INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

74-12,322

RICE, William Keaton, Jr., 1941-
EFFECTS OF DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES ON CHILDREN'S
PERSONALITY-TRAIT INFERENCES.

The University of Oklahoma, Ph.D., 1973
Education, psychology

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

EFFECTS OF DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES ON CHILDREN'S
PERSONALITY-TRAIT INFERENCES

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY
WILLIAM KEATON RICE, JR.
Norman, Oklahoma

1973

EFFECTS OF DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES ON CHILDREN'S
PERSONALITY-TRAIT INFERENCES

APPROVED BY

George A. Leckworth
Michael Langenbach
Larry E. Fortlage
Robert H. Lerner

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to those individuals who aided in this dissertation.

Grateful thanks for continuing aid and guidance is extended to Dr. George A. Letchworth, committee chairman. Appreciation is also expressed to the other members of the committee, Dr. Larry E. Toothaker, Dr. Albert D. Smouse, and Dr. Michael Langenbach, for their timely comments and constructive criticisms.

The help and cooperation of Superintendent A. H. Howell, Superintendent Ben Travis, and the principals, teachers, and students of their school districts is greatly appreciated.

Loving thanks is given to Marion, my wife, for encouragement and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Manuscript to be submitted for publication	
INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHOD.....	5
RESULTS.....	11
DISCUSSION.....	14
REFERENCES.....	17
APPENDIX A. Prospectus.....	20
APPENDIX B. Letter to Superintendents.....	41
APPENDIX C. Mean Age and Standard Deviation in Months for the Seventh Grade Subjects Used in Rating the Trait-Words.....	43
APPENDIX D. Instrument for Rating Trait-Adjectives.....	45
APPENDIX E. Means and Standard Deviations of Words Used in Describing Children.....	48
APPENDIX F. Means and Standard Deviations of Words Used in Describing Teachers.....	50
APPENDIX G. Mean Age and Standard Deviation in Months for the Seventh Grade Subjects Used in the Test-Retest of the Dependent Variables.....	52
APPENDIX H. Stimulus and Instrument for the Discriminant Analysis and Test-Retest.....	54
APPENDIX I. Instrument for Rating Task- and Approval- Focused Statements with Means and Standard Deviations.....	58
APPENDIX J. Mean Age and Standard Deviation in Months for Each Experimental Group.....	61
APPENDIX K. Dialogues and Instrument for the Task- and Approval-Focused Tapes.....	63
APPENDIX L. Summary Statistics.....	67

EFFECTS OF DISCIPLINE TECHNIQUES ON CHILDREN'S

PERSONALITY-TRAIT INFERENCES

INTRODUCTION

Discipline has been and continues to be an important concern within the classroom. The research on the types of discipline used has focused upon the behavior of the target child, the behavior of the observing peers, and the traits attributed to the disciplining teacher (Alden, 1960; Anderson & Brewer, 1946; Kounin, 1970; O'Leary & Becker, 1969; Shepherd & Bagley, 1970; Thomas, Becker, & Armstrong, 1968). One important variable seems to have been overlooked in these studies, i.e., how is the target of the discipline viewed by his observing peers?

Since the observing peers represent an important and powerful environmental variable in shaping the behavior of other children, knowledge of the personality-traits attributed to the target child by the observing peers could be a major determinant in the control of the target child. As Mead (1934) has suggested, a person responds to himself as others respond to him. The attitudes of the target child's peers and teachers may influence his self-concept, at least the concept of his school-self. The personality-traits attributed to the target child affect the attitudes and actions of his peers which in turn affect his attitude and behavior.

There are a number of theoretical frameworks, such as cognitive dissonance theory, balance theory, or any of the

motivational drive models, that could be used to investigate this problem. However, since the problem deals with the type of qualities attributed by an observing child, the informational processing model of attribution theory seems most appropriate.

In attribution theory, as set forth by Kelley (1967, 1972, 1973), there are two sets of principles that may function, depending upon the amount of information the observer has at his disposal. When the observer has information from more than one observation, the covariation principle applies. "An effect is attributed to the one of its possible causes with which, over time, it covaries (Kelley, 1973, p. 108)." However, when the observer has only a single observation, the discounting principle applies. "The role of a given cause in producing a given effect is discounted if other plausible causes are also present (Kelley, 1973, p. 113)." Seldom is the observer in complete ignorance of the possible factors involved in producing the observed effect, i.e., he has usually observed the type of effect before and has some idea about the pertinent causes. Using the discounting principle, the attribution of personality-traits is greatest when external causes for the observed behavior are minimal or inhibitory. When the amount of information is minimal, the observer combines the present information with information from past observations of a similar nature

into an assumed analysis of variance configuration, i.e., there is an interaction of the present information with past information and from this interaction reasonable attributional inferences are made.

Anderson and Alexander (1971) suggest that negative information is given greater weight than positive information. Jones and Davis (1965) indicate that negative behavior leads to greater attribution of personality-traits.

The present investigation focuses upon whether there is a difference in the perception by peers of the target child after approval-focused desists (e.g., "Jane, I don't like children who shout.") and task-focused desists (e.g., "Jane, you will not finish your reading if you continue to talk.")? The negative content of the approval-focused desists is directed toward the child, while the negative content of the task-focused desists is directed toward the activities of the child. Approval-focused desists result in more information of a negative quality about the child which in turn is given greater weight. Thus, a child disciplined by approval-focused desists should be viewed by observing peers as having more negative personality-traits than a child disciplined by task-focused desists. Since the approval-focused desists provide more information about the personality-traits of the child, the traits should be inferred with a greater degree of confidence by observing peers.

With this rationale, it would be expected that approval-focused desists will contain more information about the personality-traits of the child toward whom the desists are directed.

The teacher, who has little external cause to behave in any particular way, will be seen as revealing his/her personal qualities by the nature of the discipline technique employed. Previous research indicates that children dislike or attribute less skill to teachers who are critical or use approval-focused desists (Alden, 1960; Jersild, 1940). Thus, a teacher using approval-focused desists should be rated as having less desirable personality-traits and the ratings should be held with more confidence than for a teacher who uses task-focused desists. Negative behavior leads to greater attribution of personality-traits.

