers and students might assume a more symmetrical view of personal communicative responsibility. By considering perceptions of symmetry as a result of instructor friendliness, communicative responsibility theory could help to reconcile the inconsistent findings of the previous research. Using the framework of communicative responsibility, as students increase their perception of personal communicative responsibility, students should engage in behaviors that promote student learning, such as an increase in requests for clarification, an increase in the use of questions, and an increase in the number of associations created among the information. These student behaviors should aid the learning process by helping teachers confirm what their students know, as well as what their students do not know. Understanding where students stand should help teachers better adapt their coverage of material to suit the needs of their students, and increase the effectiveness of instruction and student cognitive learning.
Hypotheses

Instructor friendliness and communicative responsibility. If teacher friendliness helps to increase the perceived homophily between teachers and students, teachers and students should develop less asymmetrical levels of communicative responsibility or experience greater symmetrical perceptions of communicative responsibility. The purpose of a teacher is to expose students to new material, thus teachers should feel greater responsibility for creating understanding with the students (i.e. have high communicative responsibility). In general, students should start off as experiencing less relative communicative responsibility, thinking that the teacher is more responsible for successfully creating understanding in the classroom. Teachers should remain high in communicative responsibility throughout, and if the student feels equally responsible for the learning process, a more high symmetrical communicative responsibility should develop. As a result of student perceptions of instructor friendliness, perceived homophily between the student and the teacher should increase, producing a less asymmetrical view of communicative responsibility, with an increase in student communicative responsibility. In fact, Fisher and Waldrip (1999) found that with a friendly/helpful teacher, students engaged in some behaviors that were indicative of greater personal communicative responsibility (e.g. liked to provide their own opinions, were more likely to challenge the teacher). Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

H2: There is a positive relationship between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and student perceptions of their communicative responsibility.

Learning. Based on the tenets of communicative responsibility theory, when communicative responsibility increases, requests for clarification, the use of questions, and redundancy increase. Fisher and Waldrip (1999) found that with a friendly/helpful teacher, students perceived equity, liked to provide their own opinions, liked to work in collaboration, and were more likely to challenge the teacher. These behaviors demonstrate more communicative responsibility and might illustrate that students are more actively involved in the learning process as
well as inform teachers of what material is learned and what needs to be reemphasized. This might explain why some studies found no effect for cognitive learning, students might not have been engaging in these behaviors. Active student involvement and the teacher’s knowledge of student progress should aid cognitive learning. Therefore, higher student’s perception of communicative responsibility should be associated with increases in the student’s cognitive learning. Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3: There is a positive relationship between student perceptions of their communicative responsibility and student cognitive learning.

In comparison to cognitive learning, affective learning refers to the degree of liking of the course, the subject matter, and the instructor. Compared to the relationship between teacher immediacy and student cognitive learning, research on teacher immediacy and student affective learning has yielded more consistent support for a positive relationship between the two variables (Andersen, 1979; Andersen, Norton, & Nussbaum, 1981; Rodriguez, Plax, and Kearney, 1996).

Numerous studies have found that positive affect tends to be reciprocal; liking begets liking (Curtis & Miller, 1986). Therefore, because friendliness is characterized as demonstrating positive affect, students should experience positive affect toward a friendly instructor and increase liking of the instructor, the course, and the subject matter. Thus the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4: There is a positive relationship between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and student affective learning.
Chapter 2. Method

Sample

A total of 147 undergraduate students from the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa participated in the study, including 65 males (44%) and 82 females (56%). Participants ranged from 18 years to 46 years ($M = 21, SD = 3.91$). Eighteen participants were first-year students (12%), 33 were second-year students (22%), 42 were third-year students (29%), and 54 were in their fourth-year and beyond (37%).

Procedures

To test the research hypotheses, the researcher created a questionnaire for undergraduate college students to complete. The questionnaire measured cognitive learning, affective learning, perceived instructor friendliness, homophily, and communicative responsibility. To recruit participants, the researcher contacted Speech instructors and asked them to notify their undergraduate students about this research opportunity. The researcher provided the instructors with an email to forward to their students that contained general information about the study and explained that participation in the study was voluntary and confidential.

