

2001

Status and status differential as predictors of student learning, teacher evaluation, teacher socio-communicative style and teacher credibility

Boris Hellmann
West Virginia University

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

Recommended Citation

Hellmann, Boris, "Status and status differential as predictors of student learning, teacher evaluation, teacher socio-communicative style and teacher credibility" (2001). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 890.

<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/890>

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

Status and Status Differential as Predictors of Student
Learning, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Socio-Communicative Style
and Teacher Credibility

Boris Hellmann

Thesis submitted to the
Eberly College of Arts and Sciences
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in Communication Studies

James C. McCroskey, Ed.D., Chair
Matthew M. Martin, Ph.D.
Virginia P. Richmond, Ph.D.

Department of Communication Studies

Morgantown, West Virginia
2001

Keywords: Communication, Education, Status, Status Differential,
Instructional Setting

Copyright 2001 Boris Hellmann

ABSTRACT

Status and Status Differential as Predictors of Student Learning, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Socio-Communicative Style and Teacher Credibility

Boris Hellmann

This study examined the relationships of perceived teacher-student status as well as their status differential with student learning, teacher evaluation, teacher socio-communicative style, and teacher credibility. It was found that perceived teacher status is a weak predictor of student cognitive and affective learning, teacher evaluation, teacher socio-communicative style and teacher credibility. Students' perception of their own status was also found to be a weak predictor of the learning loss, teacher evaluation as well as teacher competence, and trustworthiness. Moreover, status differential between teacher and student was found to be a weak predictor of student affective learning as well as teacher competence. In general, this study's results show non-linear positive, but weak, relationships of both status and status differential with instructional outcomes. Further implications of these results are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

to Rebecca

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	
INTRODUCTION	
Definitions	1
Rationale & Research Questions	4
Chapter 2	
METHODS AND PROCEDURES	
Participants	6
Procedures	6
Measurement	7
Data Analyses	13
Chapter 3	
RESULTS	
Preliminary Analysis	15
Post hoc Analysis	19
Chapter 4	
DISCUSSION	21
References	25
Appendix A	
STUDENT-TEACHER SURVEY	30
Appendix B	
Table 1:	
Simple Statistics for Measures	35
Table 2:	
Correlations between Status and Status Differential & Student Learning, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Socio-Communicative Style, and Teacher Credibility	36
Table 3:	
Sizes of Low, Medium, and High Groups by Teacher Status and Status Differential	37
Table 4:	
Means, F-Ratios, and Significance for Analysis of Variance with Student-Perceived Teacher Status	38
Table 5:	
Means, F-Ratios, and Significance for Analysis of Variance with Teacher Status as perceived by others	39

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Most universities are non-profit organizations (Richmond & McCroskey, 2001) in which power plays a key role in defining and shaping these instructional organizational settings. The status differential observed within the academy in the teacher-student dialectic plays a central role in power relations.

This study sought to determine whether perceptions of status and status differential existing between the teacher and the student are important elements affecting instructional outcomes. These outcomes included student learning, teacher evaluation, teacher socio-communicative style, and teacher credibility.

Definitions

Status

Status is a "person's role or position within a group or an organization" (Richmond & McCroskey, 2001, p. 117). It can also be defined as one's social rank (Koehler, Anatol, & Applbaum, 1981) or "prestige associated with divisions of labour located within a variety of social contexts" (O'Sullivan, Hartley, Saunders, Montgomery, & Fiske, 1998, p. 298). Status affects the way people interact with each other, especially if there is a relatively large status differential among them (Hickson,

Stacks, & Padgett-Greely, 1998; Koehler, Anatol, & Applbaum, 1981; Richmond & McCroskey, 2001).

It is sometimes difficult to separate power and status while studying the complex communication processes in different settings because they are interrelated. In the instructional setting power of the teacher is not automatically granted, but is an earned right (Richmond & McCroskey, 1992). Moreover, Koehler, Anatol, & Applbaum (1981) noted that status is related to the acceptance of power. Furthermore, the "more a person exercises power effectively, the more that person is accorded high status" (p. 198).

Status can be either earned or it may come automatically with the position one holds in an organization (Richmond & McCroskey, 2001). Moreover, status is usually accompanied by different status symbols, e.g. competence, seniority, education, skills, and experience. There are also a number of tangible, visible things that denominate status like clothing and various possessions. Related to the working (i.e. office) environment, there are status symbols such as size and location of the office, furnishings, company car, secretary, and different privileges (longer lunches, extended vacation time, or flexible working hours) (Koehler, Anatol, & Applbaum, 1981; Richmond & McCroskey, 2001).

