

THE EFFECTS OF STUDENT-TEACHER SIMILARITY ON TEACHER JOB
SATISFACTION, SELF-EFFICACY, AND RETENTION

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University- San Marcos
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of ARTS

by

Jenna V. Elwood, B.A.

San Marcos, Texas
December 2008

COPYRIGHT

by

Jenna V. Elwood

2008

DEDICATION

To my parents, George and Sherri, for instilling in me the importance of education and hard work. To Bennett for always providing me with support and encouragement.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you, Dr. Marian Houser for your patience, dedication, love for instruction, and guidance. Thank you, Dr. Steven Beebe and Dr. Felipe Gomez for your time and willingness to help.

The manuscript was submitted on October 14, 2008.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT.....	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION TO THE THESIS	1
Purpose.....	1
Problem.....	1
Action from Communication Researchers	4
Overview	5
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Introduction.....	7
Theoretical Perspectives	7
Variables	10
Problem Statement	22
Overview	24
III. METHODS AND RESULTS	25
Introduction.....	25
Participants.....	26
Procedures	26
Survey Instruments	27
Results.....	31
Overview	35
IV. DISCUSSION.....	36
Introduction.....	36
Homophily	36
Homophily and Nonverbal Immediacy.....	39
Predictors of Teacher Job Satisfaction and Self-Efficacy.....	43
Overview	45

V. CONCLUSION	47
Introduction.....	47
Implications of Research.....	48
Theoretical Implications	49
Limitations	50
Future Research	51
APPENDIX: INSTRUMENTS.....	53

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Teacher Perceptions of Students' Background Homophily, Attitude Homophily, and Nonverbal Immediacy for Predicting Job Satisfaction	34
2. Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Teacher Perceptions of Students' Background Homophily, Attitude Homophily, and Nonverbal Immediacy for Predicting Self-Efficacy.....	34

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF STUDENT-TEACHERSIMILIARITY ON TEACHER JOB SATISFACTION, SELF-EFFICAY, AND RETENTION

by

Jenna V. Elwood, B.A.

Texas State University- San Marcos

December 2008

SUPERVISING PROFESSOR: MARIAN HOUSER

Teachers are dissatisfied and are experiencing a loss of self-efficacy because of perceived differences and communication mismatch between themselves and students in the classroom. This study investigated how perceptions of homophily and nonverbal immediacy may work to improve the gap between teacher and student differences and improve teacher job satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy. The purpose of this study was to discover communication behaviors that teachers need to acquire for the classroom.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE THESIS

Purpose

Teacher attrition rate is increasing (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003) at the same rate as an increase in minority students (Asburn, 2008). Lower attrition rates are impacted by teacher self-efficacy leading to job satisfaction and an overall dedication to the teaching profession (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Stoca, & Malone, 2006). The lack of teacher job satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy may be a result of a cultural mismatch between teachers and students (Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007) and hindering effective communication. One element that might contribute to classroom communication problems is the degree of similarity teachers expect between themselves and their students. This study investigates whether communication behaviors such as nonverbal immediacy and homophily (similarity) increase teacher job satisfaction and self-efficacy by bridging the gap between teacher-student differences and miscommunication.

Problem

As stated above, there is a need to discover what can be done to reduce the amount of teachers leaving the profession. The problem is not an increase in minority students, but that teachers are not satisfied and experiencing a lack self-efficacy because of teacher-student perceived differences resulting in ineffective communication in the

classroom. This study explores the communication behaviors that teachers need to acquire to overcome a cultural mismatch and increase effective communication.

Much of the past research providing the foundation for this study was conducted in K-12 classrooms. Certainly communication effects due to cultural imbalances in the classroom are not isolated to primary and secondary levels of education. This study, therefore, will investigate these issues at the college level in hopes of providing a more complete picture. From here, further analysis of the problem is provided.

Teacher Retention and Minority Students

To begin to understand the problem, teacher retention rates and increases in minority students need to be evaluated. There is a large exodus of teachers retiring after 25 years or more from the profession (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003), and the need for additional teachers is becoming a critical problem. Colleges are graduating increasing numbers of education majors who comprise over 4 % of the United States civilian work force (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Yet researchers point to the 2003 *Schools and Staffing Survey and Teacher Followup Survey data* conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics that indicates between 40 and 50 % of all beginning teachers leave the profession after just five years (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Inman & Marlow, 2004; Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007; Teven, 2007). The rise in the teacher attrition rate may be attributed to teacher-student classroom communication (Teven, 2007). If true, this calls for action on the part of researchers in the field of communication as well as education to combine efforts to uncover the possible classroom communication connections related to teacher attrition (Teven, 2007).

As teachers are exiting, student numbers are rising, especially within minority groups. Recent statistics from the National Center for Education (2006) indicate that within this minority student populace, one in five students speak a language other than English at home. A majority of these students learn English as a second language in public schools across the nation (Caesar & Kohler, 2007; Delgado, 2008). By 2022 it is predicted that nearly half of all high school graduates will be minorities enrolling as college students (Asburn, 2008). In fact, from 2000 to 2006 minority enrollment in colleges across the U.S. rose by 5.3 % (Asburn, 2008). Unfortunately, this growing and culturally diverse student body is combined with a teaching population made up of less than 10 % minorities (Inman & Marlow, 2004; Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007).

Researchers point to a possible cause of the high teacher attrition rate and overall shortage to a combination of several factors including the lack of minority teachers, increasing student diversity in the classroom, and the demographic makeup of the majority of beginning teachers (Baldwin, Buchanan, & Rudisill, 2007; Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007). Studies indicate that communication problems between teachers and students are developing due to the lack of minority teachers and the increase in minority students (Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007). Reflecting this problem is research reporting that new graduates from teacher education programs are predominately monolingual, female, and from white, middle-class backgrounds (Baldwin et al., 2007). This demographic uniformity, accompanied by the rise in student diversity may swiftly be creating a communication mismatch and a national crisis (Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007).

Violations of Beginning Teachers' Expectations

One contribution to this problem that is swiftly becoming a “national crisis” may be expectations beginning teachers maintain when entering the classroom (Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007). The new teacher typically arrives with the prospect of encountering students who share similar demographics (Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007). They may face serious expectancy violations when they meet the culturally diverse students (Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007; Yeager, Marshall, & Madsen, 2003) who communicate differently. Newly educated teachers simply may not appreciate or recognize the benefits of a more diverse student population (Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007). Expectancy violation theory (EVT) may provide a useful perspective to further investigate this possibility. As a communication theory, EVT (Burgoon, 1978) addresses the effects of noticeable differences between normative verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors within social interactions between the teachers and students. Applying an EVT perspective in the current study may help explain how teachers develop communication expectations for student nonverbal behaviors, and how subsequent perceptions and interactions within the classroom may be linked to attrition. In addition, the application of this theory may help uncover remedies for new teachers in higher education who are experiencing culturally diverse classrooms.

Action from Communication Researchers

This study calls for action from communication researchers to help uncover remedies for new teachers. Research indicates that teaching and learning is a relational communication process (Frymier & Houser, 2000; Mottet & Beebe, 2006; Mottet, Beebe, Raffeld, & Medlock, 2004). It is for this reason, that many communication scholars have

turned their attention to how communication functions in the classroom, specifically, how communication meets the students' instructional and interpersonal needs (Mottet et al., 2004). Applying a relational perspective emphasizes that teachers have needs and expectations in the classroom that students can fulfill (Mottet et al., 2004). However, little attention has been directed toward the effects of demographic differences on teachers' and students' communication needs within their relationships. This study, therefore, is unique in two ways. First, it will provide a starting point for communication researchers to evaluate if and how student-teacher differences in demographics (cultural differences) and communication behaviors affect teacher satisfaction. Second, it will open the door to expanding further research on specific communication behaviors geared for overcoming student-teacher cultural differences. This study is designed to be the starting point to discover how communication, specifically nonverbal immediacy and homophily, can help conquer student-teacher differences and, in return, increase teacher satisfaction, teacher self-efficacy, and the possible connection to teacher attrition.

Overview

In order to discover how communication behaviors can help overcome student-teacher cultural differences and increase teacher satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy, this study will provide four chapters devoted to the following areas: literature review, methods and results, discussion, and future research and limitations. The detailed literature review will provide a theoretical perspective that can be applied to gain a better understanding of teachers' expectations and the resultant effects. Furthermore, previous research will be implemented to describe the communication behaviors, nonverbal immediacy and homophily, and how they might be related to teacher job satisfaction and

teacher self-efficacy. While in presenting past research, the study will provide a rationale of the problem and will propose research questions to examine the relationship between student-teacher nonverbal immediacy and homophily with teacher job satisfaction, and self-efficacy. From this point, the study will move into the fourth chapter: methods and results. Methods implemented include survey research that will examine teachers' and students' perceptions of homophily and nonverbal immediacy as they relate to teacher job satisfaction, and self-efficacy. The results will be followed by a discussion to explain the study's findings. The discussion encompasses the fifth chapter, developed to connect previous research with the study's findings. The final chapter, future research, will provide limitations and implications of the study and will suggest ways in the study's concepts can be explored through future research. Together these chapters should unite to provide understanding and discovery about communication behaviors that can help bridge cultural and communication differences and increase teacher satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

To begin the discovery of how communication behaviors can help teachers overcome the classroom issues they are facing with culturally diverse students, literature must be examined to acknowledge what is currently known. Expectancy violation theory (EVT) will be utilized to help investigate teachers' expectations of students. The theory will help explore student and teacher demographics, communication variables including homophily, nonverbal immediacy, and teacher job satisfaction and self-efficacy. Research explains that as homophily increases, nonverbal immediacy increases (Powell, Hickson, Hamilton, & Stuckey, 2001). This study proposes possible links between student-teacher homophily and immediacy that, in turn, affect teacher job satisfaction and self-efficacy in hopes of recognizing communication behaviors that will benefit teachers.

Theoretical Perspective

As previously mentioned, expectancy violation theory (EVT) developed by Burgoon (1978) serves as a useful lens in the investigation of teacher attrition. Previous research (Yeager et al., 2003) indicates that teachers expect their students to be similar to themselves as well as to their own educational experiences. Applying an EVT

perspective may help explain how teachers develop expectations about student nonverbal behaviors. These expectations may be based on students' race, age, sex, economic status, beliefs, and attitudes that students are likely to display during an interpersonal encounter (Lannutti, Laliker, & Hal, 2001). Furthermore, EVT suggests that when individuals communicate with others, they expect them to engage in certain nonverbal behaviors (Lannutti et al., 2001). Expected nonverbal behaviors, such as immediacy and responsiveness, can be developed through social norms, background, and personal experiences (Lannutti et al., 2001). Overall, research indicates that teachers and students have classroom expectations (Houser, 2006; Lannutti et al., 2001) and students and teachers determine if these expectations have been positively or negatively violated based on their previous experiences (Koerner & Petelle, 1991). Therefore, this study will utilize EVT in order to understand and discover how expectancy violations of student-teacher demographics and homophily may affect teacher attrition rates.