The survey was administered through SONA, a subject pool management software. Through SONA, students created a login and were presented with available research studies in which they could participate. Once students logged onto SONA and selected this instructional communication study, students were directed to Survey Monkey, an online survey software and questionnaire tool, to access the survey. On Survey Monkey students were presented with a consent form that explained the research and their rights as a participant. If the student provided consent, the student was directed to the questionnaire (see Appendix A).

Using the procedure advocated by Plax et al. (1986), participants were asked to complete the questionnaire with reference to the class that they attended immediately before the completion of the questionnaire. In other words, participants were asked to complete the questionnaire in reference to a class they were currently enrolled in and that they attended right before they started the questionnaire. For instance, if a student was enrolled in an 11:30 am class and a
1:30 pm Monday, Wednesday, Friday class, and they started the questionnaire at 12:30 pm Monday, they were to complete the questionnaire in reference to their 11:30 am class on Monday (See Appendix B). Requesting that participants complete the instruments in reference to the course they attended immediately prior allowed for maximum variability in subject matter and a broad sample of instructors.

In this sample, participants reported on a variety of classes across 20 disciplines. The most frequent discipline identified was speech communication with a total of 123 students (84%). Fifty students (34%) reported on classes in their major and 97 students (66%) reported on classes outside their major. Students estimated their class size as ranging from 2 to 225 students ($M = 31, SD = 23.20$). Students reported that their instructors ($f_{\text{male}} = 61, 42%; f_{\text{female}} = 85, 58%$) held the ranks of professor ($f = 80, 55%$), lecturer ($f = 19, 13%$), and graduate teaching assistant ($f = 47, 32%$). Students also thought their instructors were between the ages of 22 to 70 years ($M =33, SD = 9.15$). The questionnaires were completed during the 15th week of a 16-week semester, after the students have had considerable exposure to the instructor but before final grades were known.

**Measures** (see Table 1 for means and standard deviations)

**Cognitive learning.** Cognitive learning was measured in three ways: a single assessment of cognitive learning, a cognitive learning loss calculation, and a predicted class grade self-report. Richmond et al.’s (1987) Cognitive Learning Loss Measure was used to estimate cognitive learning and cognitive learning loss. The scale asked students, “On a scale of 1-10, how much did you learn in this class, with 1 meaning you learned nothing and 10 meaning you learned more than in any other class you’ve had?” and “How much do you think you could have learned in this class had you had the ideal instructor?” In other words, students were asked to report how much they perceived they learned from their teacher as well as how much they think they could have learned the same content if they been taught by the ideal teacher (See Appendix C). According to Richmond et al. (1987) the first item is a direct measure of cognitive learning in which higher scores represent perceptions of more cognitive learning. The cognitive learning loss score was calculated by subtracting the response from the first question from the second question. Greater
numbers reflect a larger discrepancy between the actual teacher and the ideal teacher and more perceived learning loss. McCroskey et al. (1996) reported a test-retest reliability of .85 and .88 for the two-item learning loss scale. As the third measure of cognitive learning, students reported their predicted grade for the class. Students were asked to predict their final letter grade for the class (i.e., A, B, C, D, or F). Higher scores represent student reports of earning a higher letter grade.

**Affective learning.** Affective learning was measured using Andersen’s (1979) affective learning scale ($\alpha = .93$). The affective learning scale measured student affect toward (a) behaviors recommended in the course, (b) the course/subject matter, and (c) the course instructor, as well as the student’s likelihood of (d) attempting to engage in the behaviors recommended in the course and (e) enrolling in a related course. Attitudes toward the behaviors recommended, course content, and course instructor were assessed by four 7-point bi-polar scales: good/bad, worthless/valuable, fair/unfair, and positive/negative. Behavioral intention in terms of likelihood of attempting to engage in the recommended behaviors and enrolling in a related course are similarly assessed with four, 7-point bi-polar scales: likely/unlikely, impossible/possible, probable/improbable, and would/would not (See Appendix D). Attitude and behavioral intention scores were combined to measure affective learning, with higher scores indicating greater perceptions of affective learning.

**Perceived homophily.** Perceived homophily was measured using McCroskey, et al.’s (1975) perceived homophily measure of attitudinal and background homophily ($\alpha = .90$). McCroskey, et al.’s (1975) conceptualized homophily as the extent to which interactants are similar to one another. For this study, perceived homophily reflected the degree to which students perceived themselves as similar to their instructor and was measured using 7-point bi-polar scales. Sample items for attitude homophily included: My instructor “does think like me” and “is like me.” Sample items for background homophily included: My instructor has “status like mine” and comes from a “background like me.” The
perceived homophily measure was designed so that higher scores indicate higher perceived homophily. (See Appendix E).

