



107
109
THS



3 1293 00692 4595

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

This is to certify that the
thesis entitled

EFFECTS OF FORMALITY AND AUTHORITARIAN LEVELS
ON STUDENT DISCLOSURE TO FACULTY

presented by

Deborah L. Dyson

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

M.A. degree in Communication

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Frank J. Boster", written over a horizontal line.

Major professor

Date May 1990

PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.
TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
JAN 25 1993	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

MSU is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution

c:\cric\datedue.pm3-p.1

EFFECTS OF FORMALITY AND AUTHORITARIAN LEVELS
ON STUDENT DISCLOSURE TO FACULTY

By

Deborah L. Dyson

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Communication

1990

605549

ABSTRACT

EFFECTS OF FORMALITY AND AUTHORITARIAN LEVELS ON STUDENT DISCLOSURE TO FACULTY

By

Deborah Dyson

This study examined the role of formality and authoritarian levels on student disclosure within student-faculty interactions. Review of formality, authoritarian, and disclosure literature led to a hypothesized positive correlation between formality and disclosure, and negative correlation between authoritarianism and disclosure. Results indicated that formality was negatively associated with disclosure. Authoritarianism revealed no significant correlation to disclosure levels and was inconsistent with the second hypothesis. These findings were interpreted in view of the strengths and weaknesses of the investigation, and suggestions for future research were offered.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee: Dr. Franklin Boster and Dr. James Stiff for their support and guidance in this endeavor.

Also, I want to thank Marge Barkman, the graduate secretary for keeping me informed of all pertinent guidelines and procedural necessities, and expediting them for me when it was at all possible.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	3
Effects of Formality.....	3
Self-Disclosure.....	6
Authoritarianism.....	9
METHOD.....	13
Subjects.....	13
Procedure.....	13
Instrumentation.....	13
RESULTS.....	15
Distribution.....	15
Test of Hypotheses.....	15
DISCUSSION.....	17
APPENDICES.....	22
A. The "1982" RAW Scale.....	23
B. Communication Research Questionnaire.....	28
C. Teaching Assistant Questionnaire.....	33
REFERENCES.....	36

INTRODUCTION

Although scholars have examined both self-disclosure (Berg & Archer, 1982; Chelune, 1975; Cozby, 1973; Jourard, 1957) and authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950; Altemeyer, 1972; Ray, 1976; Rigby & Rump, 1982) carefully, to my knowledge, no studies have assessed the relationship between these constructs and formality. Because formality has been shown to be linked with important interactional outcomes, and because there is reason to expect it to be affected by authoritarianism and to affect self-disclosure, interpersonal communication theory can profit from understanding these relationships. Thus, to begin filling this void in the corpus of interpersonal communication research, this study will examine the relationships among these three variables in the context of student-professor interaction.

Formal student-professor interactions are communication sequences that are highly rule-governed. When a student must always make an appointment to meet with an instructor, when the interaction is restricted to task-related matters, and when the student must address

the professor by title it is likely that the interaction is very formal.

Alternatively, informal student-professor interactions are communication sequences that are not highly rule-governed. Indicators of informal interactions include optional appointment making, socioemotional message exchange, and first name address.

It should be emphasized that this distinction is not to be regarded as dichotomous. Rather, student-professor interactions may be scaled on a continuum, the extremes of which are illustrated by the descriptions above.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Effects of Formality

Although little research has addressed formality directly, there are lines of inquiry relevant to it. For instance, Miller and Steinberg (1975) note that formal relations require participants to expend more effort in interaction because they must both assess the rules which govern the situation and monitor their message behavior carefully.

Cialdini (1985) recognizes that certain characteristics of formality, specifically the use of titles, promote perceptions of differential status among actors. These perceptions, in turn, guide the nature of subsequent communication exchanges. For example, he relates an anecdote in which a professor began to lie about his occupation when conversing with strangers because reference to his title changed their otherwise lively comments to dull deferent responses.