Status Differential

Richmond and McCroskey (2001) noted that "too much or too little status can inhibit communication" with business organizations (p. 119) as well as affect its quality, and possibly can cause resentment or conflict. Thus, keeping the differences in status on a moderate level is important in sustaining a positive work environment. Perceived status differential plays a key role as an important factor in this process.

Status differential is a perceived difference in status between two people (Richmond & McCroskey, 2001). It is a perception, relational in the mind of the individuals. "As the perceived status differential increases ... , the quality of communication decreases" (p. 120). On the other hand, a decrease in status differential increases the quality of communication. Lazarus & Homer (1980) found that a more informal kindergarten setting effectively decreases the status differential between teacher and children, which increases participation and responsibility on the part of the children.

There are a number of studies that show positive outcomes related to status differential. In one cross-cultural study related to organizational context, Gibson (1995) found that student-perceived group efficacy was positively correlated with status differential. Related to instructional setting Siller's

(1970) study found that the status differential existent in student-teacher relationship is a prerequisite for the development of independence and maturity of students.

Rationale & Research Questions

Due to the limited research on status and status differential in the instructional context and their potential relationships with student learning, teacher evaluation, teacher socio-communicative style and teacher credibility, the following rationales and research questions were posed:

Since affective and cognitive learning are major outcomes of instruction, following research question was posed:

RQ1: To what extent are status and status differential related to student affective and cognitive learning?

Teachers' careers are determined to how students respond to the teachers. Therefore the following research question was posed:

RQ2: To what extent are status and status differential related to teacher evaluation?

Research has indicated that teacher socio-communicative style was highly associated with teacher effectiveness in the instructional setting. Therefore the following research question was posed:

RQ3: To what extent are status and status differential related to teacher socio-communicative style?

Teachers with high credibility have positive instructional outcomes. Therefore the following research question was posed:

RQ4: To what extent are status and status differential related to teacher credibility?

Chapter Two

METHODS & PROCEDURES

Participants

The participants for the study were drawn from a convenience sample of 238 students enrolled in Communication classes at a medium sized mid-Atlantic university. There were 109 males and 129 females. One hundred and forty seven students reported they had a male teacher, whereas 91 students reported that their teacher was female.

Procedures

Directions included in the survey (see Appendix A) asked the participants to evaluate the teachers that they had in the class they took immediately prior to the lecture in which the data were collected. Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, and Richmond (1986) introduced this technique. It allows larger variation in terms of both course content and teachers. Moreover, since the participants were enrolled in a service type course that enrolled students from all academic fields of study, it was assumed that the sample would be representative of teachers and classes offered at that university. The data analysis supported this belief: 25.2% of the students were taking classes related to liberal arts and humanities, 12.6% to per-medicine subjects, 13.2% to technical, i.e. so called "hard" sciences, 33.3% to social sciences, and 15.7% to business related subject matter.

Data were collected one month before the end of the semester during the regular lecture periods. By that time students were well acquainted with the typical classroom behaviors of the teachers they were evaluating.

Measurement

Development of Perceived Status Differential Instrument

The perception that students had about their status and the status of their teacher was a central concern. Thus a two-item instrument focusing on the status perception seemed to be more direct and possibly more reliable, than a multi-item measure that would focus on symbols of seniority, education, "demographic" characteristics, etc.

The core of the perceived status differential instrument was a self-report on two bipolar scales in conjunction with two questions with the following directions:

Assume that a college freshman has one (1) unit of status and the college dean has ten (10) units of status.

1. How many units of status do you think the teacher has in the class you have before this one? _____ unit(s)
2. How many units of status do you think you have? _____ unit(s)

In effect, the status differential is the score that is determined by subtracting the student's score from the teacher's score. A higher score would indicate a larger status differential, whereas the lower score would indicate a smaller status differential. If both reported numbers match, there is no perceived status differential.

A pilot study was conceptualized in order to determine test-retest reliability of the new status instrument. Undergraduate students ($n = 36$) enrolled in Communication classes at a medium sized mid-Atlantic university were asked to evaluate themselves and the teachers they had in the previous class on the ten-step continuum with the directions described above. After a week they were asked to report their answers again. Thus, the test-retest reliability of .58 for status differential was obtained. For the teacher-related item (question number one) had a test-retest reliability of .66 was obtained. For the student-related item (question number two) a test-retest reliability of .77 was obtained.