**Instructor friendliness.** Instructor friendliness was measured with fourteen items that were adapted from various measures of friendliness. Four items were adapted from Norton's (1978) friendly communicator style measure (“My teacher tends to be very encouraging,” “My teacher readily expresses admiration,” “My teacher verbally acknowledges my classroom contributions,” and “My teacher is extremely friendly.”). Due to poor reliability, Norton’s (1987) friendly communicator style measure was not used as the sole measure of friendliness. Norton (1978) reported the internal reliability for the friendly communicator style measure as .37 and Andersen, Norton, and Nussbaum (1981) reported the internal reliability as .60. To increase the reliability, nine items were added to better reflect the conceptualization of instructor friendliness. Four additional items were adapted from various friendliness measures. These other friendliness measures were not used in their entirety because the scale items were either too behaviorally or situationally specific. The item, “My teacher is warm and supportive” was adapted from the teacher friendliness subscale on the observed classroom environment measure (Eccles et al., 2003). The items: “I can confide in my teacher,” “I can trust my teacher,” and “I look forward to seeing my teacher,” were adapted from the friendship prevalence measure (Nielson et al., 2000). The remaining 6 items were created based off of reported signals friendly communicators display. The items: “My teacher is pleasant towards me,” “My teacher likes me,” and “My teacher regularly displays an open smile,” were based off of the reported behaviors of friendly communicators according to Arglye, Alkema, and Gilmore (1971). The items: “My teacher creates eye contact with me,” “My teacher uses hand gesturing,” and “My teacher uses head nodding” were based off of the reported behaviors of friendly communicators according to Peeters and Lievens (2006) (See Appendix F). All items were measured using 7-point Likert-type scales (e.g., 1=very strongly disagree, 2=strongly disagree, 3=disagree, 4=neutral, 5=agree, 6=strongly agree, 7=very strongly agree). The alpha reliability for the teacher friendliness measure was a .96.
As stated earlier, friendliness was conceptualized as demonstrating positive regard for person you treat like a peer. In order to reflect the aspect of friendliness as treating another individual like a peer, a power distance measure was also added. So although the friendliness measure captures the idea of minimal power distance, the purpose of the power distance measure is simply to highlight this aspect more directly. Power distance was measured with items adapted from Hofstede’s international work survey (Hofstede, 1980). The items were adapted to reflect power distance in the instructional setting. The revised power distance scale consisted of five items, designed so that higher scores indicate greater power distance. The items included: “When an evaluation (e.g., test grade, presentation grade) made by my teacher does not fit with my expectations, I feel free to discuss it with my teacher,” “I am not afraid to openly disagree with my teacher,” “I feel comfortable challenging my teacher,” “It is alright for me to be critical of my teacher,” and “My teacher tends to make decisions in an autocratic way (i.e., exercising absolute authority)” (See Appendix G). All items were measured using 7-point Likert-type scales (1=very strongly disagree, 2=strongly disagree, 3=disagree, 4=neutral, 5=agree, 6=strongly agree, 7=very strongly agree). The scale was designed so that higher scores indicate a greater power distance and lower scores indicate a lower power distance. Initial alpha reliability for the power distance measure was a .59. The item: “My teacher tends to make decisions in an autocratic way (i.e., exercising absolute authority)” was removed to increase the reliability of the measure. Analysis of power distance measure was conducted with the remaining four items of the measure. The alpha reliability for the revised power distance measure was a .76.