Two variables within EVT that may help to address the sources of beginning teachers' violations are 1) specific expectancies described as enduring patterns of anticipated behavior, and 2) reward valence which are the positive or negative perceptions attached to student behaviors (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2000). In the current study, expectancies are defined as enduring patterns of anticipated behaviors that the new teacher deems appropriate, desired, and even preferred (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2000). Reward valence is the degree of perceptions that represent how a teacher positively or negatively views their interactions with students. Positive reward valence is when the student-teacher interaction occurs in a way that evokes pleasure for the teacher (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2000). Valence for a reward is influenced by a teacher's level of satisfaction

with the student-teacher interaction. The application of this theory may help create an understanding of teacher nonverbal expectations in addition to revealing how student and teacher demographics in higher education affect perceptions. The results may uncover sources of teacher satisfaction and attrition.

EVT allows the author to explore whether new teachers' expectations are violated when they are placed in a culturally diverse classroom. Teachers may experience a cultural mismatch when expectations that are based on preconceived desires and preferences are not fulfilled. Research indicates new teachers placed into culturally diverse classrooms do experience a cultural mismatch (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004; Inman & Marlow, 2004). Examples of mismatches could be language barriers, significant age differences, or even attitudinal and background disparities creating communication misunderstandings. Possible results could be negative characterizations of students causing new teachers to feel disillusioned and frustrated (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004). Unfortunately, these negative feelings have frequently been linked to a lack of teacher self-efficacy, which recent research defines as feelings related to a perceived inability to teach diverse students (Tucker, Porter, Rienke, et al., 2005). Yeager and colleagues (2003) support this finding in their research that reveals demographic expectations beginning teachers from a rural college have of their students. Their expectations were based on the teachers' own rural education experiences. In addition, they reported expectations from urban school teachers felt their expectations were violated because student demographics were not similar (homophilous) to their own. These mismatched expectations ultimately resulted in feelings of frustration and overall violation (Yeager et al., 2003). Tenebaum and Ruck (2007) report similar results

indicating teachers have clear and specific expectations of students based on demographic similarity. Based on past research, classroom diversity, including differences between teacher and student demographics, may emerge as indicators of teacher expectancy violation. Therefore, this study will examine the impact of student-teacher perceptions of the others' demographic and related attitude similarities on levels of teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction as an informative contribution to the attrition crisis facing our education system (Milner & Wolfolk, 2003).

Variables

Student Demographics

To help understand the crisis, it is important to gain understanding of how student demographics differ from teachers' demographics and expectations. Today's classrooms maintain teachers who are predominately white, middle class, and female matched with students who are becoming more and more diverse (Baldwin et al., 2007; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). Resoundingly, research has uncovered a bias among teachers that has emerged when the student-teacher background differences collide (Delgado, 2008; Pigott & Cowen, 2000; Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007). Specifically teachers in the Southwestern United States, who are predominately Caucasian females, make fewer positive and more negative assessments of minority students (Delgado, 2008; Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007). As previously noted, English is being taught as a second language in public schools across the nation and one in five students speak a language other than English at home (Caesar & Kohler, 2007; Deladago, 2008). In Texas for example, Hispanic/Latino students are more likely than other ethnic groups to be retained in school and less likely to complete high school (Delgado, 2008). This is highlighted by a meta-analysis that

indicates teachers favor and have more positive expectations for European-American students than for Latino and African-American students (Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007). In contrast teachers hold significantly more positive expectations for Asian American students than European-American students (Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007). These findings suggest an influence of ethnicity on teachers' expectations and, in turn, could explain how student demographics influence teachers' perceptions of students.

Teacher expectations for student performance also appear to be impacted by student demographics (Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007). Diverse classrooms are composed of students with diverse ethnic and cultural backgrounds and language abilities in addition to students from predominately low-income families (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004; Pigott & Cowen, 2000). Thus, the beginning teacher rarely shares a similar background with students that comprise the demographically diverse classroom (Baldwin et al., 2007). The predominant question then emerges: Are teachers who are facing a culturally-mismatched teaching environment experiencing communication expectancy violations? To answer this question, the next section will explore teacher demographics to aid in identifying the mismatched teaching environment they are experiencing.

Teacher Demographics

Teacher demographics must be examined in order to gain a better understanding of how teachers are facing a culturally-mismatched teaching environment. Within higher education and public schools, the novice teacher is predominately White, middle class, and monolingual (Baldwin et al., 2007). If teachers are expected to negotiate the cultural mismatch due to classroom diversity, a suggested way to compensate is to increasingly recruit and place teachers with students who are similar in demographics (Pigott &

Cowen, 2000). Although the proportion of minority teachers for public schools and colleges is increasing, statistics clearly demonstrate how teacher demographics are different from the increasing numbers of diverse students (Ma, 2004). The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) conducted the School and Staffing Survey and found that within public schools, 83 % of the teachers were White non-Hispanics (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Only 8 % of public school teachers were non-Hispanic Black, and 6 % were Hispanic. The survey also concluded that 1 % was non-Hispanic Asian, and 1 % was listed as “other.” Furthermore, the NCES printed the 2005 *Digest of Education Statistics* report that concluded only 15 % of U.S. faculty in colleges and universities were minorities. Of college faculty, 36 % were White females, while nearly half of college faculty or 47 % were white males (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Only 6 % of college faculties were Black, 5 % were Asian/Pacific Islanders, 4 % were Hispanic, and 0.5 % were American Indian (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). These findings suggest a lack of diversity in teachers’ demographics, which contrasts with the increasing diversity in students.

According to research by Ma (2004) the teaching field is also experiencing a decrease in young teachers who may have encountered more diverse cultures. While a younger generation of educators may have lowered expectations for demographic similarity with their students, their more “seasoned” counterparts may not. With the teacher “aging” and the lack of minority teachers entering the field, student- teacher demographic differences need to be addressed as a factor of teacher satisfaction, self-efficacy, and possible attrition.

Homophily

To address student-teacher demographic differences, researchers need to look at the influence of perceived homophily on teacher satisfaction and self-efficacy.

Homophily may suggest that the lack of similarity in student-teacher demographics could result in teacher dissatisfaction and increasing teacher attrition. Research has revealed that teachers do have expectations based on student ethnic background and demographic similarity (Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007). These results suggest that when demographic similarity is not perceived, teachers may experience expectancy violations resulting in teacher dissatisfaction. Communication researchers refer to this demographic similarity as homophily—the perceived similarity between the attitudes and backgrounds of individuals (Glascock & Ruggiero, 2006). In this case, the more a teacher and student are perceived as similar or homophilous, the more communication and interaction occurs (Glascock & Ruggiero, 2006; McCroskey, McCroskey, & Richmond, 2006).

Homophily affects the amount and quality of interaction within the interpersonal encounter of the teacher and student (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999). The two dimensions of homophily that have been presented in previous research are similarity of background and similarity of attitude between individuals (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999). Background homophily refers to similarities between student and teacher in race, economic status, sex, age, and area of origin. Attitude homophily may include perceived similarities communicated in teacher-student beliefs, values, experiences, thoughts, and overall attitudes.

Research indicates that background and attitude homophily reduce uncertainty and increase positive feelings between individuals within interactions (Houser, Houran,

& Furler, 2007). In addition, evidence reveals that homophily increases student-teacher interactions and has a positive effect on the learning process (Glascock & Ruggiero, 2006). Furthermore, if teachers and students share similar attitudes and backgrounds, students perceive them as being similar and self-disclose more to their teachers (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999).

Homophily remains important to instruction because as homophily increases, students and teachers communicate more, understand one another, and continue future interactions. All of these communication behaviors are critical for desired classroom outcomes such as student cognitive and affective learning, comfortable and fun classroom environment, and teacher and student relationships (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999). The above research indicates the relevance of teacher-student homophily for positive teacher-student interactions and offers a possible explanation for how homophily between teacher-student demographics may impact teachers' expectations and perceptions of their students. As homophily is significant to teacher-student interactions, immediacy is just as valuable to the classroom.

Immediacy

For many years, communication scholars have studied the idea of immediacy as a communication behavior within the classroom (Anderson, 1978; Frymier & Houser, 2000; Hess & Smythe, 2001; Mottet, Frymier, & Beebe, 2006; Mottet, Richmond, & McCroskey, 2006; Powell et al., 2001). Originally defined by Mehrabian (1971), the principle of immediacy states that people interact with people they like, prefer, or highly evaluate (Rocca & McCrosky, 1999). Anderson (1978) continued to define immediacy as the nonverbal interaction with someone and the behaviors that increase closeness to

someone. In return, people decrease interaction with those they dislike, do not prefer, or evaluate negatively (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999). Positive affect towards a person increases immediate communication behaviors such as eye contact, increased touch, and positive verbal tone, while negative affect decreases immediate communication behaviors. Overall, immediacy reduces psychological and physical distance between communicators and enhances interaction and closeness to others (Comstock, Rowell, & Bowers, 1995). Immediacy behaviors include nonverbal behaviors such as increased eye contact, relaxed body, and increased touch. Verbal immediacy behaviors include using personal stories, humor, and verbalizing positive results (Powel et al., 2001). Immediacy has received much attention in interpersonal and organizational communication, yet the college classroom has been the primary context for most immediacy research (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999).

Many studies have been conducted to examine immediacy behaviors that occur between teachers and students within instructional communication. Results indicate that immediacy increases student cognitive learning (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999) and student attentiveness (Frymier & Houser, 1998). Finally, studies indicate that as teachers implement immediacy behaviors, students' motivation increases (Richmond, Lane, & McCroskey, 2006). Altogether, immediacy positively impacts student outcomes with nonverbal immediacy playing the greatest role in positive classroom outcomes (Mottet, Frymier, & Beebe, 2006; Mottet, Richmond, & McCroskey, 2006). Because immediacy, especially nonverbal immediacy, plays such an important role within student outcomes, it is important to discover how it might affect other classroom outcomes, such as teacher satisfaction and feelings of self-efficacy.

Nonverbal Immediacy

Immediacy impacts student outcomes and teacher nonverbal immediacy helps meet students' interpersonal needs. Research on nonverbal immediacy reaffirms students' desire for a positive relationship with their teachers (Mottet, Frymier, & Beebe, 2006). As previously stated, positive student- teacher relationships have a positive effect on the learning process (Glascok & Ruggiero, 2006). Teacher nonverbal immediacy also increases student-teacher interaction and communication (Richmond et al., 2006). Studies indicate teachers' nonverbal immediacy results in more positive student affect and more positive student evaluations of the nonverbally immediate teachers (Anderson, 1978; Rocca & McCroskey, 1999). Overall, teacher nonverbal immediacy contributes to the formation of teacher-student relationships.