Since the reliability of the one-item scale was not high in the initial phase of the development of status differential measure, two additional items were incorporated into the final survey framework in order to test the instrument's concurrent validity. The first measure was a direct measure of student's

perceptions. The new measure was an indirect estimate of those same perceptions. The two additional questions were:

3. How many units of status do your classmates think the teacher has in the class you have before this one? _____ unit(s)

4. How many units of status do your classmates think you have? _____ unit(s)

The second instrument containing questions number three and four was conceptualized as an indirect measure of status and status differential. The analysis revealed concurrent validity of .82 between the status differential instrument measuring student perceptions of status (questions number one and two) and the status differential instrument measuring perceptions of others (questions number three and four).

A correlation of .83 was found between the items measuring the teacher status directly (question number one) and indirectly (question number three). Moreover, the correlation of .85 was found between the items measuring the perception of student status directly (question number two) and indirectly (question number four).

Cognitive Learning

The cognitive learning instrument were responses on two bipolar scales advanced by Richmond, McCroskey, Kearney, & Plax (1987). Respondents were asked to indicate on a scale of 0-9 (with "0" meaning nothing and "9" meaning more than any other class they had ever had) their perception of how much they felt they learned in the class they had before the class in which the data were collected. A second scale used the same 0-9 range and was focused on the question of how much students believed they could have learned had they had an ideal instructor. To compute the "learning loss" - a second indicator of cognitive learning, results from item one were subtracted from item two, thus creating the a "learning loss" measure.

Affective Learning

Previous research indicated that affective learning could be representatively measured by evaluating two aspects of the affective learning context: affective evaluations of course content and potential future enrollment in a course with a similar content (Teven & McCroskey, 1997). Thus affective learning was measured in this study by the use of two, four-item (McCroskey, 1994) measures that employed a seven-step continuum (strongly agree: 7, strongly disagree: 1). They were related to the affect toward the course content (good/bad; worthless/valuable; fair/unfair; negative/positive) and toward

enrolling in another course with similar content (likely/unlikely; impossible/possible; probable/improbable; would not/would). In the present investigation, alpha reliabilities of these scales were .83 for their affect toward the course content and .95 for their likelihood of enrolling in another class with similar content. Both dimensions together had alpha reliability of .90.

Teacher Evaluation

Two four-item measures (good/bad; valuable/worthless; fair/unfair; negative/positive) advanced by McCroskey (1994) were utilized to measure teacher evaluation on a seven-step continuum (strongly agree: 7, strongly disagree: 1). They were related to attitudes toward the teacher as well as to likelihood of taking another course with the teacher. In the present investigation, alpha reliabilities of these scales were .89 for their attitude toward the instructor and .94 for their likelihood of taking another course with that instructor. Both dimensions together had alpha reliability of .94.

Teacher Socio-Communicative Style

A two dimensional randomly distributed 20-item measure (McCroskey & Richmond, 1990) was used to assess teacher socio-communicative style. The two dimensions were labeled as assertiveness and responsiveness. In the present study they were measuring student perception related to teacher's socio-

communicative style on a five-step continuum (strongly agree: 5, strongly disagree: 1). Assertiveness items were: (1) [teacher] defends own beliefs; (2) [is] independent; (3) forceful; (4) has strong personality; (5) [is] assertive; (6) dominant; (7) willing to take a stand; (8) acts as a leader; (9) [is] aggressive; and (10) competitive. Responsiveness items were: (1) [teacher is] helpful; (2) responsive to others; (3) sympathetic; (4) compassionate; (5) sensitive to the needs of others; (6) sincere; (7) gentle; (8) warm; (9) tender; and (10) friendly. In the present investigation, alpha reliabilities of these two dimensions were .86 for assertiveness and .93 for responsiveness.

Teacher Credibility

In the present study student perceptions of three dimensions of teacher credibility were measured: teacher competence, caring, and trustworthiness. The items related to these three dimensions confirmed by Thweatt & McCroskey (1998) were evaluated on a seven-step continuum (strongly agree: 7, strongly disagree: 1).

The items related to the competence dimension of teacher credibility were: (1) Reliable/Unreliable; (2) Informed/Uninformed; (3) Qualified/Unqualified; (4) Competent/Incompetent; (5) Trained/Untrained; (6) Expert/Inexpert.

