THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHER-OFFERED EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT TO PUPIL CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

By

GLEN H. WALTER, JR.

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE COUNCIL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

1977
To Jackie
There are a great number of people who have directly and indirectly contributed to the preparation of this study. I appreciatively acknowledge the following people:

Dr. Carl Rogers, who through his writings, has introduced me to the humanistic philosophy of education.

Dr. Arthur Combs, who through his friendship, instruction, and writings, has added meaning and understanding to my concept of the helping professions.

Dr. Patricia Ashton, chairperson of my committee, for countless hours spent improving my grammar, rewording my thoughts, and correcting my spelling errors. Her patience, thoroughness, time, and effort is deeply appreciated. Her genuine concern for me, and all of her students, has made her special.

Dr. Donald Avila, friend and committee member, for his advice, knowledge, and friendship which has made my doctoral program a growth producing experience.

Dr. Walter Busby, friend and committee member, who, by his example, gave me insight into the dynamics of good teaching, and who, like Dr. Avila, extended his friendship and warmth beyond that of a professor.

Dr. R. S. Soar and Dr. R. L. Roebuck, for allowing me to use data from research studies that they have conducted.

Dr. Robert Jester, who not only helped with the statistical design of this study, but who also unselfishly shared his office for the entire year.
Ruth and Glen Walter, my parents, whose Christian love, support, and guidance has always, and will forever, influence me.

And, to my wife, Jackie, who has been willing to work beside me, sacrifice, and alter her life around this program and study, so that my dream of helping others could become a reality, I dedicate this study. I will be forever grateful.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ........................................ iii
LIST OF TABLES ........................................ vii
LIST OF FIGURES ........................................ viii
ABSTRACT .................................................. ix

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION ........................................ 1
   Statement of the Problem ............................... 1
   Purpose of the Study ................................ 4
   Significance of the Study .............................. 4

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ...................... 6
   Introduction ........................................... 6
   Theoretical Rationale ................................ 6
   Empirical Evidence on Interpersonal Skills ......... 10
   Summary ............................................... 20

III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY ................................ 22
   Hypotheses ............................................ 22
   Subjects ............................................... 23
   Procedures ............................................ 23
   Instrumentation ....................................... 24
      Florida Climate and Control System ............... 24
      Intra- and Inter-Reliability ....................... 25
      Validity ........................................... 26
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>INTER-RATER RELIABILITY FOR ASPY SCALES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND NUMBER OF CASES OF TEACHER-OFFERED EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT, PUPIL SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR, AND PUPIL DEVIANT BEHAVIOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CORRELATIONS (r), r SQUARED, AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE OF TEACHER-OFFERED VARIABLES OF EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT WITH PUPIL SUPPORTIVE CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CORRELATIONS (r), r SQUARED, AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE OF TEACHER-OFFERED VARIABLES OF EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT WITH PUPIL DEVIANT CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Z TRANSFORMATIONS AND LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE FOR CORRELATIONS OF TEACHER-OFFERED EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT AND PUPIL SUPPORTIVE AND DEVIANT BEHAVIOR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>INTERCORRELATIONS OF TEACHER-OFFERED VARIABLES OF EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# List of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scatter diagram of the variable teacher-offered empathy with pupil supportive behavior.</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scatter diagram of the variable teacher-offered genuineness with pupil supportive behavior.</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Scatter diagram of the variable teacher-offered respect with pupil supportive behavior.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Scatter diagram of the variable teacher-offered empathy with pupil deviant behavior.</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Scatter diagram of the variable teacher-offered genuineness with pupil deviant behavior.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Scatter diagram of the variable teacher-offered respect with pupil deviant behavior.</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate Council of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

THE RELATIONSHIP OF TEACHER-OFFERED EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT TO PUPIL CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR

By

Glen H. Walter, Jr.

August 1977

Chairman: Dr. Patricia Ashton
Major Department: Foundations of Education

Empathy, genuineness, and respect have often been identified as critical factors in the facilitation of learning. However, empirical evidence of the relationship between these teacher behaviors and student classroom behavior is needed. Perhaps development of the interpersonal skills of empathy, genuineness, and respect may lead to more effective classroom management.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil classroom behavior. A significant positive correlation was expected between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive classroom behavior. A significant negative correlation was expected between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior.
Three hypotheses were tested:

Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are positively related to pupil supportive classroom behavior.

Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are negatively related to pupil deviant classroom behavior.

There is a significant difference between the correlation of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive classroom behavior and the correlation of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior.

The sample consisted of 41 fifth grade teachers and their classrooms. The sample included both black and Caucasian teachers and students from rural, suburban, and urban populations in six counties in central Florida.

Two instruments were used in the study. Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect were rated according to the Aspy Rating Scale. Observations of two factors from a systematic observation system, the Florida Climate and Control System, provided the measures of pupil supportive and pupil deviant behavior.

In testing the first hypothesis, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine the relationships of the teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect to pupil supportive classroom behavior. Each of the three teacher-offered variables had a significant positive correlation with pupil supportive behavior. The correlation of teacher-offered empathy and pupil supportive behavior was .58 (p is greater than .01); the correlation between teacher-offered genuineness and pupil supportive behavior was .584 (p is greater than .01); and the correlation teacher-offered respect with pupil supportive behavior was .47 (p is greater than .01).
In testing the second hypothesis, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine the correlations of the teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect with pupil deviant behavior. No significant relationships between the teacher variables and pupil deviant behavior were found.

In testing the third hypothesis, a formula for testing the degree of significance between two Pearson product-moment correlations from related samples was computed to determine if there was a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive behavior, and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant behavior. The findings indicated that there was a significant difference (at .05 level or beyond) for all three teacher-offered variables tested.

The data analyses led to the following conclusions:

1. Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect were significantly related to pupil supportive classroom behavior.

2. There did not appear to be any significant negative correlation between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior.

3. There was a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive behavior, and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant behavior.

Findings from this study suggest that training teachers to improve their interpersonal skills in the classroom may result in increases in pupil supportive behavior. Experimental research to investigate this possibility seems warranted.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The increasing amount of student disruptive behavior in the classroom has become a major concern in education. Gallop (1974) reported that in five of the six years he surveyed, discipline appeared as the number one problem in the schools. This problem has caused such a concern in the public schools in Florida, that a Governor's Task Force (1973) was commissioned to study school disruption. According to this Task Force, the growing frequency of disruption, the increased number of disruptive students, and the losses resulting from school disruption have created one of the most serious and complex problems yet encountered by schools.

Parent groups, teachers, administrators, colleges of education, and national educational organizations have all been trying to solve this distressing problem. Articles offering solutions to discipline problems in the classrooms have appeared in innumerable newspapers, magazines, and educational journals. The works of Bell (1971), Moser (1971), Gaines (1972), McCurdy (1973), McMillen (1973), and Stainback (1973) are representative of the enormous amount of literature dealing with the problem of classroom discipline. Despite the concerted efforts of countless groups, the problem of classroom discipline still remains.

Statement of the Problem

A great deal of empirical research has been conducted to identify factors related to classroom discipline. For example, Branch (1974)
reported that as many as 87 variables have been used to describe disruptive students, including socioeconomic status, academic achievement, IQ, race, sex, age, number of siblings, and whether or not parents are divorced. Since most of the variables found to be related to disruption were either unchangeable (race, sex, age) or beyond the scope of the schools (socioeconomic status, home environment, level of parents' education, marital status), Branch (1974) concluded that research has provided little assistance to educators in curbing school disruption. In a review of several research approaches to the study of classroom management, Dunkin and Biddle (1974) concluded that, while behavior modification and classroom climate studies have revealed a number of potentially productive directions for research applied to the problem of classroom discipline, considerable research is needed that explores the relationships between teacher characteristics and student behaviors.