It is also important to note that students' displays of nonverbal immediacy behaviors have a powerful effect on the teacher-student relationship. Student nonverbal immediacy has been shown to produce increased levels of teacher job satisfaction (Mottet, Beebe, & Fleuriet, 2006). Their nonverbal immediacy produces liking and helps create interpersonal relationships between the teachers and students (Frymier & Houser, 2000). The value in this is that teacher satisfaction, in turn, contributes to developing positive teacher-student relationships (Mottet, Beebe, & Fleuriet, 2006). This suggests that when student-teacher relationships are not developed, teachers may feel as if their expectations have been violated resulting in increased levels of teacher dissatisfaction. Furthermore, research suggests that most instructors expect students to engage in certain nonverbal behaviors when they communicate with them (Lannutti et al., 2001). This suggests that when students are not nonverbally immediate, the student-teacher

relationship may be affected resulting in teacher expectancy violations and dissatisfaction. Overall, student nonverbal immediacy is essential to instructional communication because it forms teacher-student relationships resulting in teacher job satisfaction. Most importantly these feelings of satisfaction may predict self-efficacy and, ultimately, teacher retention.

Prior research suggests that nonverbal immediacy is related to homophily (Powell et al., 2001). Developing a homophilous relationship results in nonverbal immediacy because as people are drawn to those they like, they are drawn to those that are similar to themselves (Powell et al., 2001). This indicates that the more a student feels similar to the teacher (and vice versa), the more the student likes the teacher. Therefore, as the course progresses and students and teachers discover greater similarities, their nonverbal immediacy increases and impacts mutual evaluations (Powell et al., 2001). The relationship between nonverbal immediacy and homophily may also help predict why differences between students and teachers affects teacher satisfaction, self-efficacy, and retention.

Teacher Satisfaction

Due to the high annual teacher turnover rate and staffing problems, researchers have begun to question beginning teachers about their departure from the teaching profession (Ingersoll & Smith, 2003). One survey indicates that 28.9 % of beginning teachers report an overall dissatisfaction as a result of student composition, the classroom environment, and cultural norm violations (Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2006). These multiple factors could be violating teachers' expectations, resulting in teacher dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction, in turn, has been shown to be a good predictor of teacher

retention as well as a determinant of teacher commitment (Shann, 1999). Teacher job satisfaction frequently refers to what teachers hope to gain from teaching in conjunction with what they are receiving (Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2006). In addition, it is related to the value teachers feel they have contributed to the teaching role (Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2006). Researchers point to circumstances where the new teacher finds value in his or her role and has strong desires and aspirations to teach but is not satisfied because the environment does not meet their personal needs—making the teacher feel devalued (Dworkin, 1980; Ingersoll & Smith, 2003; Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2006). The teachers' dissatisfaction could be a result of the teaching environment and the teachers' demographics.

Demographic Links

Research reports teacher demographics (background) to be a contributing factor influencing how they adapt in the classroom (Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007). Teachers with different demographic backgrounds (such as race, age, sex, language, economic status, and area of origin) from their students, particularly white teachers from high paid or high status occupations, are more likely to experience culture shock, less satisfaction, and quit teaching (Dworkin, 1980). Research indicates that when teacher demographics are matched with those of their students the teachers' level of job satisfaction is affected (Dworkin, 1980; Milner & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2003; Yeager et al., 2003). In addition, research further suggests that minority and lower status teachers (such as community college teachers or lower paid teachers) are more likely to be satisfied and remain in a teaching position than teachers who are white, from high occupational origins (such as universities, tenure, or higher paid teachers) (Kim, Twombly, & Wolf-Wendel, 2007).

This suggests that teacher demographics impact teacher job satisfaction and that teachers find satisfaction in environmental cultures that are homophilous to their own. In other words, the more teachers experience homophily within their environment the less uncertainty they experience (Kim et al., 2007; Yeagar et al., 2003), resulting in more positive communication and a more affective learning environment for students.

College Context

Student-teacher composition, the variety of student demographics within the classroom, and student-teacher homophily may also affect teacher satisfaction within particular education contexts—specifically the college classroom. Kim and colleagues (2007), for example, discussed the existence of faculty job dissatisfaction due to the majority of black students enrolled at four-year institutions primarily employing White faculty (Kim et al., 2007). This research reveals colleges have a reputation for greater student diversity (Kim et al., 2007) and an overall need for teachers to adapt to changing student demographics. Overall, however, differences in student-teacher demographics of faculty at four-year institutions have been shown to lead to teacher dissatisfaction (Kim et al., 2007). Hispanic/Latino and Asian faculty members, at four-year institutions, are reported being less satisfied than White faculty members or any other race (Kim et al., 2007). Since the majority of college students are Caucasian (McDonough & Edmonds, 2006) this finding suggests that Hispanic/Latino and Asian faculty demographics are not matched with their students, which may result in teacher dissatisfaction.

Demographic differences have also been found to exist between faculty at universities and community colleges, and between Caucasian and minority university faculty. Community college faculty remain more satisfied, despite the fact that

community colleges have greater student diversity including ethnic minorities, women, students over the age of 25, and part-time students, than four-year universities (Hardy & Laanan, 2006). However, faculty members at community colleges are more diverse than those teaching at four-year universities, which may result in greater satisfaction because teacher and students are more homophilous (Kim et al., 2007). On the other hand, minority faculty at four-year universities, whose students are predominantly Caucasian and middle to upper class, remain dissatisfied due to experiencing demographic differences with their instructors (Kim et al., 2007). Teacher dissatisfaction could be explained by expectancy violation where teachers have particular expectations of students' demographics causing a violation when they are faced with different demographics. Research suggests, in fact, that all university faculty, including those who are not minority, experience dissatisfaction because of demographic differences between themselves and students (Kim et al., 2007). Overall, this research implies that teacher job dissatisfaction could be a result of these very basic differences between teacher and student, which could, in turn explain reports of lower levels of teacher self-efficacy.

Teacher Self-Efficacy

As differences in teacher and student demographics affect job satisfaction, they can also contribute to teacher levels of self-efficacy. Bandura (1994) defines self-efficacy as "people's beliefs about their capabilities to produce designated levels of performance that exercise influence over events that affect their lives" (p. 1). A teacher's belief in their abilities reflects their level of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994; Tucker et al., 2005). Levels of self-efficacy might influence teacher's job satisfaction. In other words, those who have a high sense of self-efficacy are more likely to feel a great sense of job

satisfaction (Caprara et al., 2006). The meaning and measurement of teacher efficacy has been the subject of considerable debate by researchers due to the assertion that efficacy is context specific (Goddard, Hoy, & Hoy, 2000). Teachers feel efficacious for teaching certain subjects to certain students in very specific settings, with these feelings changing as the variables change (Goddard et al., 2000). If teachers feel differing levels of self-efficacy when teaching in specific settings, then differences in demographics may result in an experience or setting that does not meet their expectations. This expectancy violation could result in lack of satisfaction and lower self-efficacy which could, in turn, affect teacher attrition. Because teachers' expectations in their communication and interpersonal relationships with students may not be met, self-efficacy may suffer (Mottet et al., 2004). Due to demographic differences, such as age and background, teachers may struggle to communicate with students and establish an interpersonal relationship.

Although demographic differences can be a barrier to teacher self-efficacy, when they are managed demographic differences can result in positive feelings of self-efficacy (Tucker et al., 2005). Research predicts that a positive increase in self-efficacy occurs when teachers understand that external factors (e.g., culture) impact students' academic and social behaviors (Tucker et al., 2005). Self-efficacy also increases when teachers acknowledge the meaning of cultural sensitivity and how to adapt to student needs (Tucker et al., 2005). By becoming more aware and more culturally sensitive, teachers may be able to reduce differences between themselves and their students (Tucker et al., 2005) and start looking for similarities to increase feelings of homophily. Homophily will increase student-teacher interaction and help to develop interpersonal relationships which can be important in the classroom (Frymier & Houser, 2000).

The following studies illustrate how a teacher can lose feelings of self-efficacy if unable to recognize and appreciate demographic differences. Research by Milner and Woolfolk-Hoy (2003) reveals a minority teacher loss of self-efficacy because she did not feel welcome or a sense of belongingness. She experienced decreasing levels of self-efficacy as she fought to invalidate stereotypes due to demographic differences placed on her by students and other faculty. A similar study depicted a Latina beginning teacher at a diverse, low economic school struggling with Hispanic minority students' nonverbal and verbal responsiveness to math (Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007). The teacher felt as if she could not get the students to find value in math and connect with her because the students' culture was different from her own. When she was finally able to establish cultural relevance for the minority students by relating the material to their cultural work ethics, they began to respond to her and feelings of self-efficacy in the classroom rose (Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007). These studies suggest differences in teacher-student demographics can produce a loss of teacher self-efficacy. Yet, they also demonstrate that if teachers expect differences and are aware of increasing student diversity, they can work to adapt and allow for improved student-teacher communication.

Problem Statement

After examining previous research, the problem investigated in the current study is further supported. The problem remains as follows: teachers are dissatisfied and are experiencing lower self-efficacy because of a perceived cultural mismatch and, in turn, communication differences within the classroom. As a result of perceived differences, communication misunderstandings occur creating teacher frustrations and ultimately leading to rising teacher attrition. To help overcome this problem, this study will explore

how background and attitude homophily and nonverbal immediacy may work to improve the gap between teacher and student expectations, ultimately improving teacher job satisfaction and self-efficacy. This study, therefore, will inquire whether students and teachers differ in perceptions of the others' homophily. Furthermore, the study will attempt to identify a relationship between students' perceptions of teacher homophily and their use of nonverbal immediacy toward their teacher. A relationship between teachers' use of nonverbal immediacy and their perceptions of homophily with students will also be examined. Finally, the current study hopes to determine if student-teacher homophily and nonverbal immediacy predict teacher job satisfaction and teacher self efficacy. The results of this study, therefore, hope to yield answers to the following research questions:

RQ 1: To what extent do college students and teachers differ in perceptions of the others' background homophily (demographics) and attitude homophily?

RQ 2a: Is there a relationship between students' perceptions of teachers' background and attitude homophily and their own use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors?

RQ 2b: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of students' background and attitude homophily and their own use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors?

RQ 3: To what extent do teacher perceptions of students' attitude homophily, background homophily and nonverbal immediacy predict levels of job satisfaction and self-efficacy?