The trustworthiness dimension included following items: (1) Trustworthy/ Untrustworthy; (2) Ethical/Unethical; (3) Genuine/Phoney; (4) Honest/Dishonest; (5) Honorable/Dishonorable; (6) Moral/Immoral.

The "good will" or "caring" dimension was clearly separated and identified by Teven & McCroskey (1997). For the purposes of this study their recommendation to equalize the number of items to both other dimensions of ethos was taken into consideration. Thus, respondent students were asked to evaluate the following six items representing teacher's caring: (1) Cares about me/Doesn't care about me; (2) Has my interests at heart/Doesn't have my interests at heart; (3) Self-centered/Not self-centered; (4) Unconcerned with me/Concerned with me; (5) Insensitive/Sensitive; (6) Not understanding/Understanding.

In the present investigation, alpha reliabilities of these three dimensions of teacher credibility were .90 for teacher competence, .90 for teacher caring, and .91 for teacher trustworthiness.

Data Analyses

Alpha was set at .05 for all tests of significance. Simple statistics for status, status differential and outcome measures are reported in Table 1.

Pearson correlations were utilized as data analytic techniques to investigate relationships of perceived status and

teacher-student status differential with student learning, teacher evaluation, teacher socio-communicative style and teacher credibility (Table 2). Analyses of variance were used to probe potential non-linear relationships.

Chapter Three

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

Research Question One

Research question one examined the relationship of teacher status and teacher-student status differential with student affective and cognitive learning. Pearson correlations indicated that both student-perceived teacher status as well as others perceptions and cognitive learning were associated at a statistically significant level ($\underline{r} = .24$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for student perception, and $\underline{r} = .21$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for perception by others). Higher levels of perceived teacher status were related to higher levels of cognitive learning. This indicates that the higher the teacher status, the more students learn. Learning loss was also significantly associated with perception of status ($\underline{r} = -.16$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for student-perception, and $\underline{r} = -.14$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for perception by others). These results indicate that the higher the teacher status, the less learning loss occurs. Moreover, there are two significant findings related to perception of student status and learning loss. Pearson correlations indicated that student status and learning loss were associated at a statistically significant level ($\underline{r} = -.17$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for student perceived status, and $\underline{r} = -.15$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for status as perceived

by others). This indicates that students who perceive themselves as having higher status tend to have less learning loss.

Although there was no significant correlation between status differential and either cognitive learning or learning loss, Pearson correlations indicated that status differential and affective learning were associated at a statistically significant level ($\underline{r} = .19$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for student-perceived status differential, and $\underline{r} = .13$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for status differential as perceived by others). Moreover, significant positive relationships were found between teacher status and affective learning ($\underline{r} = .20$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for student-perception, and $\underline{r} = .15$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for perception by others). It seems that the higher status differential and teacher status, the more affective learning occurs.

Research Question Two

The second research question investigated the association of status and status differential with teacher evaluation. Results indicated that only teacher status and teacher evaluation were related ($\underline{r} = .25$, $\underline{p} > .05$ for student-perception, and $\underline{r} = .24$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for perception by others). This indicates that teachers who are perceived as having higher status also get better teacher evaluations. Moreover, there are also two significant findings related to perception of student status and teacher evaluation. Pearson correlations indicated

that student status and teacher evaluation were associated at a statistically significant level ($\underline{r} = .14$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for both student perceptions and perceptions by others). This indicates that students who perceive themselves as having higher status tend to evaluate their teachers much higher.

Research Question Three

The third research question looked at the relationships of status and status differential with teacher socio-communicative style. Results showed statistically significant positive associations between only teacher status and teacher assertiveness ($\underline{r} = .23$, $\underline{p} > .05$ for student-perception, and $\underline{r} = .26$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for perception by others). Higher levels of teacher status appear to be associated with higher levels of teacher assertiveness. Moreover, significant positive relationships were found between teacher status and teacher responsiveness ($\underline{r} = .19$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for student-perception, and $\underline{r} = .20$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for perception by others). It seems that teachers who are perceived as having higher status are seen more assertive, and to a somewhat lesser degree more responsive.