Avila and Purkey (1971) argued that traditional approaches to discipline, whether positive or negative, treat the maintaining of discipline as if it were a matter of using certain techniques. The authors recommended a new approach to discipline. This new approach focuses on the teacher's beliefs about self, pupil, and teaching. The authors suggested that perhaps the most important teacher belief affecting classroom discipline is the teacher's belief in the worth and dignity of the individual.

Adding support to the approach recommended by Avila and Purkey (1971), Davidson and Lang (1960) reported that among students in grades four through six the higher the student's perceptions of positive feelings from the teacher, the more desirable was the student's classroom behavior. Rogers (1967) agreed that the relationship between the teacher
and the student is the key to effective teaching, and he identified three teacher attitudes or qualities that facilitate teacher-student relationships. These three teacher qualities are empathy, genuineness, and respect. Rogers (1967) defined these teacher qualities as follows:

**Empathy.** When the teacher has the ability to understand the students' reactions from the inside, has a sensitive awareness of the way the process of education and learning seems to the student, then again the likelihood of significant learning is increased. (p. 10)

**Genuineness.** When the facilitator is a real person, being what he is, entering into a relationship with the learner without presenting a front or a facade, he is much more likely to be effective. This means that the feelings which he is experiencing are available to him, available to his awareness, that he is able to live these feelings, be them, and able to communicate them if appropriate. It means that he comes into a direct personal encounter with the learner, meeting him on a person-to-person basis. It means that he is being himself, not denying himself. (p. 6)

**Respect.** It is caring for the learner, but a non-possessive caring. It is an acceptance of this other individual as a separate person, having worth in his own right. It is a basic trust—a belief that this other person is somehow fundamentally trustworthy. (p. 8)

Rogers felt that these three teacher qualities create an atmosphere that is conducive to significant learning.

Rogers has written extensively about the need for teachers to exhibit these qualities in their interactions with students. However, there has been little empirical research to determine the relationship between these teacher behaviors and actual student behavior in the classroom. This study was designed to provide evidence regarding the relationships among the teacher qualities of empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil classroom behavior to determine if these teacher characteristics might be expected to have an impact upon classroom management.
Purpose of the Study

The objective of this study was to determine if teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are related to pupil classroom behavior. More specifically, the following hypotheses were investigated:

Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are positively related to pupil supportive classroom behavior.

Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are negatively related to pupil deviant classroom behavior.

There is a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive behavior and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior.

Significance of the Study

Carl Rogers (1961) has stated that the major aim of education is the facilitation of learning. He added that facilitation of significant learning rests upon certain attitudinal qualities which exist in the relationship between the facilitator and the learner. The three teacher qualities which Rogers (1967) felt would facilitate learning are empathy, genuineness, and respect. Although many educators have agreed with Rogers (Gordon, 1974; Johnson, 1972; Wittmer & Myrick, 1974), there has been little empirical research to support this position. Aspy (1969) presented preliminary evidence to suggest that there is a relationship between the three qualities of the facilitative teacher and student achievement as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test. On the basis of his findings, Aspy (1974) developed a training module to help teachers use these interpersonal skills in their classrooms. Aspy (1974) has
also developed scales to measure these behaviors in teachers' classrooms. Roebuck (1975) demonstrated that these scales were a better means of predicting student achievement than specific-behavior observational instruments.

There has been little research to evaluate the effect of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect on actual student behavior in the classroom. Perhaps these skills are the key to classroom management. This study was designed to investigate the relationships of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect to student classroom behavior. If it can be demonstrated that there is a relationship between the teacher's interpersonal skills and pupil classroom behaviors, a basis for assisting teachers in their efforts to cope with classroom discipline problems might be provided.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Empathy, genuineness, and respect have long been considered an integral part of interpersonal skills. Rogers (1961) emphasized that these skills are essential for facilitative teaching. Wittmer and Myrick (1974) also identified these three teacher qualities as key characteristics for facilitating learning. Based on the assumption of the importance of these skills to effective teaching, Aspy (1974) and Gazda (1973) have included empathy, genuineness, and respect in teacher training modules designed to help teachers develop interpersonal skills.

In this chapter, the rationale for considering the interpersonal skills of empathy, genuineness, and respect as essential to facilitative teaching is reviewed. In addition, the research indicating that these skills are related to student achievement is presented. Finally, research supporting the hypothesis that the interpersonal skills of empathy, genuineness, and respect are related to student classroom behavior is discussed.

Theoretical Rationale

The aim of education, as defined by Rogers (1967), is the facilitation of learning. Rogers described the facilitation of learning as "the function which may hold constructive, tentative, changing, process answers to some of the deepest perplexities which beset man today" (p. 5). Rogers asserted that the key to facilitative teaching is the presence of
certain qualities in the personal relationship between the facilitator and the learner, and he identified three qualities or attitudes as necessary in this process.

The first quality that Rogers indicated a teacher should exhibit is empathic understanding:

When the teacher has the ability to understand the student's reactions from the inside, has the sensitive awareness of the way the process of education and learning seems to the student, then again the likelihood of significant learning is increased. (p. 10)

Empathic understanding is the ability of the teacher to see the world from the student's eyes.

The second, and, according to Rogers, perhaps the most important teacher quality related to facilitative teaching, is that of realness or genuineness. The genuine teacher is aware of his or her feelings, is able to live these feelings, and is also able to communicate these feelings, if appropriate. The genuine teacher can be a real person in his or her relationship with students. The genuine teacher can be happy, sad, bored, or enthused, and, in the process, becomes a real person to the students. Not all teachers possess genuineness, but as Rogers pointed out, it is a necessary quality for facilitation of learning.

The third quality that a teacher should possess in order to facilitate learning is respect; that is, acceptance of the other individual as a separate person. Rogers referred to this quality as "prizing the learner, prizing his feelings, his opinions, his person," (p. 8). The teacher who possesses this quality has the ability to accept the student
for what the student is, not for what the teacher wants the student to be. The respectful teacher can accept a student who is bored, and sometimes troublesome, because the student is seen as an imperfect human being with many potentials.

In summarizing the three qualities essential to facilitative teaching, Rogers (1967) concluded:

When a facilitator creates, even to a modest degree, a classroom climate characterized by such realness, prizing, and empathy, he discovers that he has inaugurated an educational revolution. Learning of a different quality, proceedings at a different pace, with a greater degree of pervasiveness occurring. Feelings - positive, negative, confused - become a part of the classroom experience. Learning becomes life, and a very vital life at that. The student is on his way, sometimes excitedly, sometimes reluctantly, to becoming a learning, changing being. (p. 11)

A number of other writers have also emphasized the critical importance of the student-teacher relationship in facilitating learning in the classroom. For example, Combs and Syngg (1959) defined the goal of education as the ability "to create the optimum conditions for individual growth and achievement of adequacy," (p. 343). According to Combs and Syngg, to facilitate the lifelong search for adequacy, education must involve personal elements, and learning must have personal meaning for the learner. Thus, the teacher must become more a facilitator of student growth than a conveyor of facts and figures.

Gordon (1974) stated that the most important factor in teacher effectiveness is the ability of the teacher to establish a particular kind of relationship with students:
It is the quality of the teacher-learner relationship that is crucial. More crucial, in fact, than what the teacher is teaching, how the teacher does it, or whom the teacher is trying to teach. (p. 13)

Wittmer and Myrick (1974) defined the goal of education as the facilitation of "an openness in attitudes so that individuals feel free to engage in personal growth experiences. It also implies that individuals must become more aware of their humanness and how this humanness affects all choices and decisions," (p. 1). According to Wittmer and Myrick, most teachers really want to facilitate the personal growth of their students, but, in too many cases, are hampered by traditional and conventional approaches which make facilitation difficult, if not impossible.

Wittmer and Myrick proposed that a teacher who is committed to facilitating personal growth in students will provide learning situations where learning is-

1. meaningful to the learner
2. voluntary
3. self-initiated
4. self-evaluated
5. feeling-oriented

Wittmer and Myrick also listed six characteristics which identify teachers who are high facilitators of personal growth. These are-

1. effective listening
2. genuineness
3. understanding  
4. respect  
5. intelligence  
6. skill in interpersonal communication

In summary, a number of theorists have indicated that teacher effectiveness is dependent upon the development of particular teacher-student relationships. A teacher must be able to create a warm, accepting, and genuine relationship with students in order to facilitate learning.