Wilson (1968) found that when the same individual was introduced as either a student, demonstrator, lecturer, a senior lecturer, or a professor, he was perceived as being approximately 1/2 inch taller with

each increase in status. Such results suggest that titles are symbols of authority, and that they encourage subordination and deference.

Similarly, Darby and Judson (1987) report that informal, less controlled office furniture arrangements were evaluated more positively by students. A group of 134 students were asked to rate each of four basic office designs, ranging from very formal to very informal. Students rated the less formal offices more favorably. Moreover, the male students reported that the less formal arrangement was more conducive to better acquaintanceship, and the female students said that they would prefer remaining in the less formal office after business was completed. These findings suggest that students are aware of the power differential inherent in student-professor relationships, and that they feel more comfortable in an environment which facilitates perceptions of student-professor equality.

A 1979 study by Andersen examining teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness is consistent with these findings. Immediacy has been defined as those communication behaviors that facilitate closeness and nonverbal interaction between individuals (Mehrabian, 1969). The solidarity construct has been found to be significantly related to immediacy. Solidarity is defined as a reflection of "the degree of psychological,

social and perhaps even physical closeness between people" (Wheeles, 1978, p. 145). The study examined the effects of teacher immediacy on student behavioral commitment, affect, and cognitive learning. It further examined the solidarity construct as it contributes to the predictive power of immediacy.

Students in several sections of an interpersonal communication course were asked to complete two instruments measuring teacher immediacy. Three trained observers also rated each instructor's immediacy. Nonverbal immediacy included such behaviors as demonstration of closer physical distance, communication on the same spatial plane, touches, use of direct body orientation, smiles, head nods, use of eye contact, vocal expressiveness, gestures, interaction and encouraged reciprocity, and informal dress. In addition, students completed an instrument assessing student affect, behavioral commitment, solidarity, and cognitive learning.

Results revealed that 50% of the variance in student attitudes could be attributed to student perceptions of teacher immediacy. Immediate instructors were evaluated more favorably by students and evoked increased levels of student behavioral commitment. Solidarity gave increased predictive power to two operationalizations of affect: affect toward course content and affect toward the

instructor. No relationship was found between teacher immediacy and cognitive learning.

The reviewed literature illustrates the manner in which formal and informal communication styles affect communication exchanges. Formal communication is effortful and rule restricted. Further, formal interaction is often hierarchical in nature, involving differential status and role-oriented discourse. In contrast, informal communication behavior affords an increased amount of acceptable messages that may exceed task oriented discourse and studies suggest that low to moderate levels of formal communication behavior in instruction may increase levels of affective and behavioral learning (Nussbaum & Scott, 1979; Andersen, Norton, & Nussbaum, 1981).

Self-Disclosure

Self-disclosure has been defined as a quality of communication in which one person provides personal information about his or her thoughts, needs, or feelings to another individual (Cozby, 1973; Jourard, 1959). Culbert (1967) distinguished between self-description and self-disclosure. The former includes disclosure of information that an individual would feel comfortable sharing with most others; the latter requires that information one believes could only be acquired if he/she

reveals it be shared, and is information that would not be freely shared with anyone who inquired.

Proponents of the social penetration theory argues that self-disclosure increases as the relationship between interactants becomes more interpersonal (Altman & Taylor, 1973; Levinger, 1980). Although some self-disclosure has been found to be both healthy and necessary for the development of strong relationships (Chaikin & Derelga, 1974; Sermat & Smyth, 1973), research indicates a curvilinear effect in which extreme levels of disclosure can indicate psychological disturbance (Jourard, 1958) and lead to less liking for the discloser (Cozby, 1972; Jourard, 1958).

Miller and Steinberg (1975) identify several potential motives for self-disclosure. They distinguish three relational levels: cultural, sociological, and psychological. At the cultural level, predictions are based on shared cultural knowledge. At the sociological and psychological levels, predictions are based on formal or informal group membership and individual analysis; respectively.