Overview

The increase in teacher attrition rates and the rise of student diversity have drawn increased attention to factors of student-teacher demographics and their effects on teacher job satisfaction and feelings of self-efficacy. Research suggests teacher self-efficacy influences job satisfaction (Caprara et al., 2006) and the overall relationship between retention and levels of self-efficacy and job satisfaction (Milner & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2003). The current study suggests that if teacher-student demographics are similar then teachers will expect to have a high degree of attitude and background homophily. However, a problem arises when teachers' expectations of homophily are not met in the classroom as previous results indicate a loss in job satisfaction and feelings of self-efficacy (Mottet et al., 2004; Souto-Manning & Dice, 2007). The goal of this study, therefore, is to identify the connection between student-teacher communication and teacher feelings of job satisfaction and efficacy. More specifically, this study will investigate the relationship between student and teacher demographics and perceptions of homophily and nonverbal immediacy with teacher feelings of job satisfaction and self-efficacy in hopes of explaining rising teacher attrition in today's education system. Survey research will be utilized with college teachers and their students to answer the questions posed in this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND RESULTS

Introduction

To answer the questions proposed, graduate teaching assistants and students from a Southwestern university completed survey items measuring homophily, nonverbal immediacy, satisfaction, and self-efficacy. T-tests, Pearson's correlation, and regressions were then performed to analyze the participants' responses. From these tests, results were drawn regarding the proposed research questions. Results indicated that teachers' and students' did not perceive themselves as having different attitude or background homophily. Results also indicated that when students' share similar perceptions of their teachers' attitudes and backgrounds students implemented more nonverbally immediate behaviors. However, when teachers' shared similar perceptions of their students they did not increase their use of nonverbal immediacy. The only predictor of job satisfaction was attitude homophily. Finally, the results indicated that teacher self-efficacy was not predicted by background homophily, attitude homophily, or nonverbal immediacy. The following section will provide greater detail about the methods and the results of the study.

Participants

Graduate Teaching Assistants

The sample included 21 Communication graduate teaching assistants who were Communication lab instructors for the undergraduate participants in the study. They were recruited from a Southwestern university in the United States. All participating graduate teaching assistants were relatively new lab instructors with one semester of experience or beginning their first semester. The sample included 16 females (76%) and five males (23.8%). Of the graduate teaching assistants, 12 identified themselves as Caucasian (57.1%), three as African American (14.3%), five as Hispanic (23.8 %), and one as Asian (4.8 %). Age of the participants ranged from 20 to 50 with an average age of 24. All graduate teaching assistant participants had a bachelors' degree and were currently working on a masters in communication.

Student Subjects

The student sample for this study included 419 undergraduates who were recruited from a required introductory Communication course at a Southwestern University in the United States. The sample included 227 females (54 %) and 192 males (45.7%). Ethnic backgrounds of the participants were as follows: 304 Caucasian (72.4%), 19 African American (4.5%), 68 Hispanic (16.2%), 19 Native American (4.5%), one Indian (.2%), one Pacific Islander (.2%), 12 Asian (2.9%), and nine who identified as other (2.1%). Age of the participants ranged from 18 to 40 with a mean age of 19.

Procedures

Graduate teaching assistants and students were asked to complete an instrument consisting of questions that reflected their views toward how similar they felt they were

with their current students or with their graduate teaching assistant in regard to background and attitude homophily. Both groups were also asked how much they used nonverbal immediacy within the classroom. In addition, the students' and graduate teaching assistants' perceptions of satisfaction and efficacy were measured. Demographic questions were also included at the end of the questionnaire. Data were collected during the third lab class of a 30 class semester. Internal Review Board (IRB) approval was granted prior to distributing the surveys. The research team obtained informed consent from graduate teaching assistants and students and both groups were given IRB contact information for questions or concerns regarding the study.

The graduate teaching assistants were contacted through email asking them to participate in a study exploring communication in the classroom. Surveys were distributed during two different semesters, Summer Session II 2008 and Fall 2008. Research was conducted in an identical time frame during both semesters. All graduate teaching assistants were asked to allot ten minutes at the beginning of their third class meeting and to allow the research team to explain the project. During this time, graduate teaching assistants and students were asked to read and sign a letter of consent. All subjects were made aware that the data collected was anonymous and participation was voluntary. Graduate teaching assistants and students were asked to complete the surveys based on the teacher and students in their current communication lab section.

Survey Instruments

Homophily

To measure participants' expectations of homophily the perceived Homophily Scale (Glascock & Ruggiero, 2006; McCroskey, Richmond, & Daly, 1975) was utilized.

The scale for this study measured perceived similarity between graduate teaching assistant and student. The scale was divided into two different dimensions: background and attitude. The original homophily scale created by McCroskey and colleagues contained four items regarding background homophily and four items depicting attitude homophily. Due to low reliabilities reported in past research utilizing the background homophily scale (McCroskey, 2007), an additional item was added to the scale in hopes of increasing the reliability. Overall, for this study, the background scale contained five items and implemented the bipolar adjectives *Like Me* and *Unlike Me*. The background homophily scale was used to compare student- teacher demographics. The attitude scale contained 14 items that ranged from *Thinks like me/Doesn't think like me*, *Behaves like me/ Doesn't Behave like me*, and *Has beliefs like mine/Doesn't have beliefs like mine*. Both background and attitude homophily scales are semantic differential scales which ask respondents to rate the strength of their opinions on a range from one to seven. Numbers one and seven identify very strong feelings. Numbers two and six identify strong feelings. Numbers three and five identify fairly weak feelings. Number four identifies neutral or undecided feelings. Greater perception of similarity is indicated by higher scores. (Glascok & Ruggiero, 2006; McCroskey, 2007). The possible range of responses for the background homophily scale was between five and 35. Scores for the attitude homophily scale could range from 14 to 98. Previous research reported that low alpha reliability scores (below .70) are common for the background homophily instrument (McCroskey, 2007), with strong reliability scores (above .80) for attitude homophily (McCroskey, 2007). The alpha reliability found in the current study was .58

for background homophily, even with the addition of a fifth item. The alpha reliability reported for attitude homophily was .77.

Nonverbal Immediacy

A 16-item, five-point likert-type measure developed from Richmond, McCroskey, and Johnson (2003) was used to assess graduate teaching assistants' and students' perceptions of the nonverbal immediacy behaviors utilized by the other. The nonverbal immediacy scale used a five-point Likert-type response. The items were (with this class) use hands to gesture, use monotone voice, and frown while talking to the teachers. Greater similarity is indicated by higher scores. Baringer and McCroskey (2000) reported a past reliability of .79 for the nonverbal immediacy instrument. The alpha reliability for the current study was .78.

Teacher and Student Satisfaction

To measure graduate teaching assistant and student satisfaction, Mottet, Beebe, Raffeld, and Medlock's (2004) five-item, seven-point bipolar scale was implemented. Graduate teaching assistants and students were asked to circle the number that best represented their assessment of their satisfaction with the class. The following bipolar adjectives were used: *Satisfied/ Unsatisfied*, *Happy/Sad*, *Gratified/ Ungratified*, *Pleased/ Not Pleased*, and *Fulfilled/ Unfulfilled*. (Mottet, et al., 2004). The job satisfaction scale is a five item semantic differential scale which asks the respondents to rate the strength of their opinions with a range from one to seven. Numbers one and seven identify very strong feelings. Numbers two and six identify strong feelings. Numbers three and five identify fairly weak feelings. Number four identifies neutral or undecided feelings. The possible range of scores for the job satisfaction scale was between six and 42. Previous

research reported an alpha reliability of .97 (Mottet et al., 2004). The alpha reliability found in the current study was .89.

Self-Efficacy

To measure graduate teaching assistant and student self-efficacy, a five-item, seven-point bipolar scale, created by Mottet and colleagues (2004), was implemented. The scale measured the graduate teaching assistants' perceptions of their effectiveness and students' assessment of their effectiveness as a student in the class (Mottet et al., 2004). Participants were asked to circle the number that best represented their assessment of their personal levels of self-efficacy. The following bipolar adjectives were used: *Capable/ Uncapable*, *Skilled/ Unskilled*, *Effective/ Ineffective*, *Efficient/ Inefficient*, and *Successful/Not Successful*. Mottet and colleagues' teacher self-efficacy scale is a semantic differential scale which asks the respondents to rate the strength of their opinions with a range from one to seven. Numbers one and seven identify very strong feelings. Numbers two and six identify strong feelings. Numbers three and five identify fairly weak feelings. Number four identifies neutral or undecided feelings. Possible scores ranged from five to 28. Mottet and colleagues (2004) reported an alpha reliability of .95. The alpha reliability found in the current study was .73. Though the exact same items were used in this study, a possible explanation for a lower reliability could be the fact that the teacher participants were new graduate teaching assistants with little to no experience in teaching and feelings of self-efficacy. Therefore, consistent responses may have been more difficult for this group of instructors.

Teacher and Student Demographics

Graduate teaching assistant and student demographic items included age, race, sex, economic group, and area of origin. The authors created questions to measure classroom demographics based on the parameters set within the 2004 National Postsecondary scale (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Students and teachers were asked to complete the demographic questions as part of the survey.

Results

As explained above, survey research was implemented to determine the relationships between communication behaviors and teacher job satisfaction and self-efficacy. As details were provided describing the survey instruments, further details will be provided below describing the results of the tests.

RQ 1: To what extent do college students and teachers differ in perceptions of the others' background homophily (demographics) and attitude homophily?

The first research question focused on college students' and teachers' perceptions of each others' background homophily and attitude homophily. Two independent-samples *t*-tests were calculated comparing the mean score of teachers' ($n=21$) and students' ($n=419$) perceptions of the others' background and attitude homophily. No significant differences were found between teachers' and students' perceptions of the others' attitude and background homophily. In other words, the means and standard deviations for teachers' and students' perceptions of the other's background homophily (student $m=19.2$, $sd=.83$; instructor $m=20.9$, $sd=5.54$) were not significantly different [$t(441)=1.3$, $p=.20$]. There was also no difference between student-teacher levels of perceived attitude homophily. Again, means and standard deviations for teachers' and

students' perceptions of the others attitude homophily (student $M= 53.7$, $SD=9.7$; instructor $M=53.4$, $SD=10$) were not significantly different ($t(144)=.32$, $p=.77$).

RQ 2a: Is there a relationship between students' perceptions of teachers' background and attitude homophily and their own use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors? Not sure how these should be formatted?

To answer RQ2a, a Pearson correlation was calculated to examine the relationship between student perceptions of background homophily and attitude homophily with their teacher and, in turn, their own use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Students' perceptions of their teachers' background homophily suggest that there was not a significant relationship with demographic similarity and their own use of nonverbal immediacy ($r(420)=.368, p>.01$). Student perceptions of their teacher's attitude similarity, however, suggest a significant but small relationship ($r(420)=.23$, $p < .01$). The results indicate that students may be more nonverbally immediate when they have perceptions of sharing similar attitudes with their teachers.

RQ 2b: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of students' background and attitude homophily and their own use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors?