**Empirical Evidence on Interpersonal Skills**

One of the first efforts to gain empirical evidence on Rogers' theory that the key to helping relationships is the presence of attitudinal qualities of empathy, genuineness, and respect was a study conducted by Barrett-Lennard. Barrett-Lennard (1962) developed an instrument that measured genuineness or congruence, prizing or positive regard, and empathy or understanding. The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory was then given to both client and therapist to determine the perception of the relationship by both the client and therapist. Barrett-Lennard found that those clients who had shown more therapeutic change, as measured by other instruments, reported more genuineness, positive regard, and empathy in their relationship with the therapist than did those clients who showed less change.

Emmerling (1961) extended the research on conceptualization of the helping relationship to secondary school teachers. In his study, Emmerling divided teachers into two groups on the basis of how they answered the question, "What is my most serious problem in school?"
Teachers who listed their most serious problems in a positive, student-oriented manner were placed in a group labeled "open" or "positively oriented," and teachers who listed their most serious problems in a negative or critical manner were placed in a group identified as "negative." When the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory was given to the students of these two groups of teachers, it was found that the positive group of teachers was perceived as significantly more real, more accepting, and more empathetic than the negative group of teachers.

In the studies by Barrett-Lennard and Emmerling, the clients and students perceived that the most effective helper was the teacher or therapist who possessed the qualities of empathy, genuineness, or respect. Being perceived as effective is an important aspect of evaluation of effectiveness in the teaching profession, but educators insist that, in addition to being perceived effective by students, teachers need to be able to demonstrate that they have helped students achieve academically. A number of studies have attempted to determine if students who have teachers that possess a high degree of empathy, genuineness, and respect have greater academic success.

Christenson (1960) studied the relationships between pupil achievement, pupil affect-need, teacher warmth, and teacher permissiveness at the elementary school level. Using a $2 \times 2 \times 2$ factorial design with two levels of permissiveness, warmth, and affect-need, and using a covariance analysis to determine growth in achievement, Christenson found that warmth of teacher was significantly related to vocabulary and arithmetic achievement. Christenson's study suggests that affective qualities in teachers, such as warmth, do make a significant impact upon students' achievement.
Further investigating the relationship between teachers' interpersonal skills and pupil classroom achievement, Aspy and Hadlock (1967) reported the effects of teachers with high and low levels of empathy, genuineness, and respect on student performance. After recording classrooms of elementary school classrooms, trained raters determined the level of the teachers' interpersonal skills. Student performance was assessed in order to determine a relationship to teacher level of functioning. Aspy and Hadlock reported that students of teachers with the highest levels of empathy, genuineness, and respect gained significantly more in academic achievement than did those students who had teachers that offered low levels of empathy, genuineness, and respect. Students of the teachers rated low on empathy, genuineness, and respect were also significantly more truant than those students of the high level teachers.

In another study of the effects of teacher-offered conditions of empathy, genuineness, and respect upon student achievement, Aspy (1969) again found a relationship between the teacher's interpersonal skills and student achievement. The classrooms of six third-grade teachers and their 120 students were recorded twice, once in March, then again in May. The students were given the Stanford Achievement Test to measure academic gain. After having three trained raters evaluate the tapes, Aspy separated the teachers that rated high from those that rated low on the three interpersonal skills. The analysis of the data revealed significant differences between the two groups on four sub-tests of the Stanford Achievement Test. The sub-tests were paragraph meaning, language, word meaning, and work study skills. Aspy concluded
that these results support the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and cognitive growth of students.

Aspy, Black and Roebuck (1972) studied the relationship between elementary teachers' interpersonal skills in the classroom and their students' level of cognitive functioning. The authors divided 40 teachers into two groups of 20. One group of teachers taught a reading lesson at Level One of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. The other group of teachers taught reading lessons at Level Two or higher. A one-hour tape of the reading lesson was rated using Carkhuff's scales for empathy, congruence, and positive regard, Flanders Interaction Analysis, and levels of cognitive functioning achieved by students. An analysis of the relationship between students' cognitive functioning and the teacher's interpersonal skills indicated that the teacher's positive regard was significantly related to cognitive achievement.

Adding more support to the hypotheses that a positive relationship does exist between the interpersonal skills of the teacher and student academic success is a study by Boak and Conklin (1975). These investigators studied the effects of a training program in interpersonal skills for junior high school teachers on students' scores on the Canadian Test of Basic Skills and the Test of Achievement in Basic Skills: Mathematics. Using the Mann Whitney U Test, Boak and Conklin reported that students of teachers with high levels of empathy, genuineness, and respect had obtained significantly higher scores in language arts and mathematics than students of teachers with low levels of interpersonal skills.
Another study investigating the effects of systematic human relations training for teachers on student achievement was conducted by Hefele (1971). Thirty-one teachers that were enrolled in a teacher preparation program at a school for the deaf in Buffalo, New York, were given human relations training. By giving the students of these teachers the California Achievement Test (Reading, Arithmetic, and Literature), before (March, 1968) and after (February, 1969) the training, Hefele was able to correlate the students' gains in academic achievement with the teachers' level of interpersonal functioning. On the basis of a multiple regression analysis, Hefele concluded that reading achievement was positively related ($r = .79$) to the level of teacher interpersonal functioning. In addition to supporting the hypothesis that a correlation between the interpersonal skills of the teacher and student academic achievement exists, Hefele's study also gives some evidence that teachers can be trained to increase their levels of interpersonal skills.

From the studies reviewed in this chapter, there is evidence to suggest that, in addition to being perceived by their students as more effective, teachers with high levels of interpersonal skills also create an atmosphere that is conducive to academic success. The basic purpose of the present study was to determine if a relationship exists between the interpersonal skills of teachers and their students' classroom behavior. While the amount of empirical evidence supporting this hypothesis is limited, there are studies that suggest that teachers who possess high levels of interpersonal skills do create an atmosphere that is conducive to pupil supportive behavior and a deterrent to pupil disruptive behavior. Research supporting this hypothesis is discussed in the pages that follow.
A series of early studies investigating the effects of teacher personality on student classroom behavior were designed by Anderson and his associates (Anderson & Brewer, 1945; Anderson & Brewer, 1946; Anderson & Reed, 1946). Anderson's et al. findings were based on observations of preschool, primary school, and elementary school classrooms, involving five different teachers and extending over several years. From his studies, Anderson et al. reported three significant findings. The first significant finding was that the behavior of the teacher more than any other individual set the climate of the classroom. The teacher with a dominant classroom style set a climate of further domination by students in the classroom, and the teacher with an integrative style, that is, who respected students and allowed them to express themselves, established a climate of further integration by the students in the classroom. The second significant finding was that when a teacher had a higher proportion of integrative contacts, pupils showed more spontaneity and initiative, more voluntary social contribution, and more problem solving. The third significant finding was that when a teacher had a higher proportion of dominant contacts, pupils were more easily distracted from school work.

A further study investigating the effect of the attitudes and behaviors of teachers on the emotional climate of 53 elementary classrooms was conducted by Fowler (1962). Criterion measures used were the Observation Schedule and Record, Russell Sage Social Relations Test, and Flander's Interaction Analysis. Predictor measures consisted of the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Using correlation analysis, Fowler found that the attitudes of teachers were significantly related to teacher and pupil behavior.
The findings of both Anderson et al. and Fowler are important because they indicate that teacher attitudes do influence pupil behavior in the classroom. More specifically, Anderson et al. found that teachers who displayed a high proportion of accepting and respectful interactions with pupils had pupils who displayed more voluntary social contributions or supportive behavior, and that teachers who displayed a high proportion of dominant contacts had pupils who were more easily distracted from school work, which could lead to deviant behavior. Anderson's et al. findings add support to the hypothesis investigated in this study that teachers' interpersonal skills are related to pupil supportive behavior.