**Communicative responsibility.** The communicative responsibility measure was loosely based on items from Aune’s (2005) communicative responsibility measure. Since Aune’s (2005) communicative responsibility measure originally measured the extent to which individuals felt communicatively responsible in a direction-giving scenario, items were modified to reflect the communicative responsibility students felt in the instructional setting. The communicative responsibility scale consisted of six items, designed so that higher scores indicate
greater communicative responsibility. The items included: “I feel just as responsible as my teacher for contributing to my understanding of class lectures and presentations,” “Simply attending class does not ensure understanding of my teacher’s lectures and presentations. While in class, I must also actively participate to ensure my understanding of my teacher’s lectures and presentations,” “If I am unclear about class lectures or presentations, it is my responsibility to ask my teacher for clarification,” “I have an obligation to ask as many questions as needed to assure my understanding of lectures and presentations,” “I feel responsible for providing relevant examples of classroom concepts during lectures and presentations,” and “Understanding between my teacher and me is primarily my teacher’s responsibility.” (See Appendix H). All items were measured using 7-point Likert-type scales (1=very strongly disagree, 2=strongly disagree, 3=disagree, 4=neutral, 5=agree, 6=strongly agree, 7=very strongly agree). Initial alpha reliability for the communicative responsibility measure was a .75. The item: “Understanding between my teacher and me is primarily my teacher’s responsibility”) was removed to increase the reliability of the measure. Analysis of communicative responsibility was conducted with the remaining five items of the measure. The alpha reliability for the revised communicative responsibility measure was a .85.

In addition to that measure of communicative responsibility, the following two items were included to measure the percent of their communicative responsibility and their perceptions of their teacher’s communicative responsibility in the classroom: “Indicate on the scale below the extent to which you believe your teacher is responsible for successfully creating understanding in the classroom” and “Indicate on the scale below the extent to which you believe you are responsible for successfully creating understanding in the classroom.” The scale ranged from 0% to 100% and increased in increments of 10% (See Appendix H). The mean percent that students felt their teacher was responsible for successfully creating understanding in the classroom was 72.86% (SD = 20.14). The mean percent that students felt they were responsible for successfully creating understanding in the classroom was 60.61% (SD = 28.05).
Chapter 3. Results

Instructor Friendliness and Homophily

Hypothesis one predicted a positive relationship between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and student perceptions of perceived homophily with the instructor. As predicted, results revealed a significant positive correlation between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and perceived student-instructor homophily, $r (146) = .43$, $p<.01$. As previously mentioned in the methods section, a power distance measure was also included to reflect part of the conceptualization of friendliness as demonstrating positive regard for a peer. There was a significant negative relationship between perceptions of instructor friendliness and power distance, $r (146) = -.34$, $p<.01$, in other words, as perceptions of instructor friendliness increased, perceptions of power distance diminished. Correlations, means, and standard deviations can be found on Table 1.0.

Instructor Friendliness and Communicative Responsibility

Hypothesis two predicted a positive relationship between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and student perceptions of their communicative responsibility. As predicted, results revealed a significant positive correlation between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and student perceptions of their communicative responsibility, $r (146) = .61$, $p<.01$. There was also a significant negative relationship between power distance and student perceptions of their communicative responsibility, $r (146) = -.30$, $p<.01$.

Communicative Responsibility and Cognitive Learning

Hypothesis three predicted a positive relationship between student perceptions of their communicative responsibility and student cognitive learning. Cognitive learning was measured in three ways: a single item cognitive learning measure, the cognitive learning loss measure, and student reported class grade. All three measures of cognitive learning supported the hypothesis. As predicted, results revealed a significant positive correlation between student perceptions of communicative responsibility and student cognitive learning, $r (146) = .34$, $p<.01$. A significant positive correlation between student perceptions of communicative responsibility and student predicted class grades was found, $r (145) = .19$, $p<.05$. 


And a significant negative correlation between student perceptions of communicative responsibility and cognitive learning loss was found, $r (146) = -.24$, $p < .01$.

**Instructor Friendliness and Affective Learning**

Hypothesis four predicted a positive relationship between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and student affective learning. As predicted, results revealed a significant positive correlation between student perceptions of instructor friendliness and student affective learning, $r (146) = .66$, $p < .01$. There was a significant negative relationship between power distance and student affective learning, $r (146) = -.25$, $p < .01$. 
Chapter 4. Discussion

The findings of this study contribute to an expanded understanding of the relationship between teacher friendliness and student learning. Overall, the study results confirm the relevance of teacher friendliness to learning. As predicted, as student perceptions of instructor friendliness increased, perceptions of power distance decreased and perceptions of homophily increased. Furthermore, the more students thought of their teacher as friendly, the more students reported liking the teacher, the subject matter, and the course. In addition, the more students saw that they were responsible for their learning in the classroom, the more students reported experiencing cognitive learning.