According to Miller and Steinberg, self-disclosure can facilitate movement from the cultural to the sociological to the psychological relational level. They define self-disclosure as personally private information which is intended for relational or personal growth.

They recognize most student-faculty relationships as relatively informal and at the sociological level.

Perhaps the most consistent finding in this literature is that disclosure tends to be reciprocated. Disclosure reciprocity refers to a tendency for a person to respond to another with the same level of self-disclosure initiated by the other (Cozby, 1972; David & Skinner, 1974; Jourard, 1959). Altman and Taylor (1973) suggest that reciprocity is most critical during the early stages of a relationship in order to nurture the mutual trust necessary for relational escalation. The reciprocity effect is not linear however. A study by Cozby (1972) revealed that at extremely high levels of disclosure intimacy, reciprocity becomes a less potent predictor of responses. Subsequent studies have been consistent with these findings (Archer & Berg, 1978; Brewer & Mittelman, 1980; Rubin, 1975).

These results suggest a potential relationship between formality and self-disclosure. Formal communication transactions are less likely to involve self-disclosing behavior due to their rule-governed, restrictive nature. The role orientation of formal interaction does not motivate people to escalate the relationship, and discourse is largely confined to nonintimate exchanges. Traditional formal interaction involves a rigid status differential and initiated

communication exchange is largely downward (Likert System 1 & 2, 1967; Weber, 1947). This has implications for the reciprocation effect. Downward communication is initiated by supervisors, and consists largely of directives. In contrast, upward communication is limited and responsive in nature consisting largely of clarifying and confirmatory statements. Thus, it is likely that subordinates will reciprocate nonintimate levels of communication initiated by the supervisor. Given minimal motivation and opportunity to exchange personally private information, it is likely that formal interaction will exhibit low levels of disclosure.

In informal communication contexts, a wider range of messages is appropriate. Opportunity for relational escalation is apparent and likely more of an incentive than in formal contexts. Informal contexts are less role defined and are indicative of a small status differential. The less hierarchical nature of informal interaction affords increased opportunity for either interactant to increase the intimacy of the exchange. Therefore, the following hypothesis is advanced:

- H₁: Disclosure is higher in informal communicative contexts than in formal communicative contexts.

Authoritarianism

Research in the area of authoritarianism is relatively controversial; there has been considerable

debate over the definition of authoritarianism and its measurement. Research studies have identified several characteristics of the authoritarian personality. Altemeyer (1973) identifies three basic elements of authoritarianism, two of which are germane to this study: conventionalism, aggression, and submission.

Conventionalism, as defined by Altemeyer, refers to a high degree of adherence to the social conventions which are perceived to be endorsed by society and its established authorities. Aggression is conceptualized as a general aggressiveness, directed against various people, which is perceived to be sanctioned by established authorities. The final element, submission, is regarded as a high degree of adherence to the authorities who are perceived to be established and legitimate in the society in which one lives.

Conventionalism reflects a tendency to adhere to norms and customs outlined by traditional religious and secular doctrine. God's law and its authority is deemed acceptable and independent notions of morality are unacceptable. Highly conventional people believe that authority determines what is right and alternative ways of doing things are wrong. Furthermore, it is believed that individuals should strive to be well behaved and respectable. Normative behavior refers to how people

ought to act, not necessarily how they do act. Finally, right wing authoritarians are resistant to change.

Highly submissive individuals believe that established authorities are trustworthy and deserve obedience and respect. These people support government regulations, and do not question its sovereignty. Example of legitimate authority figures include parents, religious officials, and government officers. In a limited and role-specific capacity teachers, bus drivers, and employers may also be perceived in this manner. Altemeyer maintains that right wing authoritarians are not only submissive to right wing authorities. Although such individuals would prefer right wing authority, they are more likely to submit to an unfavorable government than those who are less submissive.

Informal student-faculty interactions can be considered nonnormative. Professors are authorities and informality is atypical of interactions with an authority. Instead, interaction in such relationships is largely restricted by a series of role governed guidelines. Moreover, disclosure in these relationships is unconventional. Typical discourse in the traditional student-faculty interaction is task oriented and nonintimate.