A Pearson correlation was also conducted for RQ2b to examine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of their background and attitude homophily with students in their classes and their own use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Results revealed that teacher perceptions of background homophily with their students is unrelated to their own use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors ($r(21)=.18$, $p=p < .01$). In regard to attitude homophily, results also revealed that teachers' perceptions of attitude homophily with

their students is unrelated to their use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors ($r(21)=.21$, $p=.36$). The results indicate that there is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of background homophily or attitude homophily with their students and an increase in their use of nonverbal immediacy.

RQ 3: To what extent do teacher perceptions of students' attitude homophily, background homophily and nonverbal immediacy predict levels of job satisfaction and self-efficacy?

To answer research question three, a multiple regression was conducted to determine the best linear combination of background homophily, attitude homophily, and nonverbal immediacy for predicting teacher job satisfaction. The means and standard deviations can be found in Table 1. This combination of variables did not significantly predict teacher job satisfaction, $F(3,20)= 2.405$, $p>.05$ with an R square of .298. The only variable that was a significant predictor of teacher job satisfaction levels was perceived attitude homophily ($B=.551$, $p<.05$). A multiple regression was also conducted to determine the best linear combination of background homophily, attitude homophily, and nonverbal immediacy for predicting teacher self-efficacy. The means and standard deviations can be found in Table 2. Again, this combination of variables did not significantly predict teacher self-efficacy, $F(3, 20)=.781$, $p>.05$ with an R square of .121.

Table 1

Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Teacher Perceptions of Students' Background Homophily, Attitude Homophily, and Nonverbal Immediacy for Predicting Job Satisfaction

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β
Background Homophily	20.86	5.54	-.001	.246	-.012
Attitude Homophily	53.43	9.98	.330	.138	.551*
Nonverbal Immediacy	67.62	3.57	.0003	.350	.002
Constant (Job Satisfaction)	10.19	5.98	-7.38	23.11	

Note. $R^2 = .298$; $F(3,20) = 2.405$, $p > .05$ * $p < .05$

Table 2

Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for Teacher Perceptions of Students' Background Homophily, Attitude Homophily, and Nonverbal Immediacy for Predicting Self-Efficacy

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SEB</i>	β
Background Homophily	20.86	5.54	.304	.214	.362
Attitude Homophily	53.43	9.98	-.005	.120	-.119
Nonverbal Immediacy	67.62	3.57	-.215	.305	-.165
Constant (Self-Efficacy)	13.19	4.65	24.31	20.12	

Note. $R^2 = .122$; $F(3, 20) = .781$, $p > .05$

Overview

Survey research was implemented to determine the relationships between perceived homophily, nonverbal immediacy, satisfaction, and self-efficacy. To answer the research questions, the study utilized t-tests, Pearson correlation, and linear regression to obtain results. Findings indicated that there were no significant differences between teachers' and students' perceptions of the others' background or attitude homophily. Results also suggest that students may be more nonverbally immediate when they share similar perceptions of their teachers' attitudes and backgrounds. Although students' perceptions of homophily affected students' use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors, teachers' perceptions of homophily did not affect their use of nonverbal immediacy. Results indicated that attitude homophily was the only predictor of job satisfaction for teachers. Finally, results indicated that background homophily, attitude homophily, and nonverbal immediacy did not predict teacher self-efficacy. With these results in mind, a discussion of the findings and detailed explanations will be provided next.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

Introduction

After providing results of the study, further analysis needs to be provided in order to fully understand what the findings suggest. This chapter will provide a better understanding of why teachers and students do not perceive themselves as being different from one another. Furthermore, this discussion will provide reasoning for why students implement nonverbal immediacy behaviors when they perceive attitude homophily with instructors, but teachers fail to do so. To further clarify, an explanation will be provided describing the possible effects teacher training might have on the implementation of nonverbal immediacy behaviors by the graduate teaching assistants in this study. In addition, teacher training may help to explain why attitude homophily was a predictor of job satisfaction but not self-efficacy.

Homophily

RQ 1: To what extent do college students and teachers differ in perceptions of the others' background homophily (demographics) and attitude homophily?

The results of this investigation indicate that teachers' and students' perceptions of each others' background homophily and attitude homophily are not significantly different. What this means is teachers and students perceive that they are not different from one another in sex, race, age area of origin, and economic status. This lack of perceived difference could be a result of the population sampled at the particular Southwestern University. Though it is considered, by university officials, to be a very diverse population, there is enough consistency within the population that no particular group or demographic background perceives they are different or unusual than the other. Most of the students and teachers are from surrounding and similar areas which could explain their lack of differences. This lack of difference is supported by the two participant pools who are generally from a similar area and are also similar in race, economic status, culture, and age.

As teachers and students share similar perceptions in regard to background homophily, they also share similar perceptions about attitude homophily. Students' and teachers' perceptions of the others' backgrounds appear to contribute to similar perceptions of attitude homophily. In this case, teachers and students perceive themselves as having no differences to one another in attitude which includes having similar to one another in attitude which includes values, beliefs, and ideas. Attitude, beliefs, and values are created and established by background experiences that have been created and instilled in them. Teachers' and students' perceptions of lack of differences in these areas may be a result of actually having similar backgrounds to their students. For example, most of the students and teachers are from surrounding and similar areas as this particular university is primarily a commuter campus. Because of this, it seems

natural that they would share the same culture and cultural values which could create similar attitudes and beliefs. To further explain, students and teachers have similar perceptions of similarities of one another's race. A person's values, attitudes, and beliefs are all affected by their background which would encompass ethnicity (Beebe, Beebe, & Ivy, 2008). Therefore, because the participants studied are similar in ethnicity, it makes sense they might also be similar in attitude. This result allows researchers to draw some connections to the effects of diversity on teacher satisfaction and self-efficacy.

Although the population sampled is a major limitation of this study, similarities in perception of attitudes could explain why students and teachers were satisfied with their classes. The results suggest that the teacher sample in this study did not experience expectancy violations because not only did they fail to perceive differences between themselves and their students, but the students also did not perceive themselves as being different. Within the sample studied, any differences that may exist between teachers and students are much too subtle to detect. The teachers and students sampled appear to share a homophilous culture in which there few major differences between the students and teachers that would cause expectancy violations. In this case, a scale that accounted for more minor differences might have been more useful in determining how homophily affected classroom communication in this particular sample. Past research suggests that teachers and students who enter classroom environments that unexpectedly violate their culture may experience a greater communication mismatch and resulting in culture shock (Dworkin, 1980). Furthermore, in past studies teachers have reported that varying classroom environments and cultural norm violations impact their job satisfaction (Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2006). Since participants in the current study did not

experience an environment that would create major cultural violations, the result was a culturally homophilous sample that failed to depict communication breakdowns that are realistically occurring in the classroom (Dworkin, 1980). Perhaps due to this, the teachers' expectations of the students were met, resulting in job satisfaction. In addition, it describes the value of teacher expectations and the communication barrier created by an overall lack of awareness. The results of the study relay the importance of creating similarity between the teacher and student, despite demographic differences, to try to prevent a communication mismatch.

Homophily and Nonverbal Immediacy

RQ 2a: Is there a relationship between students' perceptions of teachers' background and attitude homophily and their own use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors?

The results of RQ2a are valuable as they also indicate that students may increase their use of nonverbally immediate behaviors when they perceive they share similar attitudes with their teacher. The results, in this case, suggest that homophily may be related to nonverbal immediacy. This supports previous research which indicates that developing a homophilous relationship results in immediacy because as people are drawn to things they like, they are also drawn to those things that are similar to themselves (Powell et al., 2001). These behaviors include eye contact, increased touch, relaxed body, and positive verbal tone that reduce psychological and physical distance (Comstock et al., 1995) between the teacher and students. For example, if a student feels that the teacher has a similar attitude towards work or school, the student might increase their eye contact, which communicates liking, trust, and respect, with the teacher. Furthermore, if a student

feels like the teacher has similar beliefs about the recent political campaign, for example, then the student might have a more relaxed body position when engaging in interaction with the teacher. As the course progresses and students discover greater similarities, their immediacy increases (Powell et al., 2001). The present study indicates that as students have perceptions of attitude homophily with their instructors, they become more comfortable with and increase their liking of them. The more a teacher and student are homophilous in attitude, the more communication interactions occur (Glascock & Ruggiero, 2006; McCroskey et al., 2006). As a result, students begin to implement nonverbally immediate behaviors as a way to express their feelings of similarity and liking. So as the student feels similar to their teacher, they may engage in nonverbally immediate behaviors that create positive affect.

Applying expectancy violation theory (EVT) to these results could help explain the positive affect. An EVT perspective suggests that when individuals communicate with others they expect them to engage in certain nonverbal behaviors (Lannutti et al., 2001). This indicates that as students engage in nonverbal immediacy, teachers' expectations are met as they are enduring patterns of anticipated behaviors that the new teacher deems appropriate, desired, and even preferred (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2000). If the student-teacher interaction evokes pleasure for the teacher a positive reward valence is created (Burgoon & Dunbar, 2000). This result indicates the significance of teachers trying to overcome differences and finding ways to demonstrate similarities between themselves and their students. In doing so, an increase in student use of nonverbal immediacy can occur and, in return, teacher satisfaction with the student-teacher interaction will grow. Previous research suggests that homophily should positively

increase nonverbal immediacy (Glascock & Ruggiero, 2006; McCroskey et al., 2006). However, the results of this study indicate that while attitude homophily is related to an increase in student nonverbal immediacy, background homophily is not. This could be a result of the background homophily scale consisting of only five items and a low reliability. On the other hand, background homophily may not be related to nonverbal immediacy behaviors due to its less interactive nature. Attitude homophily could have more behavioral implications that are more clearly evident in the classroom. As there is still the power differential between student and teacher, regardless of age or ethnic similarity, attitude similarities may be more readily voiced, creating greater interactive opportunities. This may, in turn, create a stronger nonverbal immediacy link.

RQ 2b: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of students' background and attitude homophily and their own use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors?

Unlike the results of RQ2a which supported a positive relationship between students' perceptions of attitude homophily toward their teachers and their use of nonverbal immediate behaviors, RQ2b was not supported. Teachers' perception of their attitude homophily with students was not significantly related to their own use of nonverbal immediacy. As mentioned above, previous research demonstrates that homophily should be significantly related to nonverbal immediacy (Powell et al., 2001). One reason for the lack of significance in this relationship could be explained by observing how the teachers in this sample were trained before entering the classroom. All teacher participants at the Southwestern university were required to attend a five day teaching and learning training academy. Within this academy, the new teachers were taught how nonverbally

immediate behaviors affect classroom outcomes. These graduate teaching assistants were provided specific nonverbal immediacy behaviors to implement within their classroom interaction. Specifically, they were trained how to implement nonverbal immediacy behaviors such as eye contact, relaxed body posture, positive facial expressions, and positive vocal expressions. The significance and power of nonverbal immediacy behaviors were discussed within the training program. These instructors were also presented with research explaining the positive effects of immediacy on student-teacher interaction and communication (Richmond et al., 2006). They were also familiarized with the positive relationship between immediacy and student affect (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999), teacher satisfaction (Mottet, Beebe, & Fleuriet, 2006) and the student-teacher relationships (Mottet, Beebe, & Fleuriet, 2006). Because the teachers had previous training on the implementation of effective communication behaviors in the classroom, they may not have been inclined to increase nonverbal immediacy behaviors even more as a result of perceptions of attitude homophily. Rather, their implementation of nonverbally immediate behaviors would have been a result of their training which provided an awareness of how it affects classroom outcomes.