In a study of 33 teachers, 5 principals, and over 900 high school students, Cogan (1958) investigated the relationship between the classroom behavior of the teacher and the productive behavior (self-initiated work) of pupils. Behavior of the teachers was placed into three categories. The categories were inclusive, preclusive, and conjunctive. Cogan defined inclusive teacher behavior as integrative, affiliative, and nurturant. Preclusive teacher behavior was defined as dominative, aggressive, and rejectant. Conjunctive teacher behavior was defined as the ability to get students to do work that was correct and in good order, the ability to make clear explanations, and the ability to handle the class. Cogan reported that there was a strong relationship between the inclusive behavior of the teachers and the self-initiated work of their pupils. This, according to Cogan,

must be of some moment to educators who place great reliance upon theories of education in which a pupil's interest, his self-reliance, his creativity, and his self-initiated activities play so important a role. (p. 103)
Wallen (1966) provided additional evidence suggesting that the interpersonal skills of the teacher are related to student classroom behavior. Wallen investigated four teacher variables in order to define meaningful dimensions of teacher behavior in the classroom. The four teacher variables were control, affiliation, stimulation, and achievement orientation. Wallen defined affiliation as the extent of warmth, support, and affection given pupils by the teacher. On the basis of observations of 118 teachers, Wallen found that the student's "liking for school" seemed to be positively related to the degree of affiliation displayed by the teacher. Another conclusion from Wallen's study was that supportive behavior on the part of the teacher seemed to foster a more friendly group interaction during the operational phase of group problem solving, and that teacher supportive behavior appeared to be negatively correlated with the extent of test anxiety in the students. These findings substantiate studies previously cited in this chapter in which a correlation between teacher warmth and support and positive pupil classroom behavior was reported.

Two studies conducted by Ryans (1961a, 1961b) lend support to the relationship between certain teacher characteristics and pupil classroom behavior. In over 1000 classrooms, Ryans (1961a) had groups of trained observers assess both pupil and teacher behavior. After a correlational analysis of the data, Ryans concluded that teachers who were understanding, friendly, organized, original, and stimulating had students who tended to be alert, participating, confident, responsible, self-controlled, and initiating.
In a later study the same year, Ryans (1961b) reported similar, but even more statistically conclusive, findings. Using three elementary schools and the same procedures outlined in this previous study, Ryans concluded that pupil classroom behavior was related to a number of teacher characteristics. Such teacher classroom characteristics as being understanding, friendly, organized, original, and stimulating were significantly related to purposeful and productive pupil behavior.

In both of Ryans' studies, the findings indicate that teacher-offered understanding or empathy is one of a number of teacher characteristics that are positively related to supportive pupil behavior. Ryans' findings provide evidence suggesting that Rogers' three core conditions of empathy, genuineness, and respect could have a positive effect on pupil classroom behavior.

Johnson (1971) provided more specific evidence of the effect of empathy on behavior by studying the effects of the helper's warmth, interaction, accuracy of understanding, and proposal of compromises on the listener's behavior. The author reported that his evidence indicated that there was a relationship between the expressed warmth of the helper and the degree of favorableness of interpersonal attitudes. A relationship was also demonstrated between the expressed accuracy of understanding and the proposal of compromises and the induction of cooperation in a negotiation situation. Johnson's results give support to a Rogerian theory that suggests that a student's perceptions of the teacher's warmth and understanding affects the student's behavior in a compromise situation.

Of particular relevance to the present study is a report by Berenson (1971) that provided significant evidence of the impact of the teacher's
interpersonal skills on the teaching-learning process. Berinson described the results of a systematic human relations training program with a group of 48 elementary education majors selected at random from a suburban state college. Four groups were formed, with each group receiving 25 hours of training in a human relations workshop. The training occurred three weeks before student teaching. All subjects were observed during their student teaching and were measured and evaluated with Flanders' Interaction Analysis, the Student-Teacher Competency Rating Scale, and the Teaching Situational Reaction Test. The experimental group used greater amounts of praise, encouragement, acceptance, and clarification than did the control groups. The experimental group also tended to spend less classroom time criticizing and giving directions. Classroom supervisors rated the experimental group significantly higher than the control groups on total competency, general teaching competency, classroom management, and understanding of the teaching-learning process. College supervisors also rated the experimental group significantly higher in classroom management. The experimental group, as rated by both college and classroom supervisors, was also rated as more competent in the classroom, scored significantly higher on a situation reaction test, and utilized significantly more positive reinforcement behaviors in teaching.

Berinson's findings provide strong support for the hypothesis that the teacher's interpersonal skills are related to the students' classroom behavior. Berinson's experimental group of teachers scored significantly higher on both college and classroom supervisors' ratings of classroom management.
Summary

Rogers has maintained that three core conditions are necessary for facilitative teaching to occur in the classroom. These three core conditions are empathy, genuineness, and respect. Empirical research has shown that teachers who function at high levels of empathy, genuineness, and respect have been perceived as effective in their classrooms by their students. In addition to being perceived as effective in the classroom, teachers who were functioning at high levels of empathy, genuineness, and respect were also show to have created an atmosphere conducive to academic success.

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive behavior and pupil deviant behavior. Studies by Anderson and Brewer (1945) and Cogan (1958) showed that teacher behavior and attitudes do affect student behavior. Also, studies by Ryans (1961) and Wallen (1966) found that accepting and respectful teacher behavior and attitudes produced supportive pupil classroom behavior, and other teacher behavior and attitudes, such as dominance, produced deviant pupil classroom behavior. In addition, a study by Berenson (1971) revealed that a systematic human relations training program for student teachers had a significant impact on the student teachers' competence in classroom management.

From the empirical studies reviewed, there seems to be evidence to warrant a study of the relationship between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil classroom behavior. The empirical
data cited in this chapter suggest that teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are positively related to pupil supportive behavior and negatively correlated with pupil deviant behavior.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The present study was designed to investigate the relationship between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil classroom behavior. The three hypotheses that were investigated in this study are presented in this chapter. Also included in this chapter is a description of the subjects, procedures, and instruments used in the study. In addition, the procedures for analyzing the data are discussed.

Hypotheses

The relationships which have been established between interpersonal skill of teachers and student ratings of teacher effectiveness (Emmerling, 1961), interpersonal skills of teachers and academic achievement (Aspy, 1969; Boak & Conklin, 1975; Christenson, 1960), and certain teacher characteristics and pupil behavior (Berenson, 1971; Cogan, 1958; Ryans, 1961a) provided a rationale for asking the question, "Are there relationships between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil classroom behavior?" Three hypotheses were proposed to investigate these relationships:

\[ H_1: \] Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are positively correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior.

\[ H_2: \] Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness and respect are negatively correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior.
H3: There is a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive classroom behavior and teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior.

Subjects

The data for this study were collected in 41 fifth-grade classrooms in six counties near Gainesville, Florida. The counties included Alachua, Columbia, Dixie, Duval, Gilchrist, and Marian. The sample included both white and black teachers and students from rural, suburban, and urban populations. Approximately 45% of the students were attending school in communities with populations less than 2,500; approximately 29% attended schools in communities with populations between 25,000-50,000; and approximately 26% attended schools in a community size of greater than 50,000.