Informal student-faculty interaction entails lower levels of student subordination and less role definition.

Although informal interaction may produce increased levels of self-disclosure in individuals of low to moderate authoritarianism, Altemeyer's work suggests highly authoritarian individuals will engage in little self-disclosure. Rather, authoritarian individuals view a professor as an authority and will behave submissively and conventionally. Because self-disclosure within traditional student-faculty interactions is unconventional, high authoritarians prefer formal settings, and are likely to feel uncomfortable in informal interactions which entail lower levels of subordination. This chain of reasoning leads to a second hypothesis:

H₂: High authoritarians will display lower levels of disclosure in both formal and informal communication contexts than low authoritarians.

METHOD

Subjects

The subject pool used in this study consisted of 75 Ph.D. students in the departments of Mass Media, Journalism, and Communication at Michigan State University.

Procedure

Three questionnaires and an instruction sheet were placed in the mailbox of each graduate student in the sample. The questionnaires included Altemeyer's Right Wing Authoritarian Scale (RWA, 1982) and two self-designed questionnaires developed to measure disclosure and formality (see Appendices A, B, C). Questionnaires were returned by mail, and data collection spanned a nine-week period, producing a response rate of 29 percent.

Instrumentation

Altemeyer's 30-item "RWA" Scale was used to measure the authoritarianism of the respondents (see Appendix A). A second 33-item measure was distributed to determine the faculty member with whom the subject most frequently interacts. In addition, it was designed to assess levels

of formality and disclosure within this student-faculty relationship (see Appendix B). A third 15-item instrument was designed to assess the formality and disclosure levels among subjects and their own students (see Appendix C). The alpha coefficient for formality was .80. Disclosure was as a one-item measure.

RESULTS

Distribution

The mean formality was 2.075 with a standard deviation of 1.022. The distribution was slightly positively skewed (0.607) and platykurtic (-0.594). The mean authoritarianism was 3.454 with a standard deviation of 2.267. This distribution was also positively skewed (0.243) and platykurtic (-0.704). The self-disclosure measure had a mean of 2.666 with a standard deviation of 1.007. Skewness was slightly negative (-0.353), and the distribution was slightly platykurtic.

Test of Hypotheses

H₁ predicts that disclosure is higher in informal communicative contexts than in formal communicative contexts. Regression was linear and results indicated significant negative correlation between formality and disclosure; $r = -.594$ ($t = -2.953$; $df = 16$; $p < .01$). Thus, the data are consistent with the first hypothesis and suggests that less formal student-faculty relationships are more disclosive than more formal relationships.

H₂ predicts that the higher one's authoritarianism, the less one will disclose both in formal and informal

communication contexts. Regression was linear and results indicated no significant correlation between authoritarianism and disclosure; $r=.023$ ($t=0.1003$; $df=19$; $p>.05$). These data are inconsistent with the second hypothesis and suggest that there is no relationship between authoritarianism and disclosure.

Serendipidously, the data indicated an interesting linear relationship between authoritarianism and formality; $r=.27$ ($t=1.1306$; $df=16$; $p<.10$). These data suggest that the greater one's authoritarianism, the greater the tendency to prefer more formal settings. Moreover, independent analysis of disclosure and formality levels within the context of teaching assistant--undergraduate student interaction revealed a significant linear positive correlation $r=.589$ ($t=3.0922$; $df=18$; $p>.5$).

DISCUSSION

It was predicted that as formality increased, disclosure within student-faculty interactions would decrease. Data were consistent with this expectation. Moreover, it was expected that the higher one's authoritarianism, the less one would disclose both in formal and in informal student-faculty relationships. This second hypothesis was not consistent with the data.

The latter may be a result of the fact that the sample consisted of individuals only low to moderate in authoritarianism. The range of authoritarianism in this sample may be indicative of the type of individual who matriculates in the College of Communication at the graduate level, or perhaps indicative of those people motivated to respond to a study such as this. In any case, the effect of range restriction is known to attenuate correlations, and these data appear to be affected by this artifact.