Specifically, it is hypothesized that children who hear a tape-recording of a child disciplined with approval-focused desists will rate the child as having less desirable personality-traits as measured by a 5-point Likert-type personality-trait scale than children who rate the personality-traits of the child disciplined by task-focused desists. Children who rate the personality-traits of the child disciplined with the approval-focused desists will be more confident of their ratings than those who rate the personality-traits of a child disciplined by task-focused desists

as measured by a 3-point degree of confidence scale. A teacher who is heard using approval-focused desists on the tape-recording will be rated as having less desirable personality-traits on a 5-point Likert-type personality-trait scale than a teacher who uses task-focused desists. Children hearing the teacher using the approval-focused desists will be more confident of their ratings than those hearing a teacher using task-focused desists as measured by a 3-point degree of confidence scale.

Method

Small groups of three to six eighth grade boys and girls were presented one of two tape-recordings containing either approval-focused or task-focused desists. After listening to the tape-recording, the subjects (Ss) made trait inferences about the target of the desists on a 5-point personality-trait scale and indicated their degree of confidence in each trait inference on a 3-point degree of confidence scale. They then made trait inferences about the teacher heard on the tape-recording and indicated their degree of confidence in each trait inference. The ratings on each scale were summed to give a total score on each of the four measures. In summing the personality-trait scales, the rated value of the negative trait-words (mean value less than 2.75) was determined by subtracting the rating from 6.

Subjects

The sample size of 64 was selected to provide power of .90 against a 1.0 standard deviation (SD) difference at alpha equal to .01 for each dependent variable. The sample size was slightly larger than the minimum suggested for the multivariate analysis of variance (Anderson, 1958).

Thirty-two eighth grade boys and 32 eighth grade girls were randomly selected from 114 eighth grade students in two small school districts in central Oklahoma. Sixteen boys and 16 girls were randomly assigned to one of two treatment groups, i.e., approval-focused (AF) or task-focused (TF). The mean (M) age and SD in months for each group was: AF boys, M = 161.56, SD = 4.23; AF girls, M = 162.75, SD = 3.61; TF boys, M = 162.06, SD = 7.31; TF girls, M = 168.56, SD = 11.84. While the TF girls were six months older than the other groups, it was felt that this variation in no way affected the investigation of the effect of type of desists on personality-trait inferences made about the target child.

Procedure

Groups of three to six Ss at a time were instructed in the use of a 3- and a 5-point Likert-type scale and they were given practice using each. The subjects were then instructed:

You are going to listen to a short tape-recording taken in a classroom. You will hear a teacher talking to a boy. You will then be asked how well some words

describe the boy to whom the teacher is talking and then the teacher. After each word are the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Circle one of these numbers. The number you circle will indicate how much you think the word describes the person in other situations, not just the one you heard. The numbers mean:

1. Not at all
2. Only a little
3. Somewhat
4. Fairly well
5. Extremely well

After you have circled one of the five numbers, put a circle around one of the groups of letters to indicate how sure you are that you are correct. NS means not sure, S means sure, and VS means very sure.

After listening to the tape, each trait-word was read to the group at the rate of approximately one word every eight seconds. After the words for both sections had been presented, one minute was allowed for each S to check his paper to see that he had circled one number and one group of letters for each trait-word.

Instrumentation

Phase I. Development of the personality-trait scales. Seventy-six trait-adjectives appropriate for describing a student and 40 trait-adjectives appropriate for describing

a teacher were selected by the experimenter from 555 trait-adjectives previously rated by Anderson (1968). The words were selected to: (a) approximate the frequency distribution of Anderson's (1968) list and (b) be in the vocabulary of a sixth grade student. The trait-adjectives selected for each list were randomly ordered. The lists were then presented to 52 seventh grade students in two schools. Only 50 of the 52 were used because two of the students failed to follow directions. The students rated each word on a 4-point scale indicating how well they knew the meaning of the the word and then on a 7-point scale indicating how much they thought other children would like a child described by the word. The second list of 40 words, used to describe the teacher, was rated in the same manner. The product-moment correlations between the mean word values in this study and those presented by Anderson (1968) were found to be .96 for the words used in describing a child and .97 for the words used in describing a teacher.

Twenty-two words were selected for the final trait-list used to describe a child and 16 words were selected to describe a teacher. The basis for selection by the experimenter was: (a) 90% or more of the students indicated that they knew the meaning of the word, (b) the word had a SD of less than 1.5 and (c) it had a mean value higher than 5.25 or less than 2.75. Alternate forms of the personality-

trait scales were constructed. Each alternate form contained an equal number of words with mean values above 5.25 and below 2.75. When antonym pairs had been chosen, one word went into each form. Words were switched until the sum of the mean values for each alternate form was approximately equal. The words for each alternate form were then arranged randomly.

Phase II. Validation of the instrument. Thirty-two seventh grade students were presented stories about two boys. The stories were designed to portray one of the boys as possessing very desirable personality-traits and the other as having less desirable traits. Stories about two teachers, one positive and one negative, were also presented. After each story, the students indicated on the appropriate personality-trait scale how well the trait-word described the individual and how sure they were of their ratings.

A discriminant analysis (Tatsuoka, 1971), using only the trait-ratings of the child and the trait-ratings of the teacher was performed. The probability of correctly classifying the two boys on the basis of the trait-ratings was 100%. The probability of correctly classifying the teachers based on the trait-ratings was 96.8%.

The split-half reliability for the trait-ratings of the child was .98. For the confidence in the ratings, it was .77. The reliability for the ratings of the teacher was

.98 and .63 for the confidence in the ratings of the teacher. After five days, the stories were again presented and the test-retest reliabilities for the total scores were: .97, .69, .95, and .75, respectively.