Research Question Four

The last research question examined the relationship of status and status differential with teacher credibility. Pearson correlations indicated that status differential and student-perceived teacher competence were associated at a statistically

significant level ($\underline{r} = .15$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for self perceived status differential, and $\underline{r} = .18$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for status differential as perceived by others). Moreover, significant positive relationships were found between teacher status and teacher competence ($\underline{r} = .30$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for student-perception, and $\underline{r} = .32$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for perception by others), and student status and teacher competence ($\underline{r} = .13$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for both student as well as perception by others). It seems that the higher status differential, teacher and student status, the more teacher seems to be perceived as competent.

Although there were no significant correlations between status differential and other two dimensions of teacher credibility (teacher caring and trustworthiness) significant positive relationships were found between teacher status and student-perceived teacher caring ($\underline{r} = .18$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for student-perception, and $\underline{r} = .16$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for perception by others). It seems that the higher the perception of teacher status, the more is teacher likely to be perceived as caring. Moreover, significant positive relationships were also found between teacher status and teacher trustworthiness ($\underline{r} = .26$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for student-perception, and $\underline{r} = .28$, $\underline{p} < .05$ for perception by others). These results seem to indicate that the higher the perception of teacher status, the more the teacher is perceived to be trustworthy.

Finally, there are two significant findings related to perception of student status and teacher trustworthiness. Pearson correlations indicated that student status and student-perceived teacher trustworthiness were associated at a statistically significant level ($r = .25$, $p < .05$ for student-perceived status, and $r = .22$, $p < .05$ for status as perceived by others). This indicates that students who perceive themselves as having higher status tend to have more trust in their teachers.

Post hoc Analysis

Even though there were no research questions related to sex or class characteristics it is possible that these variables may be associated with student perceptions of status. Thus post hoc analyses were conducted by utilizing General Linear Model Procedure to examine the effects of sex and class characteristics. Although there were no significant findings related to the class characteristics, sex differences were found related to student perception of teacher status. In general, female students evaluated their teachers as having higher status than their male counterparts ($F(1,236)=4.84$, $p<.05$ for student-perception of status, and $F(1,236)=7.04$, $p<.05$ for perception by others).

Analyses of variance were used to probe potential non-linear relationships. Students that reported low teacher status

and minimal status differential were determined by using cut-offs of one standard deviation below the sample mean. The same method (one standard deviation above the sample mean) was used to identify the group of students that reported high status or large status differential. Moreover, since the one standard deviation ($SD = 1.3$) above the mean of the perceived teacher status ($M = 6.8$ for direct, and $M = 6.6$ for indirect measure) was very close to the maximum value of teacher status, the cut-off for the students that reported high teacher status was set at 7.0. The mapping of high, medium, and low groups is represented in Table 3.

Results of these analyses (see Table 4 and Table 5) reveal that high status was significantly superior to moderate or low status in almost every case. Only in the cases of student-perceived teacher competence and learning loss were the low and moderate status perceptions significantly different from one another. This is revealing clearly non-linear patterns. High status is associated with positive effects. Low and moderate status are associated with less positive effects.

Chapter Four

DISCUSSION

Although the effects of perceived status and status differential were very small in the present study, there are possible explanations for this occurrence. They relate foremost to the measurement of status differential: while it was found that the perceived status differential instrument has good concurrent validity, its precision was low. As already noted, the conceptualization of status denominates many things: age, ethnicity, religion, gender, competence, seniority, education, skills, and experience. Thus, the word "status" that was used in the survey probably stimulated different meanings in the minds of respondents: e.g., while some students might have been more focused on the issues of seniority, others might have been more focused on teacher's competence and skills.

Therefore the low precision of the instrument would suggest artificially reduced correlations. Nevertheless, the present study showed positive outcomes of perceived status and status differential in the instructional setting. Students tend to learn more, both affectively and cognitively, if they perceive the teacher as having higher status. Also, they have less learning loss. Moreover, the status differential between teacher and student has positive effects on student affective learning and perceptions of teacher competence.

With regard to teacher evaluations, the study indicate that teachers who are perceived as having higher status also get better teacher evaluations. They are also seen to be more assertive, and to a lesser degree more responsive. Moreover, higher-status teachers are more likely to be perceived as competent, caring and trustworthy.

Finally, the study found that students who perceive themselves as having higher status tend to have more trust in their teachers. This is the only relevant and consistent finding pertinent to perceptions of student status. It must be emphasized that the linear correlations obtained are extremely conservative estimates of the relationships between status and the outcome variables. As noted in Tables 4 and 5, non-linear relationships accounted for as much as 15 percent of the variance.