Two additional relationships warrant further discussion. The correlation between formality and authoritarianism suggests that highly authoritarian individuals prefer formal settings. This finding is consistent with Altemeyer's concept of authoritarian

submission and conventionalism. Formal student-faculty relationships are conventional and require higher levels of student submission than informal interaction.

An unexpected positive correlation between formality, and graduate student disclosure to their own students is intriguing. This finding may be an outgrowth of the nature of a typical graduate teaching assistant-student relationship. Often graduate teaching assistants must work at establishing credibility and authority within the teaching role. Further, teaching assistants may experience uncertainty regarding their communication effectiveness. Formal interaction with students serves to decrease role ambiguity, perhaps increasing levels of relational comfort for the teaching assistant. An increase in relational comfort could potentially evoke increased levels of disclosure.

Another potential basis for this finding may further reflect the nature of this relationship. Within the teaching role, graduate teaching assistants may strive to fulfill perceived faculty expectations by exhibiting high levels of formality within student interaction. Alternatively, graduate teaching assistants desire to be well liked by their students and may self-disclose in an effort to be perceived positively by them. A positive relationship between disclosure and formality in this case reflects a desire to be perceived positively by both

faculty members and students. This explanation is particularly viable in view of the fact that many graduate teaching assistants are merely a few years older than their students having not long since been themselves undergraduates. These teaching assistants are often uncomfortable in their authoritative roles and will attempt to compensate by trying in some way to demonstrate corresponding levels of solidarity with their students.

Explanation for such a finding may merely reflect a conceptual flaw in this research. "I have shared personal information about myself to some students," emerged the single-item measure for disclosure among graduate students and their own students. With no clear definition of what constitutes "some students" and "personal information," this one-item variable lacks the psychometric properties necessary to be overly confident in interpreting this correlation.

The findings have at least one major implication for existing literature and future study. Self-disclosure has been found to be positively associated with interpersonal solidarity (Wheeles, 1976, 1978), which in turn has been positively correlated with teacher effectiveness (Hurt, McCroskey, & Scott, 1978) and improved teacher evaluation by students (Nussbaum & Scott, 1981). The findings of this study indicate that

less formal student-faculty interaction is likely to increase both variables, thereby improving student perception of student-teacher interaction.

High authoritarian individuals seem to prefer more formal settings. This notion has potential implications for studies examining the constructs of immediacy, solidarity, and self-disclosure in teacher-student relationships (Andersen, Norton, & Nussbaum, 1979; Kearney, Plax, & Wendt-Wasco, 1985; Sorenson, 1989). These constructs tend to be closely linked with increased disclosure, which is characteristic of less formal interaction. An authoritarian tendency to prefer slightly formal settings adds an additional dimension to existing literature regarding these two variables. The relationships among authoritarianism and both immediacy and solidarity in education are areas for future research.

The finding that teaching assistant disclosure to students may be associated positively with formal student-teacher interaction has potential implications for research, particularly in the arena of upward and downward disclosure. It is possible that there may be a conceptual difference between superordinate and subordinate disclosure within the academic context. Further, this finding spurs further interest in aspects of teaching style among graduate teaching assistants.

Student perception of teaching assistant communication variables are also of interest, particularly with regard to teacher effectiveness.

Though this study has uncovered interesting relationships, it has a number of limitations. Uppermost among these is its extremely small sample size. To examine the relationships in question and to investigate additional findings, a much larger sample is necessary. The nature of instrumentation used in this study further prevents generalization of findings. The self-report measures utilized afford opportunity for distortion of data particularly within a study where it was necessary to recall information and conceptualize the nature of interaction. An additional measure such as a diary of interaction with the faculty member, would strengthen subsequent data collection.