Phase III. Development of the tapes. Thirty-five graduate students with a mean of 3.17 years (SD = 2.8) of teaching experience were presented 18 statements. They rated these statements on a 5-point scale from approval-focused to task-focused.

A task-focused script and an approval-focused script were developed by selecting statements rated as task-focused (mean value greater than 3.50) and approval-focused (mean value less than 2.50). Each script was then recorded by a female teacher and a boy.

1. Dialogue of tape for task-focused desists.

Teacher: Today, we're going to learn how to
.....John, you won't get your
work finished if you continue to do
that and you know how important your
work is. If you need help, raise
your hand.

Student: All right

2. Dialogue of tape for approval-focused desists.

Teacher: Once you've finished this exercise,
you'll.....Tom, think

for a change. I'm ashamed that you would do that in my class. You know I don't like students that act that way.

Student: O.K.

Results

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with two factors, sex of rater and type of desist, was performed on the scores of the personality-trait ratings of the child (PTC), the confidence in the ratings of the child (CRC), the personality-trait ratings of the teacher (PTT), and the confidence in the ratings of the teacher (CRT). The MANOVA (for a discussion of the MANOVA and the U Statistic, see Anderson, 1958) revealed a significant type of desist main effect ($\underline{U} = .5759$, $\underline{df} = 4/1/60$ where 4 is the number of dependent variables, 1 is the number of degrees of freedom associated with the hypothesis being tested, and 60 is the number of degrees of freedom associated with the error term, $p < .001$). The Ss who listened to the task-focused desists differed significantly in their responses on the measures from the group that heard the approval-focused desists. Neither the sex of rater main effect nor the Sex of rater x Type of desist interaction was significant ($\underline{U} = .8990$, $\underline{df} = 4/1/60$, $p > .10$ and $\underline{U} = .9276$, $\underline{df} = 4/1/60$, $p > .10$, respectively).

Further analyses on the means, in Table 1, were per-

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for the Experimental Groups on
the Dependent Variables: Personality-Traits of the Child,
Confidence in the Ratings of the Child, Personality-
Traits of the Teacher, and Confidence in the
Ratings of the Teacher

Dependent Measure	Group			
	Approval-Focused		Task-Focused	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
<hr/>				
Personality-Traits of the Child				
M	53.25	49.81	66.63	61.13
SD	14.76	13.18	10.97	12.15
Confidence in Ratings of the Child				
M	65.38	63.00	60.06	62.88
SD	11.26	8.08	7.71	9.86
Personality-Traits of the Teacher				
M	42.19	49.38	61.56	58.63
SD	9.83	14.25	13.01	11.59
Confidence in Ratings of the Teacher				
M	49.31	46.88	50.75	48.63
SD	7.50	6.40	6.32	8.00
<hr/>				

formed in order to identify the dimension/s along which the groups differed. A discriminant analysis revealed that the PTC and PTT scores accounted for 97.6% of the total dispersion. The eigenvalues for these measures were: .111 and .795. The confidence ratings, CRC and CRT, accounted for only a small proportion (2.4%) of the total dispersion. The 2 (sex of rater) x 2 (type of desist) analyses of variance (ANOVAS) on the dependent variables, CRC and CRT, confirmed that there were no significant differences between the groups. None of the six F s was significant ($p > .10$).

A 2 (sex of rater) x 2 (type of desist) ANOVA, using the dependent variable PTC revealed that children who heard the approval-focused desists gave significantly lower trait-ratings to the target of the desists than those who heard the task-focused desists ($F = 14.79$, $df = 1/60$, $p < .001$). The $\hat{\omega}^2$ for the type of desist was .18. Thus, a moderate amount of the total variance was accounted for by the type of desist. The F s for sex of rater and the Sex of rater x Type of desist interaction were not significant ($p > .10$).

A 2 (sex of rater) x 2 (type of desist) ANOVA, using the dependent variable PTT revealed that children who heard the approval-focused desists gave significantly lower trait-ratings to the teacher than those who heard the task-focused desists ($F = 21.72$, $df = 1/60$, $p < .001$). The $\hat{\omega}^2$ for the type of desist was .23. The F s for the sex of rater and the

interaction of Sex of rater x Type of desists were not significant ($p > .10$).

The split-half reliabilities for the experimental groups on each of the four variables, PTC, CRC, PTT, and CRT, were: .90, .86, .89, and .73, respectively.

Discussion

The study was designed to determine the effect of task- and approval-focused desists. Inferences were made about the personality-traits of the target of the desists and the teacher administering the desists when the amount of information available was severely limited. Both the target and the teacher of the approval-focused desists were rated as having less desirable personality-traits than when task-focused desists were used. These findings support the discounting principle of attribution theory.

The negative rating of the teacher, using the approval-focused desists, is consistent with the finding of Alden (1960).

The hypotheses that children hearing the approval-focused desists would be more confident of their ratings than those hearing the task-focused desists were not supported. The fact that the negative quality of the approval-focused desists was directed at the child rather than the action apparently did not provide enough additional information about the child to significantly affect the

degree of confidence ratings. The interaction of the information present with information from the individual's past experience resulted in moderate confidence ratings. The variation in these confidence ratings appeared to be restricted to the individual's predispositions.

There are several limitations to this study; the desist techniques used were not randomly selected, they only represented two of a number that might have been chosen, and they were negative in quality. Also, only eighth grade students from small school districts were represented.

The study was purposely limited to the situation in which the observing peers had only a minimal amount of information. This allowed the investigation of the different desists to be made without the confounding of other variables that would normally be active in the system.

In order to provide more generalizable information about the desists, it would be necessary to investigate the effect of the desists when variables normally present are included, e.g., the type of misbehavior or the typical disciplinary techniques of the teacher. In these situations, the covariation principle applies. Consequently, different results might be obtained. As pointed by Kounin (1970), significant results in the laboratory setting frequently do not translate into significant effects in the classroom; therefore further research to determine the effects of task-

and approval-focused desists under normal classroom conditions is indicated. The present research reveals that blocking on sex can be eliminated; however providing knowledge about both the teacher and the target of the desists would be important variables to include.