The study's findings have possible implications for the instructional arena. They put an additional weight to the argument that traditional values still sustain in the educational setting. Many writers have suggested that the values were changed due to the influx of idealistic views of classroom empowerment and the minimizing of the status differential (Brady, 1995; Buckingham, 1998; Giroux, Lankshear, McLaren, & Peters, 1996; hooks, 1994; Kahaney, Perry, & Janangelo, 1993; Kanpol, 1994; McLaren, 1996; Misgeld, 1987; Shor, 1992).

Diametrically opposed to these ideas was 19th century ideal of being (and looking) old. The teacher ideal of that time was of the one who stands at the distance. This distance, conceptualized as status differential in this study, must be felt, but not within the traditional superior-subordinate teacher-student relationship. Rather than that, the knowledge should be the power base from which teachers build their status. Moreover, as the present study implies, teachers should not try to equalize themselves to the level of their students in terms of status, but should try to keep a "healthy" status differential, which will have positive instructional outcomes. The teacher should appeal to and "impress" the students while at the same time keeping this "healthy" distance.

Recommendations for future research would include the investigation of relationships of status and status differential with non-verbal immediacy. Also, by taking out other variables closely related to status (e.g., responsiveness or caring) it could be investigated whether it could be accounted for additional variance. Sex differences in perception of status could be further investigated as well. Moreover, an experimental setting focused on the manipulation of perceived instructor's status could further test the validity of status measurement. Finally, "actual" status could be assessed by students reporting their and their teacher's real, objective status existing in the

instructional setting. For this purpose class rank (e.g., freshmen, sophomore, junior, senior student vs. teaching assistant, associate professor, full professor) could be used one additional indicator of status. This objective indicator could be employed to strengthen the validity of perceived status measurement.

References

Brady, J. (1995). Schooling young children: A feminist pedagogy for liberatory learning. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Buckingham, D. (1998). Teaching popular culture: Beyond radical pedagogy. London: UCL Press.

Gibson, C. B. (1995). Determinants and consequences of group efficacy beliefs in work organizations in the United States, Hong Kong, and Indonesia. Dissertation Abstracts International, 56 (06), 2318A. (University Microfilms No. AAM95-33167)

Giroux, H. A., Lankshear, C., McLaren, P., & Peters, M. (1996). Counternarratives: Cultural studies and critical pedagogies in postmodern spaces. New York: Routledge.

Hickson, M., Stacks, D. W., & Padgett-Greely, M. (1998). Organizational communication in the personal context: From interview to retirement. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

hooks, b. (1994). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. New York: Routledge.

Kahaney, P., Perry, L. A. M., & Janangelo, J. (1993). Theoretical and critical perspectives on teacher change. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kanpol, B. (1994). Critical Pedagogy: An introduction. Westpoint, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Koehler, J. W., Anatol, K. W. E., & Applbaum, R. L. (1981). Organizational communication: Behavioral perspectives (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Lazarus, P., & Homer, S. L. (1980). Sharing Time in Kindergarten: A Study of the Relationship between Structure and Content. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Rocky Mountain Educational Research Association, Las Cruces, NM.

McCroskey, J. C. (1994). Assessment of affect toward communication and affect toward instruction in communication. In S. Morreale and M. Brooks (Eds.) Assessing college student competency in speech communication. (pp.56-71). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1990). Reliability and separation of factors on the assertiveness-responsiveness measure. Psychological Reports, 67, 449-450.

McLaren, P. (1996). Liberatory politics and higher education: A freirean perspective. In H. Giroux, C. Lankshear, P. McLaren, & M. Peters, Counternarratives: Cultural studies and critical pedagogies in postmodern spaces (pp. 117-148). New York: Routledge.

Misgeld, D. (1987). Education and cultural invasion: Critical social theory, education as instruction, and the "pedagogy of the oppressed". In J. Forester, (Ed.), Critical theory and public life (pp. 77-118). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

O'Sullivan, T., Hartley, J., Saunders, D., Montgomery, M., & Fiske, J. (1998). Key concepts in communication and cultural studies (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

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

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

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (2001). Organizational communication for survival: Making work, work (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1987). Power in the classroom VII: Linking behavior alteration techniques to cognitive learning. Communication Education, 36(1), 1-12.

Shor, I. (1992). Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Siller, J. (1970). The psychopathology of status, Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 14, 102-107.