The graduate teaching assistants (teachers) in the study were also taught communication skills to help them effectively adapt to any background and attitude differences that they might have with their students. Because they had previous training on effective communication behaviors to use in the classroom, they would not increase nonverbally immediate behaviors as a result of encountering students with similar or diverse backgrounds. Their implementation of nonverbally immediate behaviors would have been a result of their training which provided an awareness of how to be culturally

sensitive and how to adapt communication to background differences including culture, age, race, and sex. However, the results of this study are still valuable in that they emphasize the potential importance of training teachers, specifically new ones, before placing them in the classroom. Future research could contrast these results with results from graduate teaching assistants without training. If teachers are trained how to use effective communication skills, such as nonverbal immediacy and how to adapt to differences, then teachers may react to perceptions of any differences in a more effective manner. Sufficient training may, in fact, reduce serious expectancy violations, as a result of meeting culturally diverse students (Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007; Yeager et al., 2003). Overall, by becoming more aware and more culturally sensitive, teachers may be able to reduce differences between themselves and their students (Tucker et al., 2005) and start looking for similarities to increase feelings of homophily. This could, in turn, affect their use of effective communication behaviors such as nonverbal immediacy.

Predictors of Teacher Job Satisfaction and Self-Efficacy

RQ 3: To what extent do teacher perceptions of students' attitude homophily, background homophily and nonverbal immediacy predict levels of job satisfaction and self-efficacy?

Though it was expected that a relationship between students' and teachers' levels of background homophily, attitude homophily, and nonverbal immediacy would predict teacher job satisfaction, this was not the case. Though attitude homophily was revealed as a "lone predictor" of teacher job satisfaction, the relationship was slight. Previous research indicates that there are many elements to consider when determining predictors of teacher job satisfaction. Student nonverbal immediacy has been shown, in the past, to

increase teacher perceptions of satisfaction with their job (Mottet, Beebe, & Fleuriot, 2006). Research also indicates that when teacher demographics are matched with those of their students their level of job satisfaction is positively affected (Dworkin, 1980; Milner & Woolfolk-Hoy, 2003; Yeager et al., 2003). This could be a result of teachers' expectations of students not being violated. However, other factors may contribute to their satisfaction including an overall development of teacher-student relationships (Mottet et al., 2004). In addition, teacher job satisfaction is related to the value teachers feel they have contributed to their teaching role (Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2006). Therefore, although student-teacher homophily and nonverbal immediacy may be factors that contribute to teacher satisfaction, when combined they simply do not significantly contribute to a teacher's total level of job satisfaction.

Similar results were discovered with regard to the predictors of teacher self-efficacy. The combination of background homophily, attitude homophily, and nonverbal immediacy did not predict teacher self-efficacy. Furthermore, previous research reveals that a positive increase in self-efficacy occurs when teachers understand external factors (e.g. culture) that may affect students' social behaviors (Tucker et al., 2005). Teachers have expectations of students that may be based on their race, age, sex, economic status, beliefs, and attitudes that students are likely to display during an interpersonal encounter (Lannutti et al., 2001). If these expectations are not met, possible results could be negative characterizations of students causing new teachers to feel frustrated (Achinstein & Barrett, 2004). These feelings have frequently been linked to a lack of teacher self-efficacy (Tucker et al., 2005). This suggests that if a teacher understands how external factors, such as beliefs, attitudes, age, and race, affects students differently and affects

their communication within the classroom, then teacher self-efficacy should increase. An increase in levels of self-efficacy has also been reported when teachers acknowledge the meaning of cultural sensitivity and how to adapt to students' needs (Tucker et al., 2005). If teachers' self-efficacy increases when they are culturally sensitive, then the combination between background homophily, attitude homophily, and nonverbal immediacy may not be a predictor of self-efficacy because the teachers in the current study were trained to be effective communicators. Specifically they were instructed how to adapt to cultural differences and the differential levels of nonverbal immediacy. Again, when this sample of graduate teaching assistants completed their pre-teaching training, they may have been more aware and capable of handling external factors such as cultural differences. Further research comparing trained versus untrained teachers may increase the awareness of the value in training new teachers (Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007; Yeager et al., 2003)

Overview

Overall, teachers and students did not perceive themselves as being different in background or attitude homophily. This lack of difference is supported by the two participant pools who are generally from a similar area and are also similar in race, economic status, culture, and age. Because teachers and students were from similar backgrounds, they were more likely to experience little if any differences in attitude homophily. The results of the study relay the importance of creating similarity between teachers and students despite demographic differences in order to prevent miscommunication. Furthermore, the study indicated the effects of homophily on immediacy, in that as homophily increases, nonverbal immediacy would also increase.

This result is important in that it emphasizes the need to create homophily to enhance nonverbal immediate behaviors. Although, none of the variables as a combination were significant predictors of teacher job satisfaction, it allows researchers to see how important it is to discover what factors might be creating teacher job dissatisfaction and lack of self-efficacy. Most importantly, the findings of the study provide a better understanding of how and why training new teachers in communication behaviors such as nonverbal immediacy and homophily expectations is needed to improve teacher job satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy. Because of the need to improve these areas, the remaining section will discuss possible implications of the study.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Introduction

Teachers are dissatisfied and are experiencing a loss of self-efficacy because of perceived differences and communication mismatch between themselves and students in the classroom. As a result, communication misunderstandings are occurring, causing teachers to feel frustrated and ultimately resulting in possible teacher attrition. This study investigated how perceptions of homophily and nonverbal immediacy may work to improve the gap between teacher and student differences and improve teacher job satisfaction and teacher self-efficacy. In doing so, the study found the importance of creating similarity between the teacher and student. The study indicated that homophily and nonverbal immediacy may work together to lower perceptions of demographic differences and create effective classroom communication. Due to the teacher participants' prior training, the study also indicated that training could affect new teachers and increase perceptions of homophily and nonverbal immediacy while reducing feelings of dissatisfaction and lack of self-efficacy. As the purpose of this study was to discover communication behaviors that teachers need to acquire to overcome cultural mismatch and increase effective communication, it was accomplished by discovering the

importance and effects of training new teachers how to use effective communication behaviors, such as homophily and nonverbal immediacy.

Implications of Research

Findings in this study illustrate the need for new teacher training. There is an urgent need to prepare future and practicing teachers in classroom behaviors to enable them to adapt and overcome demographic differences and an inevitable cultural mismatch. Teachers should be trained on how to adapt their communication to different student demographics in order to provide a more keen awareness of cultural sensitivity. By providing training that increases awareness and produces homophily, reduced expectancy violations will also occur when embracing culturally diverse students (Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007). Teacher training programs should also be implemented to ensure effective use of nonverbal immediacy behaviors. Nonverbal immediacy behaviors include eye contact, increased touch, relaxed body posture, and positive verbal tone. New teachers need to acknowledge the positive effects of their communication on their own job satisfaction and self-efficacy, and, ultimately, student outcomes. Furthermore, teacher training, regarding the implementation of these specific communication behaviors, can help provide teachers with better teacher-student relationships (Mottet, Frymier, & Beebe, 2006), enhanced and increased student-teacher interaction (Richmond et al., 2006), affective learning (Anderson, 1978), and improved teacher feelings of contribution (Zembylas & Papanastasiou, 2006). Overall, all teachers, whether elementary, secondary, or at the college level should be involved in training that focuses on effective communication behaviors within the classroom. This would help ensure that teachers are aware and understand how communication affects their level of teacher job

satisfaction and self-efficacy. In doing so, the problem of teacher attrition, teacher dissatisfaction, and lack of self-efficacy may improve because teachers will be more competent and confident in overcoming demographic differences and miscommunication.

Theoretical Implications

This study utilized expectancy violation theory (EVT) in order to understand and discover how expectancy violations of student-teacher demographics and homophily may affect teacher job satisfaction and self-efficacy. Research indicates that teachers and students have classroom expectations (Houser, 2006; Lannutti et al., 2001) and students and teachers determine if these expectations have been positively or negatively violated based on their previous experiences (Koerner & Petelle, 1991). These expectations may be based on students' race, age, sex, economic status, beliefs, and attitudes that students are likely to display during an interpersonal encounter (Lannutti et al., 2001). The results of the study indicated that teachers' expectations of attitude and background homophily were not violated and nonverbal immediacy behaviors did not increase from the homophily balance. Overall, both teachers' and students' expectations of each other were met. Within the study, the teachers had previous experience or training and were taught how to use effective communication when expectations might not be met. Teachers were fully aware, with their previous training, of the differences they might encounter in the classroom including age, race, sex, beliefs and attitudes. In fact, they were instilled with confidence and skills needed to effectively communicate despite possible differences. To support the results, previous research explains that training could reduce the serious expectancy violations that new teachers are facing when meeting culturally diverse students (Tenebaum & Ruck, 2007; Yeager et al., 2003).

Applying an EVT lens allows both communication and education researchers to gain an understanding of the value in training instructors in the use of effective communication skills such as nonverbal immediacy. In addition, training in adapting communication behaviors can enhance new teachers' feelings of job satisfaction and self-efficacy. By implementing training that focuses on effective communication skills new teachers will embrace the classroom with confidence and the skill needed to confront any expectation that is violated. In return, this will help to balance the rise of diversity within classrooms and help increase teacher retention rate.

Limitations

Limitations emerged as the study was conducted and results were developed. First, the sample could be a major limitation in the study because it did not provide a completely diverse population in which expectancy violations could have easily been produced. The students' and teachers' perceptions of one another were similar. Due to this, the population might not be an accurate representation of the real diversity that is occurring within the classroom. Also, the teachers sampled were previously trained before entering the classroom. This is a limitation to the study because it does not provide for teachers who are new and are immediately placed within the classroom with no knowledge of the value of immediacy regardless of levels of homophily. Results may have been very different if untrained teachers were sampled. Finally, the sample could have also been a limitation because these teachers were fully capable and were teaching communication skills that are believed to be needed to overcome diversity (Beebe et al., 2006) within the classroom. Because of their previous knowledge of effective communication skills, this group of teachers was fully aware of the communication skills

that should have been implemented within the classroom. This could have resulted in a survey bias due to knowing the most beneficial and proper response on the survey.