Friendliness, Responsibility, and Learning

Previous research has found mixed results for the relationship between instructor friendliness and student-reported cognitive learning (Andersen et al., 1981; Andersen & Andersen, 1987; She & Fisher, 2000). For this study we hypothesized that communicative responsibility might be the missing variable and might be one explanation as to why instructor friendliness was not always positively related to cognitive learning (Andersen et al., 1981). Instructor friendliness should increase perceptions of common ground, which should in turn influence judgments of communicative responsibility. And as students increase their perception of personal communicative responsibility, they should engage in behaviors that promote student learning, such as an increase in requests for clarification, an increase in the use of questions, and an increase in the number of associations created among information. All of these behaviors should increase the effectiveness of instruction and thus aid student cognitive learning.

Affective Learning as a Possible Mediator

An alternative explanation is that, rather than communicative responsibility, student-reported affective learning might be the mediator variable between instructor friendliness and student-reported cognitive learning. Consistent with previous research (Andersen et al., 1981; Andersen and Andersen, 1987), instructor friendliness was positively associated with affective learning. Results from this investigation revealed that instructor friendliness was more highly associated with
affective learning than cognitive learning. Affective learning, student self-reported as the liking of the instructor, course, and subject matter might influence students to work harder in the course and thus cause an increase in cognitive learning. If students like their instructor, enjoy the course, and are interested learning in the subject matter, students should be more likely to pay attention in class, complete their assignments, study outside of class, and engage in other behaviors that would promote cognitive learning. Although not the same, the predicted pattern of associations between affective to cognitive learning are consistent with the Rodriguez et al. (1996) cognitive-affective learning model. According to Rodriguez et al. (1996), teacher immediacy functions to increase the motivation of a student to learn and thus causes an increase in the student’s cognitive mastery of the material.

**Friendly Instructors**

Another explanation of the relationship between instructor friendliness and student learning is that friendly instructors might simply be different than less friendly instructors. Qualities specific to friendly instructors might directly contribute to student-reported cognitive and affective learning. For instance, friendly instructors might self-disclose more information than less friendly instructors, and this disclosure of relevant personal examples or experiences might help students further understand concepts being covered in class. In addition, friendly instructors might ask more questions, encourage students to talk, solicit different viewpoints or opinions, and follow up on student-initiated discussions, all of which might influence student-reported cognitive and affective learning. Although these behaviors might encourage student communicative responsibility, students might be engaging in these behaviors (e.g., asking questions, asking for clarification, creating associations among information) without attributing them to being more personally responsible for understanding in the classroom.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

There were several limitations in the current study. One limitation of the study was the measurement of friendliness. As a concept, friendliness has a rather amorphous nature and has been difficult to define. There has been no consistent definition or measurement of teacher friendliness in the instructional
communication literature. For this study, instructor friendliness was measured with fourteen items that were adapted from various measures of friendliness. A single measure of friendliness was not utilized because previous research did not find acceptable reliability estimates for any single general friendliness instrument (e.g., Andersen, Norton, & Nussbaum, 1981; Norton, 1978) or past assessments contained friendliness scale items that were either too behaviorally or situationally specific (e.g., Eccles et al., 2003; Nielson et al., 2000). Although the friendliness measure used in this study had a reliability of .96 and a factor analysis revealed the measure was unidimensional, this measure needs to be further tested and verified. Additional research is needed to help clarify the definition of friendliness and determine what behaviors constitute friendliness. Future research could also focus on certain aspects of the friendliness construct, specifically power distance and homophily.

Another limitation was the communicative responsibility measure. Aune’s (2005) previously established communicative responsibility measure originally evaluated the extent to which individuals felt communicatively responsible in a direction-giving scenario. A new communicative responsibility measure needed to be created to suit the context of this investigation. Although the alpha reliability for this new measure was a .85 and a factor analysis revealed the measure was unidimensional, the measure has not been previously tested and verified. However, it is important to note that the communicative responsibility measure had construct validity; the measure was consistent with hypotheses and correlated with other variables in the predicted ways. Nevertheless, this communicative responsibility measure should be further tested to ensure the scale’s validity.