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

Thweatt, K. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1998). The impact of teacher immediacy and misbehaviors on teacher credibility. Communication Education, 47, 348-358.

Appendix A

STUDENT-TEACHER SURVEY

This survey is concerned with how students perceive teachers. We are asking that you complete the survey to the best of your knowledge. Please respond to the survey in terms of the class you took immediately before the class you are in now. If you do not have a class earlier in the day than this one, then respond to the last class you had yesterday.

Please do not sign your name or indicate your teacher's name to this form.

In the space provided please list the subject matter of that class:

Please circle the range in which the number of that class falls:

- 1)1-99 2)100-199 3)200-299 4)300-499

Assume that a college **freshman** has one (1) unit of status and the **college dean** has ten (10) units of status.

How many units of status do you think the teacher has in the class you have before this one? ____ unit(s)

How many units of status do you think you have? ____ unit(s)

How many units of status do your classmates think the teacher has in the class you have before this one? ____ unit(s)

How many units of status do your classmates think you have? ____ unit(s)

On the scale of 0-9 please indicate how much did you learn in the class you have before this one, with 0 meaning **nothing** and 9 meaning you **learned more than in any other class** you've had?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

How much do you think you could have learned in the class you have before this one if you had the ideal instructor?

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Please turn over for next page

Below are several items, which look at how you feel about various aspects of the class you have before this one. Please circle the number for each item, which best represents your feelings about each area of that class.

My attitude toward the content of that course:

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

My attitude about the instructor of the class I have before this one:

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

My likelihood of actually enrolling in another course of related content, if my schedule so permits:

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

The likelihood of my taking another class with the teacher of the class I have before this one, if I have a choice, is:

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

Please turn over for next page

The questionnaire below lists twenty personality characteristics. Please indicate the degree to which you believe each of these characteristics applied to the teacher teaching the class you took immediately before this one. Please mark whether you (5) **strongly agree** that it applies, (4) **agree** that it applies, (3) are **undecided**, (2) **disagree** that it applies, or (1) **strongly disagree** that it applies. There are no right or wrong answers. Work quickly; record your first impression.

The teacher of the class you have before this one is:	___1.	helpful
	___2.	defends own beliefs
	___3.	independent
	___4.	responsive to me
	___5.	forceful
	___6.	has strong personality
	___7.	sympathetic
	___8.	compassionate
	___9.	assertive
	___10.	sensitive to the needs of others
	___11.	dominant
	___12.	sincere
	___13.	gentle
	___14.	willing to take a stand
	___15.	warm
	___16.	tender
	___17.	friendly
	___18.	acts as a leader
	___19.	aggressive
	___20.	competitive

Please turn over for next page

On the scales below please circle your **feelings about the teacher** of the class you have before this one. Please complete all items.

The teacher of the class you have before this one **is**:

- | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Reliable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Unreliable |
| 2. Uninformed | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Informed |
| 3. Unqualified | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Qualified |
| 4. Competent | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Incompetent |
| 5. Untrained | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Trained |
| 6. Inexpert | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Expert |
| 7. Cares about me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Not concerned about me |
| 8. Has my interests
at heart | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Did not have my
interests at heart |
| 9. Self-centered | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Not self-centered |
| 10. Concerned for me | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Not concerned for me |
| 11. Insensitive | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Sensitive |
| 12. Not understanding | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Understanding |
| 13. Untrustworthy | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Trustworthy |
| 14. Unethical | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Ethical |
| 15. Phoney | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Genuine |
| 16. Honest | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Dishonest |
| 17. Honorable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Dishonorable |
| 18. Moral | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Immoral |

The sex of that teacher

Teaching the class you took

Immediately before this one is: (circle) Male Female

My sex is: (circle) Male Female

Thank you for your participation!

Appendix B

Table 1

Simple Statistics for Measures

Measure	Mean	SD	Reliability	Range
Teacher Status	6.8	1.3	N/A	3-9
Student Status	3.2	1.2	N/A	1-7
Teacher Status*	6.6	1.3	N/A	3-9
Student Status*	3.1	1.2	N/A	1-7
Status Differential	3.6	1.5	N/A	1-8
Status Differential*	3.5	1.4	N/A	1-8
Cognitive Learning	5.4	2.0	N/A	0-9
Perceived Learning Loss	1.4	1.6	N/A	0-7
Affective Learning	41.3	10.9	.90	14-56
Teacher Evaluation	42.2	12.1	.94	10-56
Teacher Assertiveness	34.9	6.8	.86	17-50
Teacher Responsiveness	36.6	7.8	.93	12-50
Teacher Competence	35.9	5.8	.90	6-42
Teacher Caring	30.6	7.1	.90	9-42
Teacher Trustworthiness	34.3	6.1	.91	14-42

*Status and Status Differential perception of others reported by student.