Procedures

The 41 classrooms observed for the present study were visited once a month from November, 1970, through April, 1971, by a team of observers, resulting in six observations of each classroom. The time of the classroom visits varied so that three of the six observations sampled different subject-matter areas. Each team recorded systematic classroom observations by using the Florida Climate and Control System (FLACCS). Each team consisted of two observers who were graduate students, research assistants, or permanent members of the staff of the Institute for the Development of Human Resources. All observers were trained during September and October in a scheduled course at the University of Florida. Each observation in the classroom consisted of half-hour visits. During the half-hour, the observers alternated 5-minute periods of marking the
FLACCS instrument. In addition, small battery-powered audiotape recording equipment simultaneously recorded the classroom activity. From the audiotapes made during the FLACCS coding, three tapes were selected at random for each teacher. From each of the three tapes selected for each teacher, two 3-minute segments, one from the beginning of the tape and one near the end of the tape, were selected at random and then rated independently by three trained raters using Aspy's Scales for Empathy, Genuineness, and Respect. The raters were a professor and two graduate students in education. The raters were trained for a period of 15 hours. The training ended when 85% agreement was reached by the three raters; acceptable agreement was set at ±.3 of a scale level. Once acceptable levels of agreement had been reached, each rater independently rated all segments of the audiotapes. Each rater rated every teacher on all three measures, and the results were averaged to obtain the teacher's score on each scale. The teacher's scores on the Aspy Rating Scales were made available by Dr. F. L. Roebuck.

Instrumentation

Florida Climate and Control System. Pupil behavior was coded by using an observational instrument developed by Soar, Soar, and Ragosta (1971), the Florida Climate and Control System (FLACCS), which was developed from several other observational instruments. The FLACCS data for this study were collected under the National Institute for the Development of Human Resources, University of Florida, Gainesville. The data were made available by Dr. R. S. Soar, principal investigator of the grant. The FLACCS instrument has two major parts. (See Appendix for a copy of the instrument.) The first part, with 84 items, is
concerned with teachers' control of the classroom and with pupil response. The second section consists of 78 items dealing with verbal and nonverbal expressions of affect by either teacher or student.

For this study, two of the nine factors from the FLACCS were used. These factors consisted on the following behaviors:

1. **Pupil Supportive Behavior**
   - (a) pupil reports rule to another, (b) pupil gives reason, (c) pupil works, plays cooperatively, collaborates; (d) pupil seeks reassurance, support, (e) pupil agrees with another, (f) pupil helps another, (g) pupil helpful shares.

2. **Pupil Deviant Behavior**
   - (a) pupil engages in out-of-bounds behavior, (b) pupil aimless, wondering, (c) pupil teases, (d) pupil commands, or demands, (e) pupil makes disparaging remarks, (f) pupil makes faces, (g) pupil threatens, (h) pupil uncooperative, resistant, (i) pupil interferes, threatens, (j) pupil takes, damages property of others, (k) pupil picks at child, (l) pupil pushes or pulls, holds, (m) pupil hurts with something, hits, (n) pupil leans close to another, (o) pupil horseplay.

**Intra- and inter-reliability.** Ragosta (1974) presented evidence regarding the intra- and inter-observer reliability of the FLACCS factors based on data gathered in 289 classrooms in eight experimental programs and a sample of comparison classrooms, grades K-2 in Project Follow Through. Ragosta reported that the intra-observer or within-observer reliability estimate, adjusted by the Spearman-Brown formula and based on two series of observations by the same observer in the 289 classrooms for FLACCS factor 3 -- Teacher-Pupil Supportive Behavior — was .90 for one observer who
visited the classrooms early in the day, and .91 for an observer who visited the classrooms later in the day. For FLACCS factor 7 — Negative Behavior — the intra-reliability estimate adjusted by the Spearman-Brown formula was .83 for the observer who observed the classroom early in the day and .88 for the observer who observed the classroom later in the day. The inter-observer or between-observer reliabilities were based on the two series of observations done by two different observers in each of the 289 classrooms. For factor 3, the inter-observer reliability coefficient was .73, adjusted by the Spearman-Brown formula, and for factor 7, the inter-observer coefficient was .79. Thus, the inter- and inter-observer reliability estimates for the FLACCS factors relevant to this study appear sufficiently high to warrant their use.

Validity. With respect to validity of the FLACCS, Soar (1973) reported that factor 3, Teacher-Pupil Supportive Behavior, and factor 7, Pupil Negative Affect, as well as the other seven factors of the instrument, discriminated between different experimental programs in Project Follow Through. In addition, Soar and Soar (1975) reported that the affect factors were related to classroom achievement in the expected direction. This evidence suggests that the FLACCS factors do measure an important component of student classroom behavior.
Aspy Rating Scales for Empathy, Genuineness, and Respect

This set of scales, revised by Aspy (1974), is designed to measure the degree of empathy, genuineness, and respect evident in the teacher's interactions with students in the classroom. A description of these scales is presented here:

1. **Empathy scale.** This measures the teacher's understanding of the meaning of classroom experiences for the students. Each of the teacher's behaviors is assigned a value from 1 to 5 on the following scale (Aspy, 1974):

   **ASPY EMPATHY SCALE**

   **Understanding of Empathy**

   **Level 5** The tone and words of the teacher's verbal communication **always** add to the students' meanings. The students are always helped to express deeper meanings of their experiences.

   **Level 4** The tone and words of the teacher's verbal communication **consistently** add to the students' meanings. The students are usually helped to express deeper meanings of their experiences.

   **Level 3** The tone and words of the teacher's verbal communication match the students'. That is, they neither detract from nor add to the students' expression of meaning.

   **Level 2** The tone of the teacher's verbal communication indicates she understands the most obvious meanings of the student's experience to him. However, the teacher's verbal communications are less intense than the student's. That is, she detracts from his expression of meaning.

   **Level 1** The teacher's verbal communication indicates no response to the students' feeling. The teacher seems totally unaware of the meaning of the experience to the student. (p. 55)
2. **Genuineness scale.** This measures the teacher's spontaneity. Each of the teacher's behaviors is assigned a value from 1 to 5 on the following scale (Aspy, 1974):

**ASPY GENUINENESS SCALE**

**Understanding of Genuineness**

**Level 5**  All of the teacher's verbal communications are spontaneous. They appear to grow out of the current interaction only. They are not mechanical or practiced.

**Level 4**  Most of the teacher's verbal communications are spontaneous, but a few of them are ritualistic.

**Level 3**  The teacher's verbal communications are about equally distributed between ritualistic and spontaneous, but the spontaneous quality dominates slightly.

**Level 2**  Most of the teacher's verbal communications are mechanical, but a few of them are somewhat spontaneous.

**Level 1**  All of the teacher's verbal communications are ritualistic. They seem to be mechanical or practiced. (p. 61)

3. **Respect scale.** This measures the extent to which the teacher communicates a positive regard for the student's ability to operate effectively at all intellectual levels. Each of the teacher's behaviors is assigned a value from 1 to 5 on the following scale (Aspy, 1974):

**ASPY RESPECT SCALE**

**Understanding of Respect**

**Level 5**  The teacher consistently communicates a positive regard for the students' abilities to operate effectively at all intellectual levels. Her guide is the students' direction. That is, she helps the students explore rather than directing them.
Level 4  The teacher consistently communicates a positive regard for the students' abilities to operate effectively in learning situations involving Level 1 of Bloom's Taxonomy, and occasionally allows her students to explore the higher intellectual processes.

Level 3  The teacher consistently communicates a positive regard for the students' abilities to operate effectively in learning situations involving memory and recognition (Level 1 of Bloom's Taxonomy) but not with the higher intellectual processes, i.e., creativity, problem solving, and evaluation.

Level 2  The teacher communicates a somewhat negative regard for the students' abilities to operate effectively in learning situations involving memory and recognition.

Level 1  The teacher communicates a clearly negative regard for the students' abilities to cope with any learning situation. (p. 59)

Roebuck (1975) reported that the Aspy Scales have been shown to meet the criteria proposed by Remmers (1963) as necessary for valid use of rating scales in research. Specifically, the Aspy Scales meet Reemer's criteria in the following ways:

1. **Objectivity.** Teams of raters can be trained to reach and maintain inter-rater reliabilities of .85 (Pearson's \( r \): \( p = .01 \)) on each scale (Aspy & Roebuck, 1973).

2. **Reliability.** Inter-rater reliability of the Aspy Rating Scales was obtained by calculating the Pearson product-moment correlations for all combinations of the three raters on each of the three scales (Roebuck, 1975). The inter-rater reliability coefficients for the three Aspy Scales appear in Table 1. Examination of the table reveals that the inter-rater reliability on the Aspy Scales is more than adequate for use in research.
In addition, it has been demonstrated that the percent of agreement obtained among the raters on these scales meets the criteria generally accepted for use of a rating scale in research (Roebuck, 1975). The percent of agreement data are also shown in Table 1.