Overall, the sample can be viewed as a limitation of the study.

Another limitation of the study is the reliability of the background homophily scale. However, the low reliability has been acknowledged by previous researchers and the creator of the scale (McCroskey, 2007). More recently, the scale has reached higher levels of reliability (McCroskey, 2007). It is important to note, that an additional item was added to increase reliability. However, had the original instrument been utilized, the reliability may have been different.

Future Research

Future research might consider the timing of survey implementation during the semester. As previously mentioned, the study was conducted toward the beginning of the semester. The teachers' and students' perceptions of homophily might have been different if the timing was different and questionnaires were distributed at the end of the semester. Had this been the case, perceptions of homophily might have been representative of less "surface diversity" (what appears to be different) and, instead, resemble greater "deep diversity" or what really is different and is discovered over time (Harrison, Price, Gavin, & Florey, 2002). In other words, if research is conducted at the end of the semester when teachers and students have had more time to develop relationships, the perceptions of diversity may be more prevalent. Future research should consider repeating similar studies at a later date within the semester.

Also, future research should explore sampling new teachers who have not been previously trained before entering the classroom. Today, almost every teacher is required

to have an education degree or instructional certificate that indicates their preparedness for the classroom. Every teacher is required to have training. However, future research needs to investigate how that training incorporates effective communication skills that will prepare teachers for the transactional process of communication that will inevitably occur within the classroom. By exploring how effective communication skills need to be merged within the education discipline, specific training programs can be developed that incorporate teaching teachers communication skills and, in turn, prepare teachers to be effective instructors and fully satisfied within their jobs. Future research may compare untrained versus trained teachers to see if communication training really affects classroom outcomes. If communication can become a focus with teacher education training then there is a bright future for understanding and responding to student-teacher diversity and teacher retention rates.

From here, there is nowhere to go, but up. The education system is facing a significant problem with teachers leaving the field. This problem needs to be managed. But, there is great hope in knowing that teachers have the necessary tools at their fingertips. If teachers are aware and can adapt to changing classroom demographics they can improve their communication skills and the student-teacher interaction. It is never too late for teachers to start learning, to start implementing those tools, and to start developing their knowledge of effective communication in the classroom.

APPENDIX

INSTRUMENTS

Instructor Survey

RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY ABOUT YOUR *Current Classroom Composition*

Below, are a series of questions regarding demographics of the current students in your classroom. Please respond as honestly and rapidly as possible. This short questionnaire should take you only 10 minutes to complete.

All of your responses are completely anonymous and will ONLY be reviewed by the research team.

Instructions: Circle the number *closest to the term* that most accurately reflects your views toward how similar you are with the aggregate of students in your classroom.

(1 & 7= *very strong feelings*; 2 & 6= *strong feelings*; 3 & 5=*fairly weak feelings*; 4=*don't know*)

1. How much are your students like you in sex (male/female)?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

2. How much are your students like you in race?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

3. How much are your students like you in age?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

4. How much are your students like you in area of origin?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

5. How much are your students like you in economic status?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

Instructions: Please CIRCLE the number closest to the description that best represents your feelings about your current classroom composition. Please read the wording for each response carefully.

(1 & 7= very strong feelings; 2 & 6= strong feelings; 3 & 5=fairly weak feelings; 4=don't know).

My current students for this semester:

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| 1. Are from a social class different to mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Are from a social class similar to mine. |
| 2. Think like me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Do not think like me. |
| 3. Don't behave like me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Behave like me |
| 4. Have a different economic situation to mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Have a similar economic situation mine. |
| 5. Have a background similar to me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Have a background different to me. |
| 6. Do not share my values. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Share my values |
| 7. Are like me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Are unlike me. |
| 8. Treat people like I do. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Treat people differently than I do. |

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|
| 9. Come from a different geographic area from me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Come from a similar geographic area as me. |
| 10. Had a childhood similar to mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Had a childhood from different from mine. |
| 11. Have thoughts and ideas ideas unlike mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Have thoughts and ideas similar to mine. |
| 12. Express attitudes similar to mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Express attitudes different from mine. |
| 13. Have a lot in common with me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Have little in common with me. |
| 14. Have beliefs that are like mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Have beliefs that are different than mine. |

Instructions: Circle the number *closest to the term* that most accurately reflects your degree of your current job satisfaction. Please read the response options carefully.

(1 & 7= *very strong feelings*; 2 & 6= *strong feelings*; 3 & 5= *fairly weak feelings*; 4= *don't know*)

In this teaching position I currently feel...

- | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Satisfied | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Not Satisfied |
| Not Pleased | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Pleased |
| Happy | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Sad |
| Not Gratified | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Gratified |
| Fulfilled | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Not Fulfilled |

Instructions: Circle the number *closest to the term* that most accurately reflects your judgment or assessment of your Teaching Effectiveness. Please read the response options carefully.

(1 & 7= *very strong feelings*; 2 & 6= *strong feelings*; 3 & 5=*fairly weak feelings*;
4=*don't know*)

As an instructor for this class, I believe I am....

Effective 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not Effective

Efficient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Inefficient

Skilled 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unskilled

Capable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not capable

Successful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unsuccessful

Instructions: Below are a series of statements that describe the ways some people behave while talking with or to others. You are asked to indicate how well each statement applies to your communication with your current students. For each statement, choose the number that most closely describes your communication behavior with your students. Write that number in the space before the number of the statement.

1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Occasionally; 4 = Often; 5 = Very Often

- _____ 1. Uses hands and arms to gesture.
- _____ 2. Use a monotone or dull voice.
- _____ 3. Looks at students while talking to them.
- _____ 4. Frowns while talking to students.
- _____ 5. Has a very tense body position while talking to students.
- _____ 6. Moves away from students while talking to them.
- _____ 7. Uses a variety of vocal expressions while talking to students.
- _____ 8. Touches students on the shoulder or arm while talking to them.
- _____ 9. Smiles while talking to students.
- _____ 10. Looks away from students while talking to them.
- _____ 11. Has a relaxed body position while talking to students.
- _____ 12. Is "stiff" while talking to students.
- _____ 13. Avoids touching students while talking to them.
- _____ 14. Moves closer to students while talking to them.

_____15. Is animated while talking to students.

_____16. Looks bland or neutral when talking to students.

Have your students met your prior expectations?

YES

NO

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Please answer the following demographic information as completely as possible.

Age: _____

Sex: Male _____ Female _____

Ethnic Origin: Caucasian _____ African-American _____

Native American _____ Indian _____ Pacific Islander _____ Hispanic _____

Asian _____ Other _____

(Please Indicate)

Marital Status: Single _____ (never married) Divorced _____

Separated _____ Widowed _____ Married _____

Number of Children _____

Highest Degree Earned: High School _____ Associates _____

Bachelors _____ Masters _____ PhD _____

Location of Current Residence: _____

Where you are from (Where did you primarily grow up?):

Please hand the researcher(s) your Survey and Consent Form after you have completed them.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

Student Survey
RESPOND TO THIS SURVEY ABOUT YOUR *Current Classroom Composition*

Below, are a series of questions regarding demographics of your Communication 1310 lab instructor Please respond as honestly and quickly as possible. This short questionnaire should take you only 10 minutes to complete. All of your responses are completely anonymous and will ONLY be reviewed by the research team.

Instructions: Circle the number *closest to the term* that most accurately reflects your views toward how similar you are with your Communication 1310 lab instructor.

(1 & 7= *very strong feelings*; 2 & 6= *strong feelings*; 3 & 5= *fairly weak feelings*;
 4= *don't know*)

1. How much is your lab instructor like you in sex (male/female)?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

2. How much is your lab instructor like you in race?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

3. How much is your lab instructor like you in age?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

4. How much is your lab instructor like you in area of origin?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

5. How much is your lab instructor like you in economic status?

Like Me - 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 – Unlike Me

Instructions: Please **CIRCLE** the number closest to the description that best represents your feelings about your Communication 1310 lab instructor. You are responding to what you “think” about your instructor. Please read each choice very carefully.

(1 & 7= *very strong feelings*; 2 & 6= *strong feelings*; 3 & 5=*fairly weak feelings*; 4=*don't know*).

My current lab instructor:

- | | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Is from a social class
different than mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Is from a social class
similar to mine. |
| 2. Thinks like me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Does not think
like me. |
| 3. Doesn't behave like me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Behaves like me |
| 4. Has a different economic
situation to mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Has a similar
situation to mine. |
| 5. Has a background similar
to me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Has a background
different to me. |
| 6. Doesn't share my values. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Shares my values |
| 7. Is like me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Is unlike me. |
| 8. Treats people like I do. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Treats people
differently than I do. |
| 9. Comes from a different
geographic area than me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Comes from a
similar geographic
area as me. |
| 10. Has a childhood similar
as mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Has a childhood
different from
mine. |

- | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| 11. Has thoughts and ideas
ideas unlike mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Has thoughts and
ideas similar to
mine. |
| 12. Expresses attitudes
similar to mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Expresses attitudes
different from
mine. |
| 13. Has a lot in common with me. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Has little in
common with me. |
| 14. Has beliefs that are like mine. | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Has beliefs that are
different than mine. |

Instructions: Circle the number *closest to the term* that most accurately reflects how satisfied you are in the current Communication 1310 class. Please read your response options carefully.

(1 & 7= *very strong feelings*; 2 & 6= *strong feelings*; 3 & 5=*fairly weak feelings*;
4=*don't know*)

In my 1310 class I currently feel....

Satisfied 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not Satisfied

Not Pleased 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Pleased

Happy 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sad

Not Gratified 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Gratified

Fulfilled 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not Fulfilled

Instructions: Circle the number *closest to the term* that most accurately reflects your judgment or assessment of YOUR OWN effectiveness in your 1310 class. Please read the response choices very carefully.

(1 & 7= *very strong feelings*; 2 & 6= *strong feelings*; 3 & 5=*fairly weak feelings*;
4=*don't know*)

In my 1310 class I currently feel I AM....

Effective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not Effective
Efficient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Inefficient
Unskilled	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Skilled
Capable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not capable
UnSuccessful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Successful

Instructions: Below are a series of statements that describe the ways some people behave while talking with or to others. You are asked to indicate how well each statement applies to your communication with your instructor and the other students. For each statement, choose the number that most closely describes your communication behavior with your instructor. Write that number in the space before the number of the statement. **1 = Never; 2 = Rarely; 3 = Occasionally; 4 = Often; 5 = Very Often**

- _____ 1. Uses hands and arms to gesture.
- _____ 2. Use a monotone or dull voice.
- _____ 3. Looks at instructor while talking to them.
- _____ 4. Frowns while talking to instructor.
- _____ 5. Has a very tense-body position while talking to instructor.
- _____ 6. Moves away from instructor while talking to him.
- _____ 7. Uses a variety of vocal expressions while talking to instructor.
- _____ 8. Touches instructor on the shoulder or arm while talking to them.
- _____ 9. Smiles while talking to instructor.
- _____ 10. Looks away from instructor while talking to them.
- _____ 11. Has a relaxed body position while talking to instructor.
- _____ 12. Is "stiff" while talking to instructor.
- _____ 13. Avoids touching instructor while talking to them.
- _____ 14. Moves closer to instructor while talking to them.
- _____ 15. Is animated while talking to instructor.
- _____ 16. Looks bland or neutral when talking to instructor.