Table 2

Correlations between Status and Status Differential & Student Learning, Teacher Evaluation, Teacher Socio-Communicative Style, and Teacher Credibility

	Teacher Status	Student Status	Teacher Status*	Student Status*	Status Differ.	Status* Differ.
Cognitive Learning	.24	.11**	.21	.12**	.12**	.10**
Learning Loss	-.16	-.17	-.14	-.15	.01**	.00**
Affective Learning	.20	-.02**	.15	-.01**	.19	.13
Teacher Evaluation	.25	.14	.24	.14	.10**	.10**
Assertiveness	.23	.11**	.26	.12**	.11**	.14
Responsiveness	.19	.18	.20	.10**	.02**	.10**
Teacher Competence	.30	.13	.32	.13	.15	.18
Teacher Caring	.18	.13	.16	.11**	.05**	.06**
Teacher Trust	.26	.25	.28	.22	.02**	.07**

*Status and Status Differential perception of others reported by student.

** Correlation is not statistically significant.

Table 3

Sizes of Low, Medium, and High Groups by Teacher Status and Status Differential

	Low	Medium	High
Teacher Status	44	107 (106**)	87 (85*)
Status Differential	56	156 (154**)	26 (25**)
Teacher Status*	54	117 (116**)	67 (65**)
Status Differential*	63	122 (120**)	53 (52**)

*Status and Status Differential perception of others reported by student.

** Learning Loss sample size was smaller.

Table 4

Means, F-Ratios, and Significance for Analysis of Variance with Student-Perceived Teacher Status

	Low Status Means	Medium Status Means	High Status Means	F	P<	Eta ²
Cognitive Learning	4.66 ^a	5.12 ^b	6.06 ^{ab}	9.45	.0001	0.07
Learning Loss	1.93 ^{ab}	1.36 ^a	1.21 ^b	3.09	.0473	0.03
Affective Learning	38.20 ^a	40.01 ^b	44.45 ^{ab}	6.43	.0019	.05
Teacher Evaluation	37.68 ^a	40.79 ^b	46.18 ^{ab}	9.11	.0002	.07
Assertiveness	33.00 ^a	34.04 ^b	37.06 ^{ab}	7.38	.0008	.06
Responsiveness	34.86 ^a	36.12	38.13 ^a	3.01	.0512	.02
Teacher Competence	32.70 ^a	35.61 ^a	37.89 ^a	12.91	.0001	.10
Teacher Caring	28.80 ^a	30.15	32.01 ^a	3.44	.0338	.03
Teacher Trust	32.09 ^a	33.82 ^b	36.05 ^{ab}	7.13	.0010	.06

^{ab} means with same superscript are significantly different.

Table 5

Means, F-Ratios, and Significance for Analysis of Variance with Teacher Status as perceived by others

	Low Status Means	Medium Status Means	High Status Means	F	P<	Eta ²
Cognitive Learning	4.65 ^a	5.25 ^b	6.19 ^{ab}	10.24	.0001	0.08
Learning Loss	1.87 ^a	1.44	1.00 ^a	4.53	.0117	0.04
Affective Learning	38.13 ^a	40.97 ^b	44.43 ^{ab}	5.28	.0057	.04
Teacher Evaluation	37.41 ^a	41.19 ^a	47.80 ^a	13.02	.0001	.10
Assertiveness	32.30 ^a	34.64 ^a	37.63 ^a	10.23	.0001	.08
Responsiveness	35.09 ^a	35.38 ^{ab}	40.02 ^{ab}	9.58	.0001	.08
Teacher Competence	33.11 ^a	35.48 ^a	38.90 ^a	17.36	.0001	.13
Teacher Caring	29.30 ^a	29.60 ^b	33.33 ^{ab}	7.43	.0007	.06
Teacher Trust	31.94 ^a	33.60 ^b	37.48 ^{ab}	15.62	.0001	.12

^{ab} means with same superscript are significantly different.