Finally, many insufficiently valid measures were employed. While the designed questionnaires included measures of moderate and high reliability, many of these were one-, two-, and three-item measures. A pretest and independent coding of each variable is needed to employ such measures confidently.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE "1982" RWA SCALE

APPENDIX A

THE "1982" RWA SCALE

This survey is part of an investigation of general public opinion concerning a variety of social issues. You will probably find that you agree with some of the statements, and disagree with others; to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction to each of the statements by circling the appropriate option according to the following scale:

Circle the option labeled -4 if you very strongly disagree
-3 if you strongly disagree
-2 if you moderately disagree
-1 if you slightly disagree

Circle the option labeled +1 if you slightly agree
+2 if you moderately agree
+3 if you strongly agree
+4 if you very strongly agree

If you feel precisely neutral about a statement, circle the option labeled "0."

You may find that you sometimes have different reactions to different parts of a statement, but agree ("+1") with another idea in the same item. When this happens, please combine your reactions, and write down how you feel "on balance" (that is, a "-3" in this example).

1. The way things are going in this country, it's going to take a lot of "strong medicine" to straighten out the troublemakers, criminals, and perverts.
2. It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom to protest against things they don't like and to "do their own thing."
3. It is always better to trust the judgment to the proper authorities in government and religion than to listen to the noisy rabble-rousers in our society who are trying to create doubt in people's minds.

4. People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old traditional forms of religious guidance and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.
5. It would be best for everyone if the proper authorities censored magazines and movies to keep trashy material away from the youth.
6. It may be considered old fashioned by some, but having a decent, respectable appearance is still a mark of a gentleman and especially a lady.
7. The sooner we get rid of the traditional family structure, where the father is the head of the family and the children are taught to obey authority automatically, the better. The old fashioned way has a lot wrong with it.
8. There is nothing wrong with premarital sexual intercourse.
9. The facts of crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviation groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.
10. There is nothing immoral or sick in somebody being a homosexual.
11. It is important to protect fully the rights of radicals and deviants.
12. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
13. Rules about being "well-mannered" and respectable are chains from the past which we should question very thoroughly before accepting.
14. Once our government leaders and the authorities condemn the dangerous elements in our society, it will be the duty of every patriotic citizen to help stomp out the rot that is poisoning our country from within.
15. "Free speech" means that people should even be allowed to make speeches and write books urging the overthrow of the government.

16. Some of the worst people in our country nowadays are those who do not respect our flag, our leaders, and the normal way things are supposed to be done.
17. In these troubled times, laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with the agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things up.
18. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.
19. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up, they ought to get over them and settle down.
20. The self-righteous "forces of law and order" threaten freedom in our country a lot more than most of the groups they claim are "radical" and "godless."
21. The courts are right in being easy on drug users. Punishment would not do any good in cases like these.
22. If a child starts becoming unconventional and disrespectful of authority, it is his parents' duty to get him back to the normal way.
23. In the final analysis, the established authorities, like parents and our national leaders generally turn out to be right about things, and all the protesters don't know what they're talking about.
24. A lot of our rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other people follow.
25. There is absolutely nothing wrong with nudist camps.
26. The real keys to the "good life" are obedience, discipline, and sticking to the straight and narrow.
27. It is best to treat dissenters with leniency and an open mind, since new ideas are the lifeblood of progressive change.
28. The biggest threat to our freedom comes from the Communists and their kind, who are out to destroy religion, ridicule patriotism, corrupt the youth, and in general undermine our whole way of life.

29. Students in high school and university must be encouraged to challenge their parents' ways, confront established authorities, and in general criticize the customs and traditions of our society.
30. One reason we have so many troublemakers in our society nowadays is that parents and other authorities have forgotten that good old-fashioned physical punishment is still one of the best ways to make people behave properly.

APPENDIX B

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

The following questionnaire is designed to facilitate the research project previously discussed. Participants are asked to complete the following questions thoughtfully, and as accurately as possible. Response options range from strong agreement to strong disagreement and are illustrated as follows:

SA	A	DA	SDA
(strongly agree)	(agree)	(disagree)	(strongly disagree)

After each of the following statements, circle the response you feel is most appropriate. All responses will be strictly confidential and will be considered solely in the context of this research.