Future research should delve into the student behaviors that exhibit more responsibility and include those student actions into the communicative responsibility measure. This communicative responsibility measure focused on attitudinal statements on how responsible students felt in the classroom rather than behavioral statements. For example, one item stated, “Simply attending class does not ensure understanding of my teacher’s lectures and presentations. While in class, I must also actively participate to ensure my understanding of my teacher’s lectures
and presentations.” This item focuses on the student’s idea of what they should be doing in class, not what the student is actually doing. It is quite possible that students said that they felt responsible for their learning but did not act upon on their notions of responsibility. The way communicative responsibility was measured might explain why there was not a strong relationship between student responsibility and reported learning. Shifting the focus away from only thoughts of responsibility and also including student actions should help to get at the actual behaviors students are performing in the classroom. Perhaps instead of, “I feel responsible for providing relevant examples of classroom concepts during lectures and presentations” the item can state, “I provide relevant examples of classroom concepts during lectures and presentations.”

In addition, the hypotheses and predictions on the relationship between friendliness and learning were tested using a correlational design and thus no causation can be established. Other factors, aside from those studied, might have also contributed to reports of learning. For example, student motivation, GPA, and other demographic and psychological factors might play essential roles in explaining learning. Therefore, in order to fully understand the role instructor friendliness plays on student learning, future research should utilize an experimental design, have independent observers code for instructor friendliness behaviors in the classroom, and possibly examine student retention of information over time.

Another limitation of this study is the sample selected. The high percentage of speech communication students might limit the generalizability of the results. A total of 123 students (84%) completed this survey in reference to 10 speech communication courses. The redundancy of speech communication classes and the potential of duplicate instructors reported on might have affected the results. While this study asked participants to report on the class they had immediately prior to the start of the survey to maximize class and teacher variability, the students were informed of the survey in a speech communication course. In future studies, researchers should distribute the survey to a wide variety of disciplines, rather than courses within a single discipline, to help increase the variability in classes and instructors reported on.
Furthermore, this study utilized self-report measures to discover information about student perceptions of instructor friendliness and learning. Students might have over or under reported their instructor’s friendliness behaviors and those reports might not coincide with instructor’s self-reported friendliness behaviors. In addition, learning is a complex and difficult construct to measure and the self-reported measures of learning used in this study might not have provided a complete assessment of student learning. A future direction for this study would be to obtain the student’s actual grade (letter grade and/or percentage) for the class as well as the student’s class ranking as another measure of student cognitive learning. Another concern is that all of the variables measured might have been linked in a student’s mind and thus they might not have all assessed them independently. However, these limitations are present in all studies that use self-reported measures, and should be considered when interpreting these results.

**Conclusion**

This study investigated the role of instructor friendliness in the classroom. The purpose of this study was to gain insight into the relationship between instructor friendliness and student learning. This study provides support for the notion that instructor friendliness is related to student learning outcomes. Results from this study show that as perceptions of instructor friendliness increase, perceptions of homophily, communicative responsibility, and affective learning increase. In addition, the more students feel responsible for their learning in the classroom, the more students report experiencing cognitive learning.

Further research encompassing a wider sample of students than those represented in the present convenience sample is necessary in order to assess the applicability of the findings to the general population of students. Future research also needs to further examine the conceptualization and measurement of teacher friendliness, explore the behavioral manifestations of communicative responsibility, and develop a communicative responsibility measure that focuses on student attitudes as well as behaviors. In addition, researchers should examine the relationship between instructor friendliness and student learning using an experimental design, code for teacher friendliness behaviors, and test student
retention of class material over time. Furthermore, additional research is needed to investigate the potential mediating role affective learning might play on the relationship between instructor friendliness and cognitive learning. Nevertheless, the present study provides important insights into the role of instructor friendliness that might help in theory building about learning.
Table 1.0

Summary of Intercorrelations, Means, and Standard Deviations for Scores on Affective Learning (AL), Cognitive Learning (CL), Cognitive Learning Loss (CLL), Predicted Grade (GR), Homophily (HO), Friendliness (FR), Power Distance (PD) and Communicative Responsibility (CR). N=147.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AL</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. CL</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. CLL</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>-.68**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. GR</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. HO</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. FR</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. PD</td>
<td>-.25**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. CR</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M  5.70  7.55  -1.60  3.26  4.32  5.50  5.20  3.40
SD  .90  1.61  3.80  .77  1.26  1.06  1.04  1.03

* p < .05; ** p < .01.
Appendix A

Copy to Participant
Agreement to Participate in an Instructional Communication Study

Michele Hamada
Primary Investigator
(808) 956-3318

Your participation is being requested for a research study on instructional communication. This research study is being conducted to partially fulfill thesis requirements for a Master’s degree at the University of Hawai`i at Mānoa. This research study seeks to investigate communication in the classroom setting.