Nevertheless, as a laboratory finding, the type of desist does make a difference in how the child and the teacher are viewed. Since the self-concept of an individual is often influenced by how others view him (Mead, 1934), use of approval-focused desists could, over a period of time, have a detrimental psychological effect upon the child. For these reasons, it is suggested that the use of approval-focused desists of a negative quality be kept minimal.

References

- Alden, E. The effects on non-target classmates of the teacher's use of expert power and liking power in controlling deviant students. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University) Ann Arbor Mich.: University Microfilms, 1960. No. 68-13,446.
- Anderson, H. H. & Brewer, J. E. Studies of teachers; dominative and integrative contacts on children's classroom behavior. Applied Psychological Monographs. No. 3, 1946.
- Anderson, N. H. Likeableness ratings of 555 personality-trait adjectives. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 272-279.
- Anderson, N. H., & Alexander G. R. Choice test of the averaging hypothesis for information integration. Cognitive Psychology. 1971, 2, 313-324.
- Anderson, T. W. An introduction to multivariate statistical analysis. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Hollmann, T. D. Employment interviewers' errors in processing positive and negative information. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1972, 56, 135-139.
- Jersild, A. T. Characteristics of teachers who are "liked best" and "disliked most", Journal of Experimental Education. 1940, 9, 139-151.

- Jones, E. E., & Davis, K. E. From acts to dispositions. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Kelley, H. H. Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1967. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.
- Kelley, H. H. Attribution in social interaction. In E. E. Jones, D. E. Kanouse, H. H. Kelley, R. E. Nisbett, J. Valins, & B. Weiner (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Kelley, H. H. The processes of causal attribution. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 107-128.
- Kounin, J. S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- Mead, G. H. Mind, self, and society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- O'Leary, K. D., & Becker, W. C. The effects of the intensity of a teacher's reprimands on children's behavior. Journal of School Psychology, 1969, 7, 8-11.
- Shepherd, J. W., & Bagley, A. J. The effects of biographical information and order of presentation on the judgement of an aggressive action. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 9, 177-179.

Tatsuoka, M. M. Multivariate analysis: Techniques for educational and psychological research. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Thomas, D. R., Becker, W. C., & Armstrong, M. Production and elimination of disruptive classroom behavior by systematically varying teacher's behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 34-45.

APPENDIX A
PROSPECTUS

PROSPECTUS

INTRODUCTION

The development of a classroom climate that promotes the psychological and physical growth and well being of the student is an important prerequisite to the achievement of academic objectives. The classroom climate is dependent upon the teacher's ability to control and manage the classroom. The control of the classroom continues to be an important problem for teachers and administrators as evidenced by recent books (Brown, 1971; Clarizio, 1971; Madsen & Madsen, 1970) written to help the teacher become knowledgeable of control or discipline techniques. Discipline techniques refer to the teacher's doing something that prevents or stops undesired behavior. The control techniques suggested by these authors provide the rationale for gaining and maintaining control of the class.

Discipline problems arise when students do not conform to the role behavior specified for them. The repeated deviation from the role expectations must have some value for the child or the behavior would not occur or be worth the cost. This is amply shown in studies by Madsen, Becker, Thomas, Koser, and Plager (1968) and Allen, Hart, Buell, Harris, and Wolf (1964) in which actions, by the teacher, intended as punishment actually acted as positive reinforcers that maintained the undesired behavior.

The attempts to systematically modify the behavior patterns of an individual have relied on the work that has grown out of operant conditioning. The effects of various schedules of reinforcement, positive and negative reinforcers, punishment, extinction, shaping, and modeling (Bandura, 1969; Estes, 1944; Ferster & Skinner, 1957) have been used to explain present behavior and to indicate what must be done to change the behavior in a desired direction.

Studies have been conducted to determine the variables that might be important in classroom interaction. The teacher by virtue of his/her role is the main source of power and leadership in the classroom and as such has been the center of much investigation. Jersild (1940) found that students like teachers who were sympathetic, cheerful, good tempered, fair, consistent, unlikely to scold or shout, and effective in their explanations. The literature abounds with studies describing two teaching methods: one method is person oriented, accepting and considerate and the other is directive, controlling and task oriented. Adjectives commonly used to describe these methods are democratic, authoritarian, learner centered, teacher centered, etc. Whitehall (1949) identified two types of classrooms: teacher centered and learner centered. The research has not been consistently in favor of one or the other. The most effective desist method depends upon the type of task

and the nature of the group structure.

Studies conducted on the type of discipline technique used by the teacher and the effect of these techniques upon the behavior of the target child and the observing peers (Anderson & Brewer, 1946; O'Leary & Becker, 1969; Thomas, Becker, & Armstrong, 1968) indicate that the effect of the technique used is dependent upon the teacher's behavior while administering discipline, i.e., nervousness, shouting, and/or increase in critical remarks increased undesired behavior. While calm, quiet, and firm reprimands or praise of desired behavior reduced undesired behavior.

Kounin (1970) investigated the effect of different discipline or "desists" (Kounin, 1970, p. 2) and their effect on those observing the desist. He referred to this as the ripple effect. In the experimental situation, the variation in desist qualities resulted in different types of ripple effects, i.e., desists with clarity resulted in more conformity than desists without clarity, while desists with anger produced emotional upset and disrupted the work of those observing the desist. Alden (1960) in a similar study found that the type of desist produced different effects in the observing peers. Teachers who used expert power, i.e., task-focused desists ("Jane, you will not finish your reading if you are talking.") were more likely

to elicit desirable observing peer behavior than when liking power, i.e., approval-focused desists ("Jane, I don't like children who shout.") were used. Children who observed teachers using task-focused desists attributed more skill to the teacher than when approval-focused techniques were used.

However, in the actual classroom setting, the qualities of the disciplinary techniques had no relationship to the children's reactions. Other variables were more important, (e.g., motivation, liking the teacher, fairness, etc.) than the quality of the desist that the teacher used. Thus, the prevailing classroom climate determined the effectiveness of a particular desist.

