

# Teacher Socio-Communicative Style as a Correlate of Student Affect Toward Teacher and Course Material

Melissa Bekelja Wanzer and James C. McCroskey

*Students' perceptions of "teacher misbehaviors" may be related to teacher's socio-communicative style (i.e., assertiveness and responsiveness), type of instructor (graduate assistant versus professor), and affect for teacher and course material. Four hypotheses were confirmed, indicating an inverse relationship between perceptions of teacher misbehaviors and 1) teacher assertiveness, 2) teacher responsiveness, 3) positive affect for the teacher, and 4) positive affect for the course material. Perceptions of teacher misbehaviors did not covary with type of instructor. Teachers' socio-communicative styles may dramatically affect student perceptions of teachers and course material. Specific misbehaviors are ranked according to apparent influence on student affect. Keywords: socio-communicative style (assertiveness and responsiveness), teacher misbehaviors, instructor type, student affect for teacher, student affect for course material*

Considerably more research on positive teacher communication behaviors (Andersen, 1979; Christophel, 1990a, 1990b; Fayer, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1988; Frymier, 1992; Frymier & Thompson, 1991; Gorham & Christophel, 1990; Gorham & Zakahi, 1990; Kelley & Gorham, 1988; McCroskey, Sallinen, Fayer, Richmond, & Barraclough, 1996; Richmond, Gorham, & McCroskey, 1987; Sorensen, 1989; Thomas, 1994) has been done than on negative teacher behaviors (Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Dolin, 1995; Gorham & Christophel, 1992; Kearney, Plax, Hays, & Ivey, 1991; Thweatt & McCroskey, 1996). Of course, whether teachers' behaviors are interpreted positively or negatively is a function of students' perceptions. Because teachers' appropriate levels of assertiveness and responsiveness may play an important role in influencing students' perceptions, whether behaviors are positively or negatively perceived may depend on a teacher's socio-communicative style. This raises some interesting questions. How might a teacher's socio-communicative style influence students' perceptions of the teacher? Is there a relationship between student perceptions of the teacher's socio-communicative style and student perceptions of negative classroom behaviors (e.g., teacher misbehaviors)? This study explores instructors' socio-communicative styles (their perceived assertiveness and responsiveness), the type of instructor (graduate assistant versus professor), and student reports of liking for the instructor and affect for the subject matter the instructor taught in relationship to student perceptions of their instructor's negative classroom behaviors. This study broadens the basis for understanding negative teacher behaviors.

*Melissa Bekelja Wanzer (Ed.D., West Virginia University, 1995) is Assistant Professor, Canisius College, Department of Communication Studies, Buffalo, NY 14208-1098. James C. McCroskey (Ed.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1966) is Professor and Chair, Department of Communication Studies, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506-6293.*

### **Student Perceptions of Teacher Socio-Communicative Style and Misbehaviors.**

Socio-communicative style refers to a communicator's skill in initiating, adapting, and responding to the communication of others (Thomas, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1994). Socio-communicative style typically is measured by breaking down the construct into the two separate dimensions recognized as assertiveness and responsiveness. Several researchers have reliably measured assertiveness and responsive-

ness tendencies via this instrument (Andersen & Martin, 1995; Patterson & Beckett, 1995; Richmond & McCroskey, 1992; Thomas, 1994). Individual students who exhibit high levels of assertiveness and responsiveness generally are viewed as competent communicators (Anderson & Martin, 1995; Thomas et al., 1994). For example, instructors who exhibit high levels of assertiveness and responsiveness also engage

study, we wondered whether students' perceptions of

teachers' socio-communicative style would impact student reports of teacher misbehaviors. We predicted that professors perceived as highly assertive would be less likely to misbehave in the classroom than their non-assertive counterparts. The following hypothesis was advanced:

- H1. There will be an inverse relationship between students' perceptions of teacher assertiveness and students' perceptions of teacher misbehaviors.