Circle YES or NO to indicate whether you WILL or WILL NOT take a course from this lab instructor again?

YES

NO

PERSONAL INFORMATION

Please answer the following demographic information as completely as possible by filling in the response with the appropriate answer or placing an "X" in the blank that best describes you.

Age: _____

Sex: Male _____ Female _____

Ethnic Origin: Caucasian _____ African-American _____
Native American _____ Indian _____ Pacific Islander _____ Hispanic _____
Asian _____ Other _____

(Please Indicate)

Marital Status: Single _____ (never married) Divorced _____
Separated _____ Widowed _____ Married _____

Number of Children _____

Highest Degree Earned: High School _____ Associates _____
Bachelors _____ Masters _____ PhD _____

Location of Current Residence: _____

Where you are from: _____

Please hand the researcher(s) your Survey and Consent Form after you have completed them.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J.F. (1978). The relationship between teacher immediacy and teaching effectiveness. In T.P. Mottet, V.P. Richmond, & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp.255-282). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Achinstein, B., & Barrett, A. (2004). (Re)framing classroom contexts: How new teachers and mentors view diverse learners and challenges of practice. *Teachers College Record, 106*, 716-746.
- Asburn, E. (2008). The student pool is expected to dip and diversify. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 54*, 1-10.
- Baldwin, S.C., Buchanan, A.M., & Rudisill, M.E. (2007). What teacher candidates learned about diversity, social justice, and themselves from service-learning experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*, 315-327.
- Bandura, A. (1994). Self-efficacy. In V.S. Ramachaudran (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of human behavior* (Vol. 4, 71-81). New York: Academic Press. (Reprinted in H. Friedman [Ed.], *Encyclopedia of mental health*. San Diego: Academic Press, 1998).
- Baringer, D.K., & McCroskey, J.C. (2000). Immediacy in the classroom: Student immediacy. *Communication Education, 49*, 178-186.
- Beebe, S.A., Beebe, S.J., Ivy, D.K. (2008). *Communication Principles for a Lifetime*. New York: Pearson Custom Publishing.

- Burgoon, J.K. (1978). A communication model of personal space violations: Explication and an initial test. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 129-142.
- Burgoon, J.K., & Dunbar, N. (2000). An interactionist perspective on dominance-submission: Interpersonal dominance as a dynamically, situationally contingent social skill. *Communication Monographs*, 67, 96-121.
- Caprara, G.V., Barbaranelli, C., Steca, P., & Malone, P.S. (2006). Teachers' self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of job satisfaction and students' academic achievement: A study at the school level. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 473-490.
- Caesar, L.G., & Kohler, P.D. (2007). The state of school-based bilingual assessment: The actual practices versus guidelines. *Language, Speech, & Hearing Services in Schools*, 38, 190-200.
- Comstock, J., Rowell, E., & Bowers, J.W. (1995). Food for thought: Teacher nonverbal immediacy, student learning, and curvilinearity. *Communication Education*, 44, 251-266.
- Delgado, R. (2008). The instructional dynamics of a bilingual teacher: One teacher's beliefs about English language learners. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 43, 43-53.
- Dworkin, A.G. (1980). The changing demography of public school teachers: Some implications for faculty turnover in urban areas. *Sociology of Education*, 53, 65-73.
- Frymier, A.B., & Houser, M.L. (1998). Does making content relevant make a difference in learning? *Communication Research Reports*, 15, 121-129.

- Frymier, A.B., & Houser, M.L. (2000). The teacher-student relationship as an interpersonal relationship. *Communication Education, 49*, 207-219.
- Glascok, J., & Ruggiero, T.E. (2006). The relationship of ethnicity and sex to professor credibility at a culturally diverse university. *Communication Education, 55*, 197-201.
- Goddard, R.D., Hoy, W.K., & Hoy, A.W. (2000). Collective teacher efficacy: Its meaning, measure, and impact on student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*, 479-507.
- Hardy, D., & Laanan, F.S. (2006). Characteristics and perspectives of faculty at public 2-year colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 30*, 787-811.
- Harrison, D.A., Price, K.H., Gavin, J.H., & Florey, A.T. (2002). Time, teams, and task performance: Changing effects of surface and deep-level diversity in group functioning. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 1029-1045.
- Hess, J.A. & Smythe, M.J. (2001). Is teacher immediacy actually related to student cognitive learning? *Communication Studies, 52*, 197-219.
- Houser, M.L. (2006). Expectancy violations of instructor communication as predictors of motivation and learning: A comparison of traditional and nontraditional students. *Communication Quarterly, 54*, 331-349.
- Houser, M.L., Houran, S.M., & Furler, L.A. (2007). Predicting relational outcomes: An investigation of thin slice judgments in speed dating. *Human Communication, 10*, 69-81.

- Ingersoll, R.M., & Smith, T.M. (2003). The wrong solution to the teacher shortage. *Educational Leadership*, 60, 30-33.
- Inman, D., & Marlow, L. (2004). Teacher retention: Why do beginning teachers remain in the profession? *Education*, 124, 605-615.
- Kim, D., Twombly, S., & Wolf-Wendel, L. (2007). Factors predicting community college faculty satisfaction with instructional autonomy. *Community College Review*, 35, 159-180.
- Koerner, C.D., & Petelle, J.L. (1991). Expectancy violation and student rating of instruction. *Communication Quarterly*, 39, 341-350.
- Lannutti, P.J., Laliker, M., & Hale, J.L. (2001). Violations of expectations and social-sexual communication in student/professor interactions. *Communication Education*, 50, 69-82.
- Ma, J. (2004). Recent trends in faculty demographics and employment patterns. *TIAA-CREFF Institute: Trends and Issues*. 2- 20. Retrieved June, 16, 2008 from www.tiaa-crefinstitute.org.
- McCroskey, J.C. (2007). Teacher satisfaction and self-efficacy scales. Retrieved July 23, 2008 from [www. JamesMcCroskey.com](http://www.JamesMcCroskey.com).
- McCroskey, L.L., McCroskey, J.C., & Richmond, V.P. (2006). Analysis and improvement of the measurement of interpersonal attraction and homophily. *Communication Quarterly*, 54, 1-31.
- McCroskey, J.C., Richmond, V.P., & Daly, J.A. (1975). The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. *Communication Research*, 1, 323-332.

- McDonough, T., & Edmonds, K. (2006). Students of color make dramatic gains in college enrollment but still trail whites in the rate at which they attend college. *American Council on Education: Publications and Products*. Retrieved June 14, 2008 from www.acenet.edu.
- Milner, R.H., & Woolfolk-Hoy, A. (2003). A case study of an African American teacher's self-efficacy, stereotype threat, and persistence. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, 263-276.
- Mottet, T.P., & Beebe, S.A. (2006). Foundations of instructional communication. In T.P. Mottet, V.P. Richmond, & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp.3-32). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mottet, T.P., Beebe, S.A., & Fleuriet, C. (2006). Students' influence messages. In T.P. Mottet, V.P. Richmond, & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp.143-165). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Mottet, T.P., Beebe, S.A., Raffeld, P.C., & Medlock, A. (2004). The effects of student verbal and nonverbal responsiveness on teacher self-efficacy and job satisfaction. *Communication Education*, 53, 150-163.
- Mottet, T.P., Frymier, A.B., & Beebe, S.A. (2006). Theorizing about instructional communication. In T.P. Mottet, V.P. Richmond, & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp.255-282). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Mottet, T.P., Richmond, V.P., & McCroskey, J.C. (2006). *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Pigott, R.L., & Cowen, E.L. (2000). Teacher race, child race, racial congruence, and teacher ratings of children's school adjustment. *Journal of School Psychology, 38*, 177-196.
- Powell, L., Hickson, M., Hamilton, T., & Stuckey, J. (2001). The relationship of homophily to verbal and nonverbal immediacy in the classroom. *Communication Research Reports, 18*, 217-222.
- Richmond, V.P., Lane, D.R., & McCroskey, L.L. (2006). Teachers immediacy and the teacher-student relationship. In T.P. Mottet, V.P. Richmond, & J.C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp.255-282). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Richmond, V.P., McCroskey, J.C., & Johnson, A.D. (2003). Development of the nonverbal immediacy scale (NIS): Measures of self-and other-perceived nonverbal immediacy. *Communication Quarterly, 51*, 504-517.
- Rocca, K.A., & McCroskey, J.C. (1999). The interrelationship of student ratings of instructor's immediacy, verbal aggressiveness, homophily, and interpersonal attraction. *Communication Education, 48*, 308-318.
- Souto-Manning, M., & Dice, J.L. (2007). Reflective teaching in the early years: A case for mentoring diverse educators. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 34*, 425-430.

- Tenebaum, H.R., & Ruck, M.D. (2007). Are teachers' expectations different for racial minority than for European American students? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*, 253-273.
- Teven, J.J. (2007). Teacher temperament: Correlates with teacher caring, burnout, and organizational outcomes. *Communication Education, 56*, 382-400.
- Tucker, C.M., Porter, T., Rienke, W.M., Herman, K.C., Ivery, P.D., Mack, C.E., & Jackson, E.S. (2005). Promoting teacher efficacy for working with culturally diverse students. *Preventing School Failure, 50*, 29-34.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *Digest of Education Statistics, 2005*. Retrieved June 16, 2008 from www.nces.gov.
- Yeager, N., Marshall, P., & Madsen, K. (2003). Rural students becoming rural teachers: How long do they stay? *Rural Survival, 23*, 158- 162.
- Zembylas, M., & Papanastasiou, E. (2006). Sources of teacher job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in Cyprus. *Comparative Education, 34*, 229-247.

VITA

Jenna Victoria Elwood was born in Waco, Texas, on May 8, 1985. She is the daughter of Sherri Ann Elwood and George Edward Elwood. In August 2003, she entered Baylor University- Waco as a Communication Specialist major. She received the degree of Bachelor of Arts and Sciences from Baylor University in May 2007. In August 2007, she entered the Graduate College of Texas State University- San Marcos as a Communication student. Within her graduate career, she majored in Instructional Communication.

Permanent Address: 184 Virginia Road

Waco, Texas 76705

This thesis was typed by Jenna V. Elwood