Kounin (1970) learned that "simulated conditions may teach us something about the psychology of first impressions. These initial perceptions and reactions may be quite different from the perceptions and reactions to similar events in ongoing real situations (Kounin, 1970, p. 143)." Kounin's questions about different disciplinary techniques were replaced with questions about the types of classroom management, since the desist techniques seemed ineffective in predicting children's reactions. Dropping of the questions about the quality and effectiveness of different discipline techniques because no significant effect was found in an ongoing natural setting where the

independent variable was applied inconsistently seems premature. The desists when used consistently might produce field results similar to the experimental studies. While Kounin (1970) is displeased with simulated conditions because the results of the experiments do not correspond to the ongoing situations, it is in these simulated conditions that the effects of important variables are isolated. Thus, the initial perceptions and reactions may be quite significant in the development of other variables that affect the ongoing real situation.

The efforts to study the effects of different discipline techniques have used the observable behavior of the target child, the behavior of his observing peers, or the dispositional properties and traits attributed to the teacher by the students or adults observing the interaction as the dependent variable. Shepherd & Bagley (1970) used adults who read about the teachers discipline technique to make dispositional inferences about the teacher. Kounin (1970) indicated that if the attribute of fairness is attributed to the teacher, the observing peers will side with the teacher against the target child. However, none of the studies has investigated the dispositional qualities that the observing peers attribute to the child who is the target of different discipline techniques.

Since the observing peers represent an important and

and powerful environmental variable in shaping the behavior of other children, the dispositional traits attributed to the target child by the observing peers could be a major determinant in the control of the target child. While peers can be a deterrent to undesired behavior, they are often a source of reward for deviant behavior and thus perpetuate the deviancy. How they view the target child after different types of desists would be an important consideration. Does the type of discipline technique affect the dispositional qualities that are attributed to the target child by his peers?

There a number of theoretical frameworks, such as cognitive dissonance theory, balance theory, or any of the motivational drive models, that could be used to investigate the problem. However, since the problem deals with the type of qualities that are attributed to an observed child, the information processing model of attribution theory seems most appropriate. Attribution theory originated with Heider (1958) but was overlooked because of his balance theory and was revived by Jones and Davis (1965). Kelley (1967) integrated the Jones and Davis formulations with self-perception theory and some of the ideas from Festinger's cognitive dissonance into a single framework.

Attribution theory is a theory about how people

make causal explanations, about how they answer questions beginning with 'why?' It deals with the information they use in making causal inferences, and with what they do with this information to answer causal questions (Kelley, 1973, p. 107).

In attribution theory there are two sets of principles that are used depending upon the amount of information the observer has at his disposal. When the observer has information from more than one observation the covariation principle applies. "An effect is attributed to one of its possible causes with which, over time, it covaries (Kelley, 1973, p. 108)." Kelley's (1967) "analysis of variance" model provides the framework for predicting causal inferences. When the observer has only a single observation, the discounting principle applies. "The role of a given cause in producing a given effect is discounted if other plausible causes are also present (Kelley, 1973, p. 113)." Seldom is the observer in complete ignorance. He usually has observed similar effects before and has some idea of the relevant causes and how they relate to this type of effect. However, the person making the attribution from a single observation will not be as confident of the attribution he does make.

The attribution process seems to serve the

individual's need to make sense of the world around him. While he frequently makes use of causal inferences in so doing, he also uses descriptive constructs. To form a meaningful picture of the world, he must answer questions not only about the 'whyness' of things, but about the 'whatness' as well. Interesting enough, most constructs fit equally well into a descriptive or causal context. The traits we use on some occasions to describe people serve on other occasions as causal explanations for their behavior. The process of attributing constructs such as traits serves a dual function: it aids us in building models of the essential nature of the entities around us and in explaining the causal nature of events and actions involving those entities (Kanouse & Hanson, 1972, p. 47).

While the traits serve a dual function, Mischel (1968) found little empirical evidence that traits making up the personality really exist except in the mind of the observer. He found that the traits do not generalize across settings.

Jones and Nisbett (1972) suggest that the persistence of the idea of generalized traits is supported by the information processing biases of the observer that conspires

to make behavior appear as a quality of the actor while the situational variables are ignored, i.e., the behavior is most salient to the observer. The information is biased in that only a limited range of behavior is observed in a limited number of roles or situations and it is this information deficit which prevents disconfirmation of the trait inferences. Those observers imbedded in institutionalized structures are prone to confuse responses to role requirements with dispositional traits.

While empirical evidence does not support generalized traits across settings, generalized traits are still attributed by observers. Cognitive balance or consistency would play a role in the assignment of attributes: someone friendly in one setting should be friendly in another setting. Jones and Goethals (1972) discuss the effect of primacy and assimilation in the maintaining of consistency.

Anderson and Alexander (1971) and Hollmann (1972) indicate that negative information is given greater weight than positive information. Kanouse and Hanson (1972) suggest that negative information is given greater weight when judged against a predominantly positive background of the world because of the judgmental or anchoring effect. Jones and Davis (1965) suggest that negative behavior leads to greater attribution of personal traits or characteristics. Since the behavior goes against external pressures to con-

form to the normative behavior it must represent internal forces. Thus, this behavior carries more information than the positive behavior. Positive behavior is basically normative and contains little information about the individual since his behavior is attributed to external causes. This fits quite nicely into Kelley's (1967) "analysis of variance" model. Evidence presented by Hastorf, Schneider, and Polefka (1970) indicates that as effects become more extreme the observer has an increasing need to attribute responsibility to someone.

The observer finds that making trait inferences about other people is quite functional even if the inferences are erroneous. Because the observer is trying to assimilate the observed behavior into a simple framework, the primacy effect will be important. As the behavior becomes more extreme and divergent from the normative expectations, there is a greater need to attribute responsibility and a greater weight is given to the behavior.

With this rationale, it would be expected that the type of desist, task-focused or approval-focused, would have a significant effect on the dispositional qualities attributed to the target of the desist by observing peers.