*Responsiveness.* Responsive (called "femininity" by Bem, 1974) communicators are recognized as empathetic, indirect, gentle, and warm (Bem, 1974; Richardson & McCroskey, 1992; Rubin & Martin, 1994; Thomas, 1994; Wheelless & Dierks-Stewart, 1981). Responsiveness is recognized as one of three key components of communication competence (McCroskey et al., 1986). An individual described as responsive cares about others, is sincere in communication efforts (Thomas, 1994), and utilizes empathetic communication behaviors. Conversely, an individual who is nonresponsive does not communicate care and concern for others and may communicate aggressively. In addition, nonresponsive communicators may overestimate (Martin & Anderson, 1995) and less communicatively competent (Anderson & Martin, 1995; Thomas et al., 1994).

Highly responsive communicators are more effective in their teaching practices (Kearney, 1984; Thomas et al., 1994). Instructors perceived as responsive utilize more immediate behaviors and, in doing so, are viewed as more communicatively competent (Thomas et al., 1994). Students recognize responsive teachers as sensitive and understanding (Kearney, 1984). Highly responsive teachers reported that they do not use anti-social Behavior Alteration Techniques in the classroom (Thomas, 1994), i.e., they avoid anti-social classroom behavior. Responsive teachers are perceived as more immediate and would be less likely to exhibit classroom misbehaviors. This reasoning suggests:

- H2. There will be an inverse relationship between students' perceptions of teacher responsiveness and students' perceptions of teacher misbehaviors.

### **Instructor Type and Student Perceptions of Teacher Misbehaviors**

In the present study the students were asked to report whether the teacher they were describing was a regular faculty member or teaching assistant (TA). Although not universally the case, regular faculty members, typically, have more teaching experience than teaching assistants. They may, hence, be less likely to engage in some classroom misbehaviors simply as a function of their experience, i.e., they know better. Regular faculty members presumably have received formal evaluations of their courses from students, peers, or administrators. These teaching evaluations usually play an important role in many colleges' promotion and tenure processes. Thus, if an instructor receives poor teaching evaluations which point to specific negative behaviors, the instructor would be wise to make the necessary changes rather than risk being denied tenure, promotion, or merit pay. Perhaps, because professors have

1995). Often, they are close in age to the undergraduates and have difficulty adopting an authoritative role in the classroom. (Boehrer & Sarkisian, 1985). Teaching assistants may receive feedback from students, peers, and administrators about negative teaching behaviors, but, in many institutions, they would not be under the same kinds of scrutiny as full-time professors. However, teaching assistants may feel they have much less job security than tenured professors and would, therefore, employ behaviors in the classroom which might only be perceived (by students or supervisors) as appropriate.

Teaching assistants may be less likely to misbehave in the classroom if they are pursuing a career in academics. Many teaching assistants look forward to a career in education and, thus, may be highly motivated to do their best possible work. Given their relative lack of experience, however, their "best possible" still may include behaviors which their students perceive as misbehaviors. Because the impact of factors influencing the decision processes of faculty members has not been adequately explored, a research question was posed:

- RQ1. Is there a difference in reported teacher misbehaviors between graduate teaching assistants and regular faculty members?

### **Student Affect Toward Teacher and Content and Student Perceptions of Teacher Misbehaviors**

When teachers misbehave in the classroom, student motivation is adversely affected (Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Gorham & Christophel, 1992) and students may be more likely to resist teachers' control attempts (Kearney, Plax, & Burroughs, 1991). Teachers who offend students in class, are lazy, incompetent, or inconsiderate are probably not popular and, likely, are less liked by their students. If a student's motivation is adversely affected because a teacher misbehaves, and the student performs poorly in the class, then the student will, most likely, resent the instructor. Thus, instructors who misbehave more often will not be liked by their students, accordingly:

- H3. There will be an inverse relationship between teacher misbehaviors and student liking for the teacher.