3. Sensitivity. The Aspy Scales require the rater to make discriminations on a five point scale, ranging from no evidence of the behavior to continuous use of the behavior.

4. Validity. The discriminant validity of the Aspy Scales as a measure of teacher effectiveness has been demonstrated in a number of studies. Aspy, Black, and Roebuck (1972) and Boak and Conklin (1975) reported that teacher ratings on the Aspy Scales were positively related to students' achievement on standardized tests. Evidence of the relationship between teachers' ratings on the Aspy Scales and student behavior was provided by Aspy and Hadlock (1967). These researchers found that teachers who scored high on the Aspy Scales had students who were significantly less truant than teachers who scored low on the Aspy Scales. Thus, the Aspy Scales have demonstrated effectiveness in predicting student academic achievement, as well as student classroom behavior. As further evidence of validity, it has been shown that scores on the Aspy Scales are not influenced by years of teaching experience, teacher sex or race, and grade level (Aspy & Roebuck, 1974; Roebuck & Aspy, 1974a, 1974b).

5. Utility. The scales have been utilized in research as well as in-service training. It was demonstrated that 80% agreement in the use of the scales can be attained with as little as three hours of training in the use of the scales (Aspy, 1972; Aspy, Black, & Roebuck, 1972; Aspy & Roebuck, 1973, 1975).
## Table 1

**INTER-RATER RELIABILITY FOR ASPY SCALES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Raters</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Genuineness</th>
<th>Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson's $r$</td>
<td>1 with 2</td>
<td>0.9961</td>
<td>0.9957</td>
<td>0.9953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td>1 with 3</td>
<td>0.9986</td>
<td>0.9987</td>
<td>0.9984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coefficients</td>
<td>2 with 3</td>
<td>0.9988</td>
<td>0.9984</td>
<td>0.9984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Agreement</td>
<td>1 with 2</td>
<td>85.84</td>
<td>83.43</td>
<td>84.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 with 3</td>
<td>96.08</td>
<td>94.68</td>
<td>94.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 with 3</td>
<td>96.39</td>
<td>93.67</td>
<td>93.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Three</td>
<td>85.54</td>
<td>83.43</td>
<td>84.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. Number of Tapes Rated = 150.*
Statistical Analysis of the Data

The Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated to determine the relationship between teacher-offered empathy and pupil supportive behavior. A significant positive correlation was expected. The Pearson product-moment correlation was also calculated to determine the relationship between teacher-offered empathy and pupil deviant classroom behavior. This correlation was expected to be significantly negative. After these two correlations were computed, a test for significance of the difference between the two Pearson product-moment correlations was calculated. A significant difference between these two correlations would indicate that teacher-offered empathy is significantly related to pupil classroom behavior.

The Pearson product-moment correlation was also calculated to determine the relationship between teacher-offered genuineness and pupil supportive behavior. A significant correlation was expected. With the same correlation procedure, teacher-offered genuineness and pupil disruptive behavior were correlated. This correlation was predicted to be significantly negative. After these two correlations were computed, then a test for significance of the difference between the two Pearson product-moment correlations was calculated. A significant difference between these two correlations would indicate that teacher-offered genuineness is significantly related to pupil classroom behavior.

The Pearson product-moment correlation was also calculated to determine the relationship between teacher-offered respect and pupil supportive behavior. A significant correlation was expected. The correlation of teacher-offered respect and pupil disruptive behavior was also
determined. This correlation was hypothesized to be significantly negative. After these two correlations were computed, a test of the significance of the difference between the two Pearson product-moment correlations was calculated. A significant difference between these two correlations would indicate that teacher-offered respect is significantly related to pupil classroom behavior.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The three major questions asked in the present study were (1) are teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect positively correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior? (2) are teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect negatively correlated with pupil deviant classroom behavior? and (3) is there a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect with pupil supportive classroom and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect with pupil deviant classroom behavior?

The results of this study are presented in four sections. In the first section, the means and standard deviations of the variables observed in this study are presented. The second section contains the results of testing the first hypothesis to determine if each of the teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect was positively correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior. Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine each of the correlations. The third section contains the results of testing the second hypothesis to determine if each of the teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect were negatively correlated with pupil deviant classroom behavior. Again, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine each of the correlations. The fourth section presents the results of testing the third hypothesis to determine if there was a significant
difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect with pupil supportive classroom behavior and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect with pupil deviant classroom behavior.

Descriptive Statistics

Five variables were examined in the present study. Table 2 lists the means, standard deviations, and number of cases for all five variables.

As seen in Table 2, teacher-offered empathy had a mean of 2.38 and a standard deviation of .49. Teacher-offered genuineness had a mean of 2.46 and a standard deviation of .50. The mean for the third teacher-offered variable of respect was 2.59 and the standard deviation was .52. These statistics indicate that in this group the teachers were functioning at a rather low level of effectiveness in terms of their interpersonal skills.

Pupil supportive behavior had a mean of 6.11 and a standard deviation of 1.73. The fifth variable used in this study, pupil deviant behavior, had a mean of 5.20 and a standard deviation of 2.63.

Hypothesis 1

Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are positively correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine the relationships of the teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect to pupil supportive classroom behavior. The correlation (r), r squared, and the level of significance are displayed in Table 3.
### TABLE 2

**MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND NUMBER OF CASES OF TEACHER-OFFERED EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT, PUPIL SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOR, AND PUPIL DEVIANT BEHAVIOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Supportive Behavior</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pupil Deviant Behavior</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3

CORRELATION ($r$), $r$ SQUARED, AND LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE OF TEACHER-OFFERED VARIABLES OF EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT WITH PUPIL SUPPORTIVE CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Correlation ($r$)</th>
<th>$r$ Squared</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Empathy- Pupil Supportive Behavior</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Genuineness- Pupil Supportive Behavior</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Respect- Pupil Supportive Behavior</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.00088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 41 teachers and their classrooms
The Pearson product-moment correlation revealed that the teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect were significantly correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior. The correlation between teacher-offered empathy and pupil supportive behavior was .58, which was significant at the .00004 level. The correlation of teacher-offered genuineness with pupil supportive behavior was .58. This correlation had a level of significance equal to .00003. The third variable, teacher-offered respect, had a correlation of .47 with pupil supportive behavior, and the level of significance was .00038. Thus, the correlations of all three teacher-offered variables were all highly significant. These results support Hypothesis 1.

A scatter diagram indicating a linear relationship between teacher-offered empathy and pupil supportive behavior is shown in Figure 1. A scatter diagram of the relationship between genuineness and pupil supportive behavior is displayed in Figure 2 and a scatter diagram of the relationship of teacher-offered respect and pupil supportive behavior is shown in Figure 3. Scanning of the graphic displays reveals a moderate, direct relationship between the three teacher variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive behavior.

**Hypothesis 2**

Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are negatively correlated with pupil deviant classroom behavior.

Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated to determine the relationships of the teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect to pupil deviant classroom behavior. The correlation \( r \), \( r^2 \) squared, and the level of significance are displayed in Table 4.
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**TABLE 4**

**CORRELATION (r), r SQUARED, AND THE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE OF TEACHER-OFFERED VARIABLES OF EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT WITH PUPIL DEVIANT CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation (r)</th>
<th>r Squared</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Empathy-Pupil Deviant Behavior</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Genuineness-Pupil Deviant Behavior</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Respect-Pupil Deviant Behavior</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based on 41 teachers and their classrooms*
The Pearson product-moment correlations for the teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect with pupil deviant behavior were so low that it must be concluded that a linear relationship does not exist between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and deviant behavior. The correlation of teacher-offered empathy with pupil deviant classroom behavior was -0.10. This correlation was not significant at the .05 level; the significance was only .26. The correlation between teacher-offered genuineness and pupil deviant behavior was -0.01. This correlation was also not significant at the .05 level; the level of significance was .47. The correlation of respect with pupil deviant classroom behavior was 0.00 and, again, this correlation was not significant at the .05 level as the level of significance was .49. Although there was a negative correlation between each of the three teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant behavior, the level of significance did not reach the .05 level. These findings indicate that there was virtually no correlation between the three teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior.