Specifically, task-focused desists will result in traits that are more positive than traits attributed under the approval-focused desists as measured by the trait

questionnaire, since the task-focused desists provide less information about the target child.

Traits inferred under the approval-focused desists will be held with more confidence than the traits inferred under the task-focused desists.

Method

Two tape-recordings with different desist techniques will be presented to groups of 11 to 13 year old middle-class boys and girls. They will make trait inferences about the target child on a trait rating form and will indicate how sure they are that their inferences are correct.

Subjects

Twelve boys and 12 girls will be randomly selected from middle-class school children, ages 11 to 13. Six boys and six girls will be randomly assigned to one of the two treatment groups.

Procedure

Each group will be instructed that they are going to hear a short tape-recording of a class and that they will be asked some questions about what happened.

Instrumentation

Phase I. Development of tapes. Scripts for the task-focused and approval-focused desists will be written. A panel of five judges will rate the scripts as being either

task- or approval-focused. Alterations will be made on scripts so that there will be agreement among four of the five judges.

Phase II. Recording of the tape. The two scripts will be recorded by a teacher and several children. The tone and quality will be kept as uniform as possible.

Phase III. Development of trait-scale. A series of positive and negative adjectives selected from 555 adjectives previously rated from 0 to 6 by Anderson (1968) will be used with a Likert-type scale. Positive and negative trait adjectives will be randomly ordered.

Phase IV. Validation of the instrument. A group of 30 (11 to 13 year olds) will listen to one of two stories about a boy. The one story will be negative and the other positive in dispositional properties. The 11-13 year olds will then use the above trait-list and rate the quality and their degree of confidence in their ratings.

A discriminant function analysis will be run to see if the scale separates the two boys. If it does not, those traits that do separate the boys will be retained and the above procedure will be run again.

Analysis

The experiment is designed as a 2 (Sex) x 2 (Desist technique) factorial with 2 dependent measures (trait rating and degree of confidence). A MANOVA will be used to analyze

the data. A discriminant analysis will be done on any effect that is significant in order to identify the dimensions along which the subgroups differ. Each significant discriminant function will be graphed.

Conclusions

If the hypothesis that task-focused desists will result in traits that are more positive than traits attributed under approval-focused desists, as measured by the trait questionnaire, is supported then the attribution model gains credibility. The negative quality of the task-focused desists is directed at the behavior and not at the child; while the negative quality of the approval-focused desists is directed at the child. Therefore, the amount of information available to the observing peers for making dispositional or trait inferences is greatest with the approval-focused desist. The negative quality directed toward the target child increases the weight given to the negative traits. This is consistent with the findings of Anderson and Alexander (1971) and Hollmann (1972).

The type of desist technique does affect how the target child is viewed by his peers when they have a limited amount of information about the target child. Thus, when a child is the target of an approval-focused desist, less desirable traits are attributed to him. This could over a period of time have a detrimental psychological effect

upon the child.

If the hypothesis is not supported, then the treatment did not provide the subjects with enough differential information so that different attributes could be made. Since the study was designed to isolate the effect of different desist techniques, it would be assumed that different desist techniques would not affect how the peers see the target child in a real setting. While the study was not specifically designed to test the theoretical model; failure to accept the hypothesis would impair the model.

If the hypothesis that traits inferred under approval-focused desists will be held with more confidence than traits inferred under the task-focused desists is supported, then the theoretical idea that confidence in the attribution of dispositional traits increases with an increase in the amount of information is more credible.

Thus, the child observing approval-focused desists would be expected to believe that the traits attributed to the target child generalize across settings. If both the first and second hypotheses are supported then the attributes inferred under different desist techniques could affect the type of interaction that the target child would experience when interacting with peers who had observed the desists. Therefore, teachers should use task-focused desists so that inadvertent negative qualities are not

attributed to the target child.

Failure to accept the hypothesis would reduce the effect of different desist techniques in determining how a target child would be viewed by his peers. If the traits are not held with confidence, they will be easily modified by other information.

Sex was included as a blocking variable in order to remove variation that might be present since the socialization of boys and girls is different. Some consistent attributional bias would be expected. If there is no significant difference between the sexes, then further research in this area could eliminate sex as an important variable.

No interaction effect is expected. If an interaction effect is significant, it will complicate the interpretation of the other hypotheses.

References

- Ajzen, I. Attribution of dispositions to an actor: Effects of perceived decision freedom and behavior utilities. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 18, 144-156.
- Alden, E. The effects on non-target classmates of the teacher's use of expert power and liking power in controlling deviant students. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1960. No. 68-13,446.
- Allen, K. E., Hart, B., Buell, J. J., Harris, F. R., & Wolf, M. M. Effects of social reinforcement on isolated behavior of a nursery school child. Child Development, 1964, 35, 511-518.
- Anderson, H. H., & Brewer, J. E. Studies of teachers: Dominative and integrative contacts on children's classroom behavior. Applied Psychological Monographs, No. 8, 1946.
- Anderson, N. H. Likeableness ratings of 555 personality-trait adjectives. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 2, 272-279.
- Anderson, N. H. & Alexander, G. R. Choice test of the averaging hypothesis for information integration. Cognitive Psychology. 1971, 2, 313-324.
- Baldwin, C. P. & Baldwin, A. L. Children's judgment of

- kindness. Child Development, 1970, 41, 29-47.
- Bandura, A. Principles behavior modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1969.
- Bem, D. J. Self-perception theory. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 6. New York: Academic Press, 1972.
- Brown, P. Changing student behavior: A new approach to discipline. Dubuque, Iowa: Brown Co., 1971.
- Buyss, C. J. Effects of teacher reinforcement on elementary pupils. Psychology in the School. 1972, 9, 278-288.
- Clarizio, H. F. Toward positive classroom discipline. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1971.
- Estes, W. K. An experimental study of punishment. Psychological Monographs, 1944, 57, (3, Whole No. 263).
- Ferster, C. B. & Skinner, B. F. Schedules of reinforcement. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
- Hastorf, A. H., Schneider, D. J., & Polefka, J. Person perception. Reading, Mass. Addison-Wesley, 1970.
- Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
- Holler, R. F. Children's perceptions of teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1968. No. 68-1771.
- Hollmann, T. D. Employment interviewers' errors in processing positive and negative information. Journal of