Your Participation is greatly appreciated.

Age _____. Gender: M ____ F _____.

Ethnicity: Hispanic
Caucasian
Asian
African
African American
Native American
Other _____.

1. The faculty member with whom you speak and meet most frequently is: _____.
2.
 - a. Gender of this faculty member: _____.
 - b. Academic relationship to you (i.e., advisor, committee member, etc.) _____.
 - c. Position within Department: _____.

3. This professor has an explicitly stated "open door" policy.
SA A DA SDA
4. This professor has an implicitly stated "open door" policy.
SA A DA SDA
5. To see this professor, I must always make an appointment.
SA A DA SDA
6. I often drop by this professor's office and socialize.
SA A DA SDA
7. When meeting with this professor, we discuss only task-related items.
SA A DA SDA
8. I call this professor at his/her home occasionally.
SA A DA SDA
9. I consider this professor an authority in her/his field.
SA A DA SDA
10. This professor talks to me about items such as sports, current events, family life.
SA A DA SDA
11. When I disagree with professor, I feel comfortable expressing my disagreement.
SA A DA SDA
12. I would consult this professor concerning nonacademic matters.
SA A DA SDA
13. This professor is competent in her/his field.
SA A DA SDA
14. This professor is trustworthy.
SA A DA SDA
15. I find that I agree with this professor about most things.
SA A DA SDA

16. Generally, I would consult this professor concerning academic matters.
SA A DA SDA
17. I would not feel comfortable calling this professor at his/her home.
SA A DA SDA
18. This professor holds views similar to my own.
SA A DA SDA
19. I can count on this professor to be fair and honest with me.
SA A DA SDA
20. Overall, this professor is someone I admire.
SA A DA SDA
21. This professor is friendly and approachable, but not credible.
SA A DA SDA
22. I consider this professor a friend.
SA A DA SDA
23. This professor is very accessible to most people.
SA A DA SDA
24. Most often this professor will wear casual clothing (corduroys, blue jeans, sportswear) to the office.
SA A DA SDA
25. This professor and I often meet in informal settings outside of the office.
SA A DA SDA
26. I would not consider socializing with this professor even in a group setting.
SA A DA SDA
27. I always address this professor as "Dr. _____."
SA A DA SDA
28. This professor prefers to be addressed on a first name basis.
SA A DA SDA
29. My relationship with this professor can be defined as solely student-teacher.
SA A DA SDA

30. I would like to know this professor better.

SA A DA SDA

31. I am uncertain about my relationships with this professor.

SA A DA SDA

32. At present, I am comfortable with my relationship to this professor.

SA A DA SDA

33. This professor speaks freely with me about his or her problems.

SA A DA SDA

APPENDIX C

TEACHING ASSISTANT QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C

TEACHING ASSISTANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Please address the following brief series of questions only if you currently hold or have held a teaching assistantship in which you have been responsible for lectures and class presentations.

1. My teaching style is best described as:
_____ conventional
_____ unconventional
2. I require my students to make an appointment or to stop by during office hours only.
_____ Yes _____ No
3. My students may call me at home.
_____ Yes _____ No
4. Students generally come by only when they need help on an assignment or want to know their grade on an assignment or test.
SA A DA SDA
5. I discuss only task related items with my students.
SA A DA SDA
6. My students rarely come by to chit chat.
SA A DA SDA
7. I have shared personal information about myself to some students.
SA A DA SDA
8. Some students have shared personal information with me.
SA A DA SDA

9. I meet with my students strictly within the academic context.
SA A DA SDA
10. My students refer to me as:
___ Mr. ___ Ms. ___ Mrs.
___ Instructor ___ First Name ___ Other
11. My students visit my office.
SA A DA SDA
12. I wear career-style clothing on days I teach.
SA A DA SDA
13. I use a podium while lecturing and always stand.
SA A DA SDA
14. Most students I recognize by name and face.
SA A DA SDA
15. Most students I recognize by face, but not name.
SA A DA SDA