Teachers who misbehave regularly in the classroom may generate negative affect toward the course material. The student may enter the course motivated to do well (i.e., high level of state motivation) and then "find that motivation eroded by ineffective teaching" (Gorham & Christophel, 1992, p. 250). Gorham and Christophel (1992) noted that student demotivation is "teacher owned" while student motivation is "student owned." When a teacher exhibits negative classroom behaviors (teacher misbehaviors) students are less motivated to do well (Gorham & Christophel, 1992). Thus, when the student perceives the teacher as misbehaving habitually, the student will like the course material less. Hence:

- H4. There will be an inverse relationship between teacher misbehaviors and student affect toward course material.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Participants were 189 undergraduate students enrolled in sections of an introductory communication course at a large Eastern university. This course fulfills general

education requirements across the university and, therefore, students were representative for a wide range of academic areas.

### Design and Procedures

In exchange for extra credit, student volunteers completed the questionnaires during class time. Students were instructed to complete the research instruments with "no reference to any of the activities that you have in the course with me" prior to this class." This technique was originally developed by Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, and Richmond (1986) in an effort to maximize the variability in academic fields and allow for an assortment of different instructors.

Students received a modified list of teacher misbehaviors<sup>1</sup> (Kearney, Plax, Hays, et al., 1991), affinity-seeking strategies (Bell & Daly, 1984), and examples of nonverbal and verbal immediacy behaviors. Participants indicated "how frequently your teacher in that class exhibits the same or similar behaviors" (Kearney, Plax, Hays, et al., 1991, p. 317) with 0 = Never and 4 = Very Often. Although affinity-seeking and immediacy behaviors were included as distracters in the questionnaire (in order to force students to consider both positive and negative teacher behaviors), they were not included in data analyses. Because affinity-seeking and immediacy behaviors are generally perceived as positive, (see Dolin, 1995), including items that measure both constructs could be expected to reduce the probability of students' developing a response set toward the more negative misbehavior items on the instrument.

After completing the questionnaire, participants completed a "liking" measure (Frymier, 1992) which included 10 Likert-type items measuring the students' liking of the instructor (Cronbach's alpha was .93). Students' affect toward the course content was measured using an affective learning measure employed in many previous studies (McCroskey, 1994). Students completed four Likert-type items which assessed the students' attitude toward the course content. Alpha reliability for this scale has been reported to be as high as .96 (Richmond, 1990). For the present study, alpha was .89.

Richmond and McCroskey's (1990) 20 item Assertiveness-Responsiveness scale was used to measure the instructors' socio-communicative style. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was .87 for the assertiveness subscale and .91 for responsiveness. Finally, students were asked to indicate whether their teacher was a regular faculty member or teaching assistant.

### Results

The first hypothesis advanced an inverse relationship between teacher misbehaviors and assertiveness. Student perceptions of teacher assertiveness were negatively associated with teacher misbehaviors ( $r = -.25$ ,  $n = 189$ ,  $p < .01$ ). This modest, yet significant, correlation indicates that assertive teachers are less likely to misbehave in the classroom.

The second hypothesis advanced an inverse relationship between student perceptions of their instructor's level of responsiveness and classroom misbehaviors. Responsiveness was negatively associated with teacher misbehaviors ( $r = -.56$ ,  $n = 189$ ,  $p < .01$ ). This correlation indicates that responsive instructors are considerably less likely to be seen as engaging in misbehaviors, with covariance equal to .31.

The research question examined the difference in reported teacher misbehaviors

based on instructor type. In the present sample, 50 of the instructors were graduate teaching assistants and 117 were regular faculty (22 were not reported). The analysis of variance comparing the two groups failed to achieve significance ( $F(1, 167) = .27, p = .60$ ). Thus, instructor type does not appear to be associated with evidence of misbehaviors. However, because such a null hypothesis cannot be confirmed in one study, this matter requires further investigation.

The third hypothesis advanced an inverse relationship between teacher misbehaviors and student affect toward that teacher. Student affect toward the instructor was significantly associated with teacher misbehaviors ( $r = -.70, n = 189, p < .01$ ). As anticipated, teachers who are seen as misbehaving are less liked by the students.