- Applied Psychology. 1972, 56, 135-139.
- Jersild, A. T. Characteristics of teachers who are "liked best" and "disliked most", Journal of Experimental Education. 1940, 2, 139-151.
- Jones, E. E. & Davis, K. E. From acts to dispositions. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Jones, E. E. & Goethals, G. R. Order effects in impression formation: Attribution context and the nature of the entity. In E. E. Jones et al. (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Jones, E. E., Kanouse, D. E., Kelley, H. H., Nisbett, R. E., Valins, J., & Weiner, B. (Eds.) Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Jones, E. E. & Nisbett, R. E. The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior. In E. E. Jones et al. (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Jones, E. E., Rock, L., Shaver, K. G., Goethals, G. R., & Ward, L. M. Patterns of performance and ability attribution: An unexpected primacy effect. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1968, 10, 312-340.

- Kanouse, D. E. & Hanson, L. R. Negativity in evaluations. In E. E. Jones et al. (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Kelley, H. H. Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1967. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967.
- Kelley, H. H. Attribution in social interaction. In E. E. Jones et al. (Eds.), Attribution: Perceiving the causes of behavior. Morristown, N. J.: General Learning Press, 1972.
- Kelley, H. H. The processes of causal attribution. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 107-128.
- Kounin, J. S. Discipline and group management in classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1970.
- Madsen, C. H., Becker, W. C., Thomas, D. R., Koser, L., & Plager, E. An analysis of the reinforcing function of "sit down" commands. In R. K. Parker (Ed.), Readings in educational psychology, Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1968, 256-278.
- Madsen, C. H. & Madsen, C. K. Teaching/discipline. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1970.
- Mischel, W. Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley, 1968.
- O'Leary, K. D. & Becker, W. C. The effects of the intensi-

ty of a teacher's reprimands on children's behavior.

Journal of School Psychology, 1969, 7, 8-11.

Shepherd, J. W. & Bagley, A. J. The effects of biographical information and order of presentation on the judgment of an aggressive action. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 9, 177-179.

Steiner, I. D. Perceived freedom. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 5. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Thomas, D. R., Becker, W. C., & Armstrong, M. Production and elimination of disruptive classroom behavior by systematically varying teacher's behavior. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1968, 1, 35-45.

Whitehall, J. The development of the technique for the measurement of the social-emotional climates in the classroom. Journal of Experimental Education. 1949, 17, 347-361.

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO SUPERINTENDENTS

-42-

**The
University of Oklahoma**

820 Van Vleet Oval Norman, Oklahoma 73069

College of Education

Dear

I am working on my doctoral dissertation. It involves the investigation of how different discipline techniques affect how students perceive the student being disciplined and the teacher doing the disciplining.

As the study requires the use of sixth and seventh grade students for the development of the instrument and for the administration of the instrument, this letter is to request your approval for my using your students for the research project.

The research requires about 15-25 minutes of time. The students would either: (1) rank a group of trait-adjectives for their knowledge of the word meaning and the degree to which they would like a person described by the trait-adjective or (2) listen to a tape recording of a child being disciplined by a teacher. Using the previously rated trait-adjectives, they would indicate how they perceive both the child and the teacher on the tape. I would carry out the entire research myself and cannot foresee needing the assistance of the teachers or other school personnel, other than in the form of permission to use their students at a convenient time. It should also be noted that in the reporting of the data, the complete anonymity of the respondents will be preserved.

If you have any doubts about the nature of the materials or the procedure, I would be happy to allow you to examine the materials and go over the procedure more carefully with you before carrying out the actual research.

Sincerely,

William K. Rice

Mr. William K. Rice
304 Wadsack
Norman, Oklahoma
73069

APPENDIX C

MEAN AGE AND STANDARD DEVIATION IN MONTHS FOR THE SEVENTH
GRADE SUBJECTS USED IN RATING THE TRAIT-WORDS

Mean Age and Standard Deviation in Months for the Seventh
Grade Subjects Used in Rating the Trait-Words

N	M	SD
50	151.56	6.50

APPENDIX D
INSTRUMENT FOR RATING TRAIT-ADJECTIVES

Information. Name _____ Birth date _____ Grade _____

Instructions. There are some words on these two pages that are often used to describe children. In front of each word are the numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4. Circle one of these numbers. The number you circle will indicate how well you understand what the word means.

1. I have no idea what the word means
2. I am not sure what the word means
3. I think I know what the word means
4. I am positive I know what the word means

Following each word are the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. You are to circle one of these numbers, also. On the scale, 1 means dislike very much and 7 means like very much. The other numbers fall between these two extremes.

Think of a child being described by each word and rate the word according to how much you think other children would like the child described by that word.

Look at Example A. The word is loyal. First, mark one of the four numbers in front of the word. If you have no idea of what the word means, circle 1. If you are not sure what the word means, circle 2. If you think you know what the word means, circle 3. If you are positive that you know what the word means, circle 4.

Now, you must circle one of the seven numbers after the word loyal to indicate how much you think other children would like the child being described by that word. If you think other children would dislike a child very much who was loyal, you would circle 1. If you think other children would like a child very much who was loyal, you would circle 7. If you think other children would feel somewhere between the two extremes, circle the number that indicates how you think they would feel.

Try Example B. The word is heartless. Mark how well you know the meaning of the word and then how much you think other children would like or dislike a child described by the word. Try to use each of the seven numbers about equally often. Are there any questions?

I will read each word. You circle one of the front four numbers for how well you know the meaning of the word and then circle one of the seven numbers for how well you think other children would like the child described by the word.