A scatter diagram of the relationship of the teacher-offered variable of empathy and pupil deviant classroom behavior is shown in Figure 4. Figure 5 is a scatter diagram of the relationship of teacher-offered genuineness and pupil deviant classroom behavior, and a scatter diagram of the relationship of teacher-offered respect and pupil deviant behavior is displayed in Figure 6. An examination of these diagrams suggests that the teacher-offered qualities of empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant behavior are not related in any systematic way.
PUPIL DEVIANT BEHAVIOR

FIGURE 4

SCATTER DIAGRAM OF THE VARIABLE
TEACHER-OFFERED EMPATHY WITH
PUPIL DEVIANT BEHAVIOR
FIGURE 5

SCATTER DIAGRAM OF THE VARIABLE
TEACHER-OFFERED GENUINENESS WITH
PUPIL DEVIANT BEHAVIOR
Hypothesis 3

There is a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive classroom behavior and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior.

Teacher-offered empathy was positively correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior \((r = .58, p = .00004)\). Teacher-offered empathy was negatively correlated with pupil deviant classroom behavior \((r = .10)\), but significance did not reach the .05 level. Computation of the \(z\) transformation for determining the significance of two Pearson coefficients from a related sample (Roscoe, 1975) yielded a \(z\) value of 3.35, which was significant at the .0004 level. The finding that the correlation of teacher-offered empathy and pupil supportive classroom behavior and the correlation of teacher-offered empathy and pupil deviant classroom behavior are significantly different supports the hypothesis that the teacher-offered variable of empathy is related to student behavior.

Teacher-offered genuineness was positively correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior \((r = .58, p = .00003)\). Teacher-offered genuineness was negatively correlated with pupil deviant behavior \((r = .00009)\), but the level of significance did not reach .05. Computation of the formula for determining the significance of two Pearson coefficients from a related sample resulted in a \(z\) value of 3.16, significant at the .0008 level, indicating that there is a significant difference between the relationship of teacher-offered genuineness to pupil supportive behavior and the relationship of teacher-offered genuineness and pupil deviant behavior.
Teacher-offered respect was positively correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior \( (r = .47, \ p = .00088) \). Teacher-offered respect was negatively correlated with pupil deviant classroom behavior \( (r = .01) \), but the level of significance did not reach the .05 level. Computation of the formula for finding the difference between two Pearson coefficients from a related sample yielded a \( z \) value of 2.38, significant at the .008 level. This finding supports the third hypothesis in that there is a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered respect and pupil supportive classroom behavior and the correlation of teacher-offered respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior. Table 5 lists the \( z \) values and levels of significance for the three teacher-offered variables and pupil supportive and deviant behavior.

A correlational analysis to determine the intercorrelations among the teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect indicated that these variables are highly correlated. Table 6 presents these correlations. The correlation between empathy and genuineness was .95. The correlation between respect and genuineness was .92, and the correlation between respect and empathy was .93. These high intercorrelations indicate that only a small proportion of unique variance could be attributed to each variable, in accounting for pupil supportive or deviant behavior.

**Summary**

The statistical analysis of the data was presented in this chapter. The results of this study indicated that there is a significant positive correlation \( (r = .58, \ p = .00004) \) between the teacher-offered variable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-offered empathy, and pupil supportive behavior</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-offered empathy, and pupil deviant behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-offered genuineness and pupil supportive behavior</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-offered genuineness and pupil deviant behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-offered respect and pupil supportive behavior</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.0081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher-offered respect and pupil deviant behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6

INTERCORRELATIONS OF TEACHER-OFFERED VARIABLES
OF EMPATHY, GENUINENESS, AND RESPECT*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Genuineness</th>
<th>Respect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Based of 41 teachers
of empathy and pupil supportive classroom behavior. The teacher-offered variable of genuineness was found to have a significant positive correlation ($r = .58, p = .00003$), with pupil supportive behavior. The third teacher-offered variable of respect also had a significant positive relationship ($r = .47, p = .00008$) to pupil supportive classroom behavior. An analysis of the correlations between teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect with pupil deviant behavior revealed virtually no relationships between these variables. A significant difference (at .05 level or beyond) was found between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive classroom behavior and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect with pupil deviant classroom behavior.
Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationships of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect to pupil classroom behavior. The basic theoretical assumption underlying the study was that teachers offering empathy, genuineness, and respect create an atmosphere in their classrooms that is conducive to pupil supportive behavior and is a deterrent to pupil deviant behavior.

To investigate this assumption, three hypotheses were tested:

Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are positively related to pupil supportive classroom behavior.

Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect are negatively related to pupil deviant classroom behavior.

There is a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive classroom behavior and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior.

The sample for this study consisted of 41 fifth-grade teachers and their classrooms. The teachers were located in six counties in central Florida; rural, suburban, and urban areas were included.

Two instruments were used in the study to investigate the relationships of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect to pupil classroom behavior. Pupil classroom behavior was scored by using the
Florida Climate and Control System (Soar, Soar, & Ragosta, 1971). The FLACCS is an observational instrument which was developed to record systematically teachers' control of the classroom and their pupils' classroom behavior. Audio tape-recordings of the classroom interaction, that were made while the FLACCS was being recorded, were used to evaluate the teachers' empathy, genuineness, and respect. The Aspy Scales (Aspy, 1974) were used to evaluate the teachers' empathy, genuineness, and respect. The data collected from these two instruments were used in testing the three hypotheses.

To test the first hypothesis, a Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated to determine if the three teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect were positively correlated with pupil supportive classroom behavior. The results indicated that there were significant positive correlations between each of the three teacher-offered variables and pupil supportive classroom behavior. The correlation between teacher-offered empathy and pupil supportive behavior was .58; this correlation had a level of significance of .00004. The correlation between teacher-offered genuineness and pupil supportive classroom behavior was .58; this correlation had a level of significance of .00003. The third teacher-offered variable of respect had a correlation of .47 with pupil supportive classroom behavior; this correlation had a level of significance of .00088. These findings indicated that, in this study, teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect were related to pupil supportive classroom behavior.

To test the second hypothesis, a Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated to determine if the three teacher-offered variables of
empathy, genuineness, and respect were negatively related to pupil deviant classroom behavior. The results indicated that there was virtually no relationship between each of the three teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior. Although there were negative correlations for the three teacher-offered variables and pupil deviant behavior, the results were not significant at the .05 level. The correlation between teacher-offered empathy and pupil deviant behavior was -0.10, which was significant at the .25 level. The correlation between teacher-offered genuineness and pupil deviant behavior was .00, which was significant at the .50 level. The correlation between teacher-offered respect and pupil deviant behavior was -.01, which was significant at the .47 level. The findings from this study indicate that teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect were not related to deviant classroom behavior.

To test the third hypothesis, the formula for finding the difference between two Pearson coefficients from related samples was computed to determine if there was a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive classroom behavior and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior. The findings indicate that there was a significant difference (at the .05 level or beyond) for all three teacher-offered variables tested.

Limitations

The implications of this study must first be considered in relation to limitations in the statistical analysis:
1. As reported in Chapter IV, the correlation coefficients for
the three teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect
were high (.92 or higher). These high correlations indicate that only
a small proportion of unique variance could be attributed to each vari-
able, in accounting for pupil supportive and deviant behavior.

2. In this study, a number of correlations were calculated from the
same data. It should be noted that the greater the number of correlations
run on the same set of data, the more likely the chances of obtaining
spuriously significant results. However, it is likely that the results
obtained in this study were real, since the degree of significance reported
was quite high and in the predicted direction.