Participation in this study will involve the completion of one questionnaire. In the questionnaire, you will be asked to respond to measures assessing your perceptions of your instructor’s behavior and your learning. You will be one of approximately 150 students who will participate in this study. The estimated length of time it will take to complete this entire questionnaire is 20 minutes.

The investigator believes there is little or no risk to participating in this study. Participation in this research project is completely voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefit as a result of withdrawing from this study. Data from this study will be summarized into broad categories. No personal identifying information will be included with the research results. Your instructor will not see your responses and will not have access to the data.

Participating in this research is of no direct benefit to you. However, the results from this project might help researchers understand the effects of communication between instructors and students.

Research data will be confidential to the extent allowed by law. Agencies with research oversight, such as the UH Committee on Human Studies, have the authority to review research data. All research records will be stored in a locked file in the primary investigator’s office for the duration of the research study. All research records will be destroyed upon completion of this study.

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may call the UH Committee on Human Studies at (808) 956-5007, write to 1960 East-West Road, Biomedical Building, Room B-104, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822, or send an email to uhirb@hawaii.edu.

If you have any questions regarding this research study, please contact Michele Hamada at (808) 956-3318 or you can send an email to mhamada@hawaii.edu.
Appendix B

Survey Instructions

This research study is interested in your assessments of a course you are enrolled in this semester. When you complete this survey, please keep in mind this one course.

Directions: To get started, please identify that course. The course we would like you to select is the class you attended immediately prior to starting this survey.

For instance, if you are enrolled in an 11:30 am and 1:30 pm Monday/Wednesday/Friday class, and you start this questionnaire at 12:30 pm Monday, you are to complete this questionnaire in reference to your 11:30 am class on Monday.

Please indicate the course name of the class you are referencing (e.g., Interpersonal Relations).

Please indicate the course number of the class you are referencing (e.g., SP 381).

Please keep this class you just listed in mind while you complete this survey.
Appendix C

Cognitive Learning Measure

Directions: Answer the following questions in reference to the class/teacher you listed on this survey. Assess your entire experience in the class you listed.

1. On a scale of 1-10, how much did you learn in this class, with 1 meaning you learned nothing and 10 meaning you learned more than in any other class you’ve had?

2. On a scale of 1-10, how much do you think you could have learned in this class had you had the ideal instructor?

Note: All items assessing cognitive learning were measured with a 10-point scale. The first question measured cognitive learning, with higher scores indicating more cognitive learning. The learning loss score was calculated by subtracting the response from the first question from the second question. The learning loss scale was designed so that higher scores indicate more cognitive learning loss.
Appendix D

Affective Learning Measure

Directions: Complete the questions in reference to the class and/or teacher of the class you listed on this survey.

1. Behaviors recommended in the course:
   - Good
   - Worthless
   - Fair
   - Positive
   - Bad
   - Valuable
   - Unfair
   - Negative

2. Content/subject matter of the course:
   - Bad
   - Valuable
   - Unfair
   - Fair
   - Positive

3. Course instructor:
   - Good
   - Worthless
   - Fair
   - Positive

4. In “real life” situations, your likelihood of actually attempting to engage in behaviors recommended in the course:
   - Likely
   - Impossible
   - Probable
   - Would not

5. Your likelihood of actually enrolling in another course of related content if your schedule so permits:
   - Unlikely
   - Possible
   - Improbable
   - Would

Notes. All items assessing affective learning were measured using 7-point bi-polar scale response categories. Items 1a, 1c, 1d, 2b, 3a, 3c, 3d, 4a, 4c, 5b, 5d were reverse coded. Higher scores indicate greater perceptions of affective learning.
Appendix E

Perceived Homophily Measure

Directions: Complete the questions in reference to the teacher of the class you listed on this survey.