H4 explored the relationship between teacher misbehaviors and students' affect toward the course material. As anticipated, perception of teacher misbehaviors was significantly inversely associated with students' affect toward course material ( $r = -.47, n = 189, p < .01$ ). Students like the course material less when they perceive the teacher exhibiting negative classroom misbehaviors.

Upon further consideration of the impact of teacher misbehaviors on student liking, we wondered whether specific misbehaviors would separate the instructors who were liked from those who were liked less. In *post hoc* analyses, a median split (median = 59) was used to distinguish "liked" and "less liked" teachers (see Table 1). Twenty-three of the 24 misbehaviors significantly differentiated the well-liked from the less-liked professors.

A principal components factor analysis was performed to explore the factor structure. In order to be considered a viable factor, the investigators required that at least three misbehavior items load, minimally, .60 on one factor, with a loading no higher than .40 on any other factor. Using these criteria, a unidimensional structure emerged. Accordingly, the scale was treated as a unidimensional structure in all data analyses. This misbehavior measure had high internal consistency (Cronbach's coefficient alpha = .91).

## Discussion

This study explored teacher characteristics associated with teacher misbehaviors, student impressions of teachers who exhibit misbehaviors, and student affect for the course the teacher teaches. Assertiveness, responsiveness, student liking for the teacher, and student affect toward the course material were all negatively associated with teacher misbehaviors. Instructor type was not found to be related to teacher misbehaviors.

Students who perceived their teachers as assertive also reported them less likely to exhibit classroom misbehaviors. Assertive teachers are more likely to avoid negative classroom behaviors. As Kearney (1984) indicated, assertive teachers strive for excellence in the classroom. This striving for excellence appears to be related to their avoidance of disruptive classroom behaviors. *Post hoc* analyses found positive relationships between assertiveness and student affect toward the teacher ( $r = .36, n = 189, p < .01$ ) and course material ( $r = .25, n = 189, p < .01$ ). Thus, assertive teachers may be liked more by their students because they do not misbehave in the classroom. Additionally, the assertive teacher can impact affective learning by not exhibiting disruptive classroom behaviors.

The inverse relationship between responsiveness and evidence of teacher misbehaviors was considerable. Based on the findings in this study, one might infer that

TABLE 1  
RANKINGS OF MAXIMAL SEPARATION BY MISBEHAVIOR TYPE

Variable	Mean (SD)		t-value
	Liked Teacher	Less-liked Teacher	
1. Boring Lectures	.63 (.8)	2.05 (1.4)	-8.4
2. Information Overload	.56 (.78)	1.76 (1.2)	-8.05
3. Negative Personality	.07 (.25)	.95 (1.12)	-7.38
4. Confusing Lectures	.60 (.9)	1.71 (1.32)	-6.7
5. Inappropriate Volume	.24 (.66)	1.19 (1.32)	-6.2
6. Unprepared for Lectures	.14 (.51)	.90 (1.08)	-6.08
7. Unresponsive Personality	.11 (.55)	.87 (1.11)	-5.88
8. Poor Enunciation	.30 (.72)	1.20 (1.36)	-5.66
9. Information Underload	.53 (.85)	1.37 (1.21)	-5.44
10. Apathetic Attitude	.15 (.60)	.87 (1.14)	-5.35
11. Lack of Knowledge	.14 (.53)	.70 (1.11)	-4.37
12. Showing Favoritism	.32 (.76)	.95 (1.20)	-4.29
13. Rambling Lectures	.64 (.89)	1.32 (1.27)	-4.24
14. Keeps Students Overtime	.63 (.90)	1.20 (1.13)	-3.86
15. Work Handed Back Late	.46 (.77)	1.03 (1.25)	-3.75
16. Unfair Rules	.29 (.72)	.79 (1.09)	-3.70
17. Grammar and Spelling Mistakes	.29 (.95)	.84 (1.14)	-3.61
18. Deviates From Syllabus	.54 (.87)	1.11 (1.27)	-3.60
19. Unfair testing	.66 (.92)	1.22 (1.24)	-3.54
20. Sarcasm	.25 (.69)	.70 (1.10)	-3.36
21. Absenteeism	.03 (.23)	.27 (.68)	-3.09
22. Inaccessible	.64 (1.06)	1.09 (1.09)	-2.85
23. Tardiness*	.30 (.77)	.59 (1.07)	-2.13
24. Early Dismissal*	.73 (.99)	.97 (1.09)	-1.61