3. In reporting the findings of the third hypothesis that there
was a significant difference in the correlations of teacher-offered
empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive behavior and the
correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and
pupil deviant behavior, it should be reported that the difference could
be explained by the high correlations of teacher-offered empathy,
genuineness, and respect with pupil supportive behavior.

4. Because this study was correlational in nature, no conclusions
regarding causality can be drawn. Consequently, it remains for future
research to determine if an increase in teachers' interpersonal skills
will result in increased pupil supportive behavior and reduced pupil
deviant behavior.

5. Inspection of the means and standard deviations for teacher-
offered empathy, genuineness, and respect reveals that the teachers
in this sample were, as a group, functioning at a relatively low level
on these interpersonal skills. Consequently, the restriction in the range of the teachers' scores on the Aspy Scales of Empathy, Genuineness, and Respect may have resulted in correlation coefficients that underestimate the extent of the relationships of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect to pupil classroom behavior.

Conclusions

On the basis of findings reported for this study, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect were positively related (significance beyond the .001 level) to pupil supportive classroom behavior.

2. There did not appear to be any significant negative correlation between empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant classroom behavior.

3. There was a significant difference between the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil supportive classroom behavior and the correlations of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect and pupil deviant behavior.

Implications

The above conclusions seem to suggest several implications for educational practices concerning pupil classroom behavior. This correlational study showed that teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect were positively related to pupil supportive classroom behavior. Experimental studies should be conducted to determine if increasing teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect would create an atmosphere in the classroom that would be conducive to pupil supportive
behavior and a deterrent to pupil deviant behavior. Such research could provide the evidence needed to assist teachers with classroom management.

Teachers who are having classroom behavior problems may benefit from training in interpersonal skills. In addition, specific preparation in the skills of empathy, genuineness, and respect could be a crucial component in the preparation of future teachers.

The expected negative relationship of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect to pupil deviant behavior was not found. This may be due to the low level of interpersonal skills that the teachers in this sample displayed. The means for the three teacher-offered variables of empathy, genuineness, and respect were well below the average score expected for teachers on the Aspy Rating Scales. It is also possible that teachers need to display higher levels of interpersonal skills to reduce pupil deviant behavior than to increase pupil supportive behavior. Further research is needed to determine if increases in teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect could reduce the incidence of pupil deviant behavior.

This study investigated the relationship of teacher-offered empathy, genuineness, and respect to the behavior of an entire class. It may be worthwhile to investigate the effect of these three teacher-offered qualities on the behavior of an individual student who is disrupting the classroom.

In summary, this study demonstrated positive relationships of empathy, genuineness, and respect to pupil supportive classroom behavior. Considerable research is needed to determine if teachers can be trained to increase these skills and, as a result, increase supportive pupil behavior in the classroom.
APPENDIX
APPENDIX
INSTITUTE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida
November 25, 1970

FLACCS*
Florida Climate and Control System
(1970-1971)

Program __________________________
Teacher __________________________
City ____________________________
Date ____________________________
School __________________________
Observer _________________________
Grade __________________________
Series __________________________

Children's Art Work Displayed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abundant &amp; varied</th>
<th>Quite a few</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A few</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relation of Room Displays and Artifacts
To Children's Subcultural Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most are clearly related</th>
<th>Quite a few are related</th>
<th>Some are related</th>
<th>A few are related</th>
<th>None are related</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is an experimental form which should not be cited or used without permission of the developers.
## APPENDIX (CONT'D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Nature of Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Pupil as individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Total group w/ teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Small group w/ teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Individual's teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Structured group (S) w/o I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Free groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teacher Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Teacher Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Leads singing, games, storytime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moves freely among pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Withdraws from class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uses blackboard, X's, Charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ignores, refuses to attend P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Attends pupil briefly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Attends pupil closely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Attends P in succession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Attends simultaneously, activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nonverbal Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Nonverbal Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>tolerates deviant behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>positive redirection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>nods, smiles for control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>positive facial feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>uses &quot;body English&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>gestures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>gives tangible reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>touches, pats (gentle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>folds, pushes, spins, fimm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>takes equipment, book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>signals, raps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>shits, shakes head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>glares, frowns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pupil Control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pupil Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pupil central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Pupil -- no choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Pupil -- limited choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Pupil -- free choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>(Seat work) w/ teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>(Seat work with teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>(Works, plays w/much supervision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>(Works, plays with little supervision)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>(Resists/disobeys direct.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>obeys directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>(Requirement missed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>(Works) routine w/o reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>(Reports rule to another)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>(Keeps little)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>gives directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>gives information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Socialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Socialization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Almost never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>frequently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Structure I behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Structure II behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pupil Interest Attention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pupil Interest Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>(Ranks 1 low to 5 high)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Trainee's Name: [Name]

Section: [Section]

Episode: [Episode]

Score: [Score] of [Correct] correct.
### APPENDIX (CONT’D)

#### NEGATIVE AFFECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Verbal</th>
<th>Teacher Verbal</th>
<th>Pupil Nonverbal</th>
<th>Teacher Nonverbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Says &quot;No,&quot; &quot;I won't,&quot; etc.</td>
<td>A27</td>
<td>Waits for child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Teases</td>
<td>A28</td>
<td>Frowns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A12</td>
<td>Laughs</td>
<td>A31</td>
<td>Points, shakes finger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>Talks</td>
<td>A32</td>
<td>Pushes or pulls, holds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>Commands or demands</td>
<td>A35</td>
<td>Shows disgust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>Makes disparaging remark</td>
<td>A37</td>
<td>Takes property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>Demands attention</td>
<td>A38</td>
<td>Refuses to respond to child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>Makes someone &quot;feel small&quot;</td>
<td>A39</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>Finds fault</td>
<td>A30</td>
<td>Makes face, frowns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>Threatens</td>
<td>A31</td>
<td>Frowns, withdraws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>A32</td>
<td>Uncooperative, resistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>Code Involvement</td>
<td>A33</td>
<td>Interferes, threatens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A34</td>
<td>Makes noise, property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A36</td>
<td>Picks at child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A37</td>
<td>Pushes or pulls, holds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A38</td>
<td>Hits, hurts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A39</td>
<td>Is left out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A40</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### POSITIVE AFFECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pupil Verbal</th>
<th>Teacher Verbal</th>
<th>Pupil Nonverbal</th>
<th>Teacher Nonverbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A41</td>
<td>Says &quot;Thank you,&quot; etc.</td>
<td>A60</td>
<td>Accepts favor for self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A42</td>
<td>Agrees with child</td>
<td>A61</td>
<td>Waits for child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>Supports child</td>
<td>A64</td>
<td>Gives individual attention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A44</td>
<td>Seeks individual attention</td>
<td>A65</td>
<td>Warm, congenial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A45</td>
<td>Hears, complies</td>
<td>A66</td>
<td>Listens carefully to child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A46</td>
<td>Praises child</td>
<td>A67</td>
<td>Smiles, laughs, looks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47</td>
<td>Develops &quot;we feeling&quot;</td>
<td>A68</td>
<td>Hugs, holds, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A48</td>
<td>Is enthusiastic</td>
<td>A69</td>
<td>Synesthetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A49</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>A70</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A50</td>
<td>Code Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A51 | Says "Thank you," etc. | A71 | Helpful, shares |
| A52 | Sounds friendly | A72 | Leans close to another |
| A53 | Agrees with another | A73 |.Processes another |
| A54 | Initiates contact | A74 | Smiles, talks with another |
| A55 | Orders to stay, cooperate | A75 | Hugs another |
| A56 | Supports another | A76 | Agrees, cooperative |
| A57 | Is enthusiastic | A77 | Enthusiastic |
| A58 | Praises another | A78 | Horseplay |
| A59 | Helps another | A79 | Other |
| A60 | Other |       |       |
| A61 | Code Involvement |       |       |
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