1. Doesn't think like me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Thinks like me
2. From social class similar to mine 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  From social class different from mine
3. Behaves like me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Doesn't behave like me
4. Economic situation different from mine 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Economic situation like mine
5. Similar to me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Different from me
6. Status like mine 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Status different from mine
7. Unlike me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Like me
8. Background different from mine 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  Background similar to mine

Notes. All items assessing perceived homophily were measured using 7-point bipolar scale response categories. Items 2, 3, 5, and 6 were reverse-coded. Higher scores represent greater perceptions of student-teacher homophily.
Appendix F

Instructor Friendliness Measure

Directions: Please read the statements below and indicate your level of agreement with each. Respond to all statements in reference to the teacher of the class you listed on this survey.

1. My teacher tends to be very encouraging.
2. My teacher readily expresses admiration.
3. My teacher verbally acknowledges my classroom contributions.
4. My teacher is extremely friendly.
5. My teacher is warm and supportive.
6. I can confide in my teacher.
7. I can trust my teacher.
8. I look forward to seeing my teacher.
9. My teacher is pleasant towards me.
10. My teacher likes me.
11. My teacher regularly displays an open smile.
12. My teacher creates eye contact with us.

Notes. All items assessing instructor friendliness were measured using 7-point Likert-type scale response categories (1= very strongly disagree, 2= strongly disagree, 3= disagree, 4= neutral, 5= agree, 6= strongly agree, 7= very strongly agree). Higher scores indicate greater perceptions of instructor friendliness.
Appendix G

Power Distance Measure

Directions: Please read the statements below and indicate your level of agreement with each. Respond to all statements in reference to the teacher of the class you listed on this survey.

1. When an evaluation (e.g., test grade, presentation grade) made by my teacher does not fit with my expectations, I feel free to discuss it with my teacher.

2. I am not afraid to openly disagree with my teacher.

3. I feel comfortable challenging my teacher.

4. It is alright for me to be critical of my teacher.

5. My teacher tends to make decisions in an autocratic way (i.e., exercising absolute authority).

Notes. All items assessing power distance were measured using 7-point Likert-type scale response categories (1= very strongly disagree, 2= strongly disagree, 3= disagree, 4= neutral, 5= agree, 6= strongly agree, 7= very strongly agree). Items 1, 2, 3, 4 were reverse coded. Higher scores indicate greater perceptions of power distance.
Appendix H

Communicative Responsibility Measure

Directions: Please read the statements below and indicate your level of agreement with each. Respond to all statements in reference to the teacher of the class you listed on this survey.

1. I feel just as responsible as my teacher for contributing to my understanding of class lectures and presentations.

2. Simply attending class does not ensure understanding of my teacher’s lectures and presentations. While in class, I must also actively participate to ensure my understanding of my teacher’s lectures and presentations.

3. If I am unclear about class lectures and presentations, it is my responsibility to ask my teacher for clarification.

4. I have an obligation to ask as many questions as needed to assure my understanding of lectures and presentations.

5. I feel responsible for providing relevant examples of classroom concepts during lectures and presentations.

6. Understanding between my teacher and me is primarily my teacher’s responsibility.

Notes. All items assessing communicative responsibility were measured using 7-point Likert-type scale response categories (1 = very strongly disagree, 2 = strongly disagree, 3 = disagree, 4 = neutral, 5 = agree, 6 = strongly agree, 7 = very strongly agree). Item 6 was reverse coded. Higher scores indicate reports of higher student communicative responsibility.

1. Indicate on the scale below the extent to which you believe your teacher is responsible for successfully creating understanding in the classroom.

   0%  10%  20%  30%  40%  50%  60%  70%  80%  90%  100%

2. Indicate on the scale below the extent to which you believe you are responsible for successfully creating understanding in the classroom.

   0%  10%  20%  30%  40%  50%  60%  70%  80%  90%  100%
Appendix I

Other Measures

1. What is your age, in years?
2. What is your gender?  Male  Female
3. Please indicate your year in school.
   1st year  2nd year  3rd year  4th year  5th year and beyond
4. What grade are you earning in the class you referenced for this survey?
5. What is the approximate number of students in the class you referenced?
6. Is the class you referenced in your major or intended major?  Yes/No
7. Have you taken a previous class with the instructor for the class you referenced?  Yes/No
8. What is the gender of your instructor?  Male  Female
9. What is the approximate age of your instructor?
10. Which of the following best describes your instructor’s title?
    Professor  Lecturer  Graduate Teaching Assistant
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