Note. There were approximately 91 liked and 98 less-liked teachers. The risk of Type I error for the tabled results is very low; Steinfatt's (1979) alpha percentage (ratio of error per experiment to number of significant results) = .011. All t values were significant at the .01 level except Tardiness ( $p < .02$ ) and Early Dismissal ( $p < .05$ ).

responsive teachers are concerned about their relationships with students and, therefore, will avoid classroom behaviors which could jeopardize such a bond. *Post hoc* analyses indicated that responsiveness was significantly associated with liking for the teacher ( $r = .72$ ,  $n = 189$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and affect for the content ( $r = .37$ ,  $n = 189$ ,  $p < .01$ ). Thus, the high amount of positive affect that responsive teachers generate toward themselves and their courses may be explained, in part, by the absence of negative classroom behaviors.

The research question explored the difference in reported teacher misbehaviors as a function of instructor type. Misbehaviors do not appear to be a function of teaching experience or title, but, more likely, are associated with the instructor's socio-communicative style.

The third and fourth hypotheses examined the relationship between student liking for the teacher and affect toward the content area with teacher misbehaviors. Students liked teachers more who exhibited fewer misbehaviors. Also, when teachers were perceived as less misbehaving, the students reported higher levels of positive affect toward the course material. These parallel results are important. The liking or positive affect toward the teacher is often measured in student evaluations of teachers. However, affect toward the course material is often viewed by teachers as an indicator of affective learning. Thus, teacher misbehaviors which negatively impact teacher evaluations appear to have a parallel impact on the affective learning

of students. It is doubly important, therefore, to seek methods of helping faculty and teaching assistants to identify and reduce their uses of such behaviors.

It is important that we take particular care when inferring causation from the correlational results reported in this study. However, the theoretical path of causation that is explored here originates in the socio-communicative orientation of the teacher. Teacher socio-communicative style appears to influence students' perceptions of the teachers' levels of "misbehaviors." The students' perceptions of misbehaviors may, in turn, produce negative affect toward the teacher and/or the subject matter being taught. All of the results of this study are consistent with this theoretical causal explanation, i.e., socio-communicative style influences students' perceptions.

This study profiles the kind of teacher who is likely to misbehave. Instructors who are not assertive and/or not responsive are more likely to misbehave in the classroom than those who are high in these traits. The results from this study also tell us that we cannot point to teachers who may lack experience (teaching assistants) as being more likely to misbehave in the classroom. This research suggests that, when instructors exhibit teacher misbehaviors in the classroom, they damage their relationship with students and generate negative affect toward the course material. These damaged relationships, in turn, negatively impact student motivation (Gorham & Christophel, 1992).

There are a number of other possible negative repercussions for those teachers habitually misbehaving. The instructor who misbehaves in the classroom may receive poor teaching evaluations because 1) the students do not like her or him and 2) the students view the teacher as the source of their own (i.e., student) *demotivation*. In addition, the students may rebel against the teacher and misbehave as well. Teachers who misbehave may experience related problems such as lower student attendance, deficient enrollment in their courses, and denial of tenure and promotion. Likewise, when students have negative affect toward the teacher or the subject matter, they may communicate negative relationship cues to the teacher. As a result, the teacher may develop negative attitudes toward teaching, the class, and/or the student, and engage in negative behaviors (labeled here as "misbehaviors"), either consciously or otherwise, in retribution for the negativity of the students. Sorting out the relative importance of these relational impacts should be considered in future research.