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). Right-wing authoritarianism. Manitoba: University of Manitoba Press.
- Altman, I., & Taylor, D. A. (1973). Social penetration: The development of interpersonal relationships. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook III. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.
- Andersen, J. F., Norton, R., & Nussbaum, J. (1979). Three investigations exploring the relationships among perceived communicator style, perceived teacher immediacy, perceived teacher/student solidarity, teacher effectiveness, and student learning. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.
- Archer, R. L., & Berg, J. H. (1978). Disclosure reciprocity and its limits: A reactance analysis. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 14, 527-540.
- Berg, J. H., & Archer, R. L. (1982). Responses to self-disclosure and interaction goals. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18, 501-512.
- Brewer, M. B., & Mittelman, J. (1980). Effects of normative control of self-disclosure on reciprocity. Journal of Personality, 48, 89-102.
- Chaikin, A. L., & Derelga, V. J. (1974). Self-disclosure. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

- Chelune, G. J. (1975). Self-disclosure: An elaboration of its basic dimensions. Psychological Reports, 36, 79-85.
- Cialdini, R. B. (1985). Influence: Science and practice. Glenview, IL: Scott & Foresman.
- Cozby, P. C. (1972). Self-disclosures, reciprocity, and liking. Sociometry, 35, 151-160.
- Cozby, P. C. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 79, 73-91.
- Culbert, S. A. (1967). Interpersonal process of self-disclosure: It takes two to see one. Washington: N.T.L. Institute for Applied Behavioral Sciences.
- Darby, B. W., & Judson, N. (1987). Student's perceptions of faculty's office arrangements. Perceptual & Motor Skills, 65, 507-514.
- Davis, J. D., & Skinner, A. (1984). Reciprocity of self-disclosure in interviews: Modeling or social change? Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 2, 799-784.
- Heaven, P. C. (1985). Construction and validation of a measure of authoritarian personality. Journal of Personality Assessment, 49, 545-551.
- Jourard, S. M., & Lasakow, P. (1958). Some factors in self-disclosure. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56, 91-98.
- Jourard, S. M. (1959). Self-disclosure and other-cathexis. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 428-431.
- Jourard, S. M. (1964). The transparent self. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- Levinger, G. (1980). Toward the analysis of close relationships. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16, 510-544.
- Likert, R. (1967). The human organization. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Mehrabian, A. (1969). Some referents and measures of nonverbal behavior. Behavioral Research Methods and Instruments, 1, 213-217.

- Myong Jin, W. (1979). On getting to know you: The association between the stage of a relationship and reciprocity of self-disclosure. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 15, 229-241.
- Nussbaum, J. F., & Scott, M. D. (1979). The relationship among communicator style, perceived self-disclosure, and classroom learning. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication Yearbook III. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 561-83.
- Nussbaum, J. F., Scott, M. D. (1981). Student perceptions of communication behaviors and their relationship to student evaluation. Communication Education, 30, 44-53.
- Ray, J. J. (1976). Do authoritarians hold authoritarian attitudes? Human Relations, 29, 307-325.
- Rigby, K., & Rump, E. E. (1982). Attitudes towards authority and authoritarian personality characteristics. Journal of Social Psychology, 116, 61-72.
- Rubin, Z. (1975). Disclosing oneself to a stranger: Reciprocity and its limits. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 11, 332-346.
- Sermat, V., & Smyth, N. (1973). Content analysis of verbal communication in the development of a relationship: Conditions influencing self-disclosure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26, 332-346.
- Sorenson, G. (1989). The relationships among teachers' self-disclosive statements, students' perceptions, and affective learning. Communication Education, 38, 259-276.
- Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization. New York: Free Press.
- Wheeles, L. R. (1978). A follow-up study of the relationships among trust, disclosure, and interpersonal solidarity. Human Communication Research, 4, 143-157.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293006924595