*Post hoc* analysis shed light on teacher misbehaviors which differentiated well-liked instructors from their less-liked counterparts. Twenty-three of the 24 misbehaviors significantly differentiated the two groups. The well-liked instructors (as opposed to the less-liked instructors) were, on the average, less likely to give boring lectures, provide too much information, exhibit negative personality traits, provide confusing lectures, and use inappropriate volume while teaching. Content appeared to be the focal point of three of the five teacher misbehaviors. These findings indicate that first and foremost, students desire interesting lecture material which they can understand and hear. Tardiness, inaccessibility, absenteeism, and sarcasm appear to be least meaningful for differentiating the groups. Problems in lecture content (e.g., confusing material, too much material, or boring material) as opposed to procedural matters (e.g., absenteeism, tardiness, early dismissal, and inaccessibility) best distinguished the groups.

Some limitations to this study include, among others, 1) the number of teachers evaluated by the students is unknown, (a few may have been involved), 2) whether

misbehaviors in this study actually influence the learning process negatively is unknown, and 3) it is not clear whether these teachers use varying instructional styles. For example, tardiness may be a more meaningful misbehavior in a lecture format than in a small group format.

While the primary purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between socio-communicative style and perceived misbehaviors, another salient finding was that teacher misbehaviors are not equally discriminating. Some misbehaviors are much stronger indicators of affect toward the instructor. This has important ramifications for investigating and improving instructional quality.

### Note

<sup>1</sup>A shorter, 24-item version of the Kearney, Plax, Hays, et al., (1991) measure was used. Items relating to sexual harassment, profanity, offensive appearance of instructor, and unfair grading were excluded because participants were evaluating instructors whose identification could easily be discerned by the investigators. Further, because subject matter and time of day were identifiable, the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects felt that some of the responses might be actionable. Accordingly, these items were excluded from the survey.

### References

- Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), *Communication yearbook*, 3 (pp. 543-559). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Anderson, C. M., & Martin, M. M. (1995). Communication motives of assertive and responsive individuals. *Communication Research Reports*, 12, 186-191.
- Ash, S. (1991). How to make assertiveness work for you. *Supervisory Management*, 36, 8.
- Bacon, C. C., & Severson, M. L. (1986). Assertiveness, responsiveness, and versatility as predictors of leadership emergence. *Communication Research Reports*, 24, 53-58.
- Bell, R. A., & Daly, J. A. (1984). The affinity-seeking function of communication. *Communication Monographs*, 51, 91-115.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155-162.
- Boehrer, J., & Sarkisian, E. (1985). The teaching assistant's point of view. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 27, 7-20.
- Christophel, D. M. (1990a). *The relationship among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Christophel, D. M. (1990b). The relationship among teacher immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 323-340.
- Christophel, D. M., & Gorham, J. (1995). A test-retest analysis of student motivation, teacher immediacy, and perceived sources of motivation and demotivation in college classes. *Communication Education*, 44, 292-306.
- Dolin, D. (1995). *Ain't misbehavin': A study of teacher misbehaviors, related to communication behaviors, and student resistance*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Ellis, B. H., & Miller, K. I. (1993). The role of assertiveness, personal control, and participation in the prediction of nurse burnout. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 21, 327-342.
- Fayer, J. M., Gorham, J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1988). Teacher immediacy and student learning: A comparison between U.S. mainland and Puerto Rican classrooms. In J. Fayer (Ed.), *Puerto Rican communication studies* (pp. 111-126). Puerto Rico: Fundacion Arquelogica, Anthropologica, e Historica de Puerto Rico.
- Frymier, A. (1992). *The impact of teacher immediacy and affinity-seeking on students' motivation and learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Frymier, A. B., & Thompson, C. A. (1991, May). *The relationship among affinity-seeking, credibility, motivation, and learning: A replication and extension*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the International Communication Association, Chicago, IL.
- Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationship of teachers' use of humor in the classroom to immediacy and student learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 46-62.
- Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. (1992). Students' perceptions of teacher behaviors as motivating and demotivating factors in college classes. *Communication Quarterly*, 40, 239-252.
- Gorham, J., & Zakahi, W. R. (1990). A comparison of teacher and student perceptions of immediacy and learning. *Communication Education*, 39, 354-368.
- Gripton, M. J., & Vaienti, M. (1993). Assertiveness at work: A norm for work relationships in democratic societies and market economies. *Human Systems Management*, 12, 217-226.
- Kearney, P. (1984). Perceptual discrepancies in teacher communication style. *Communication Education*, 13, 95-105.

- Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., & Burroughs, N. F. (1991). An attributional analysis of college students' resistance decisions. *Communication Education, 40*, 325-342.
- Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Hays, E. R., & Ivey, M. J. (1991). College teacher misbehaviors: What students don't like about what teachers say and do. *Communication Quarterly, 39*, 309-324.
- Kelley, D. H., & Gorham, J. (1988). Effects of immediacy on recall of information. *Communication Education, 37*, 198-207.
- Martin, M. M., & Anderson, C. M. (1995). Roommate similarity: Are roommates who are similar in their communication traits more satisfied? *Communication Research Reports, 12*, 46-52.
- McCroskey, J. C. (1994). Assessment of affect toward communication and affect toward instruction in communication. In S. Morreale & M. Brooks (Eds.), *Assessing college student competency in speech communication* (pp. 56-71). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.
- McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1990). *Introduction to interpersonal communication*. Edina, MN: Burgess International Group.
- McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & Stewart, R. A. (1986). *One on one: The foundations of interpersonal communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- McCroskey, J. C., Sallinen, A., Fayer, J. M., Richmond, V. P., & Barraclough, R. A. (1996). Nonverbal immediacy and cognitive learning: A cross-cultural investigation. *Communication Education, 45*, 200-211.
- Patterson, B. R., & Beckett, C. S. (1995). A re-examination of relational repair and reconciliation: Impact of socio-communicative style on strategy selection. *Communication Research Reports, 12*, 235-240.
- Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. *Communication Education, 35*, 43-55.
- Podestra, C. (1995). If it would be easy if it weren't for other people. *Trials, 3*, 82.
- Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation. *Communication Education, 39*, 181-195.
- Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J., & McCroskey, J. C. (1987). The relationship between selected immediacy behaviors and cognitive learning. In M. A. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook, 10* (pp. 574-590). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1990). Reliability and separation of factors on the assertiveness-responsiveness measure. *Psychological Reports, 67*, 449-450.
- Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1992). *Communication apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness* (4th ed). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.
- Roach, K. D. (1995). Teaching assistant argumentativeness and perceptions of power use in the classroom. *Communication Research Reports, 12*, 94-103.
- Rubin, R. B., & Martin, M. M. (1994). Development of a measure of interpersonal communication competence. *Communication Research Reports, 11*, 33-44.
- Sorensen, G. (1989). The relationship among teacher's self-disclosive statements, students' perceptions, and affective learning. *Communication Education, 33*, 377-391.
- Steinfatt, T. M. (1979). The alpha percentage and experimentwise error rates in communication research. *Human Communication Research, 5*, 366-374.
- Thomas, C. E. (1994). *An analysis of teacher socio-communicative style as a predictor of classroom communication behaviors, student liking, motivation, and learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University, Morgantown.
- Thomas, C. E., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1994). The association between immediacy and socio-communicative style. *Communication Research Reports, 11*, 107-114.
- Thweatt, K. S., & McCroskey, J. C. (1996). Teacher nonimmediacy and misbehavior: Unintentional negative communication. *Communication Research Reports, 13*, 198-204.
- VanDerveer, E. (1989). Stopping discipline problems before they start. *Music Educator's Journal, 75*, 23.
- Wheless, V. E., & Dierks-Stewart, K. (1981). The psychometric properties of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Questions concerning reliability and validity. *Communication Quarterly, 29*, 173-186.
- Wheless, V. E., & Reichel, L. S. (1990). A reinforcement model of the relationship of supervisors' general communication styles and conflict management styles to task attraction. *Communication Quarterly, 38*, 372-387.