Examples:

	No idea	Not sure	Think I know	Positive I know		Dislike very much						Like very much
A.	1	2	3	4	loyal	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
B.	1	2	3	4	heartless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 2 3 4	sincere		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	unpopular		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	hot-tempered		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	courageous		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	careless		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	able		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	kind		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	obnoxious		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	intelligent		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	unintelligent		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	bossy		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	snobbish		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	cooperative		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	clownish		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	loud-mouthed		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	gossipy		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	noisy		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	weak		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	good		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	honest		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	trustworthy		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	obedient		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	sociable		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	amusing		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	touchy		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	neat		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				
1 2 3 4	annoying		1 2 3 4 5 6 7		1 2 3 4	dishonest		1 2 3 4 5 6 7				

1 2 3 4	thoughtful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	stubborn	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	self-disciplined	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	disobedient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	helpful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	timid	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	talented	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	unsociable	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	likable	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	clever	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	polite	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	careful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	clumsy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	talkative	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	popular	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	disagreeable	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	smart	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	unhappy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	unkind	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	unruly	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	forgetful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	shy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	tough	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	unfriendly	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	quiet	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	cowardly	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	generous	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	impolite	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	lazy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	mean	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	friendly	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	unselfish	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	skillful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	humorous	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	proud	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	helpless	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	unfair	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	responsible	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	sloppy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	mature	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	troublesome	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	nosey	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	sensible	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	showy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	selfish	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	rude	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	greedy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	nice	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

For the next set of words, you are to follow the same procedure; however, instead of thinking of a child, you are to think of a teacher. Rate the words according to how much you think other children would like a teacher described by the word.

1 2 3 4	narrow-minded	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	calm	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	annoying	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	demanding	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	kind	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	considerate	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	scolding	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	understanding	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	polite	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	overcritical	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	unfriendly	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	intelligent	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	interesting	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	orderly	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	patient	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	honest	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	neat	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	grouchy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	mean	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	helpful	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	strict	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	realistic	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	soft-spoken	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	boring	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	clever	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	lazy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	dull	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	weak	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	stern	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	tiresome	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	unkind	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	open-minded	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	bossy	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	rude	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	friendly	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	unfair	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	sincere	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	warm	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
1 2 3 4	forgiving	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	1 2 3 4	tough	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

APPENDIX E
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF WORDS USED IN DESCRIBING
CHILDREN

Means and Standard Deviations of Words Used in Describing Children

Word	Mean	SD	Word	Mean	SD
sincere	5.90	1.57	forgetful	3.10	1.53
hot-tempered	1.80	1.29	tough	4.54	1.84
careless	2.60	1.47	quiet	5.29	1.41
kind	6.56	1.07	generous	6.32	0.98
intelligent	6.00	1.07	lazy	2.06	1.41
bossy	1.80	1.31	friendly	6.56	0.88
cooperative	6.18	1.56	skillful	5.58	1.62
loud-mouthed	2.00	1.40	proud	5.19	1.72
noisy	2.78	1.58	unfair	1.73	1.37
good	6.54	1.01	sloppy	2.14	1.23
trustworthy	6.40	1.14	troublesome	2.08	1.34
sociable	5.40	1.32	sensible	5.82	1.35
touchy	2.92	1.55	selfish	1.48	0.79
annoying	1.88	1.32	greedy	1.54	0.91
unpopular	3.44	1.47	stubborn	2.18	1.38
courageous	5.26	1.54	disobedient	1.96	1.24
able	5.72	1.41	timid	3.76	1.55
obnoxious	3.06	1.59	unsociable	2.56	1.53
unintelligent	2.80	1.63	clever	6.32	1.08
snobbish	1.86	1.65	careful	6.29	1.06
clownish	4.14	1.81	talkative	4.42	1.73
gossipy	2.30	1.31	disagreeable	2.48	1.62
weak	3.29	1.98	unhappy	2.88	1.69
honest	6.66	1.00	unruly	2.84	1.75
obedient	6.06	1.28	self-disciplined	4.94	1.98
amusing	5.64	1.45	unfriendly	1.74	1.32
neat	6.36	1.08	cowardly	2.64	1.45
dishonest	1.34	0.84	impolite	1.96	1.46
thoughtful	6.48	1.09	mean	1.42	1.01
shy	4.32	1.60	unselfish	6.14	1.70
helpful	6.78	0.51	humorous	5.61	1.53
talented	5.92	1.10	helpless	2.72	1.62
likable	6.38	1.10	responsible	5.90	1.33
polite	6.60	0.73	mature	5.98	1.45
clumsy	3.00	1.55	nosey	2.00	1.25
popular	5.78	1.43	showy	2.70	1.62
smart	6.04	1.18	rude	1.56	0.81
unkind	1.66	0.96	nice	6.84	0.47

APPENDIX F
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF WORDS USED IN
DESCRIBING TEACHERS

Means and Standard Deviations of Words Used in Describing Teachers

Word	Mean	SD	Word	Mean	SD
narrow-minded	2.70	1.71	calm	6.26	0.88
annoying	1.78	1.07	demanding	2.54	1.61
kind	6.70	0.79	considerate	5.98	1.13
scolding	1.92	1.48	understanding	6.38	1.12
polite	6.60	0.90	overcritical	2.40	1.53
unfriendly	1.64	1.05	intelligent	6.26	0.94
interesting	6.14	0.90	orderly	4.98	1.83
patient	5.94	1.38	honest	6.70	0.65
neat	6.08	1.32	grouchy	1.44	0.81
mean	1.34	0.72	helpful	6.58	0.57
strict	2.16	1.43	realistic	5.12	1.26
soft-spoken	5.58	1.58	boring	1.94	1.49
clever	6.10	1.25	lazy	2.28	1.81
dull	1.74	1.01	weak	3.30	1.97
stern	3.39	1.43	tiresome	2.46	1.53
unkind	1.58	1.30	open-minded	5.84	1.33
bossy	1.50	0.91	rude	1.72	1.28
friendly	6.72	0.54	unfair	1.56	1.16
sincere	6.02	1.10	warm	5.73	1.43
forgiving	6.48	0.86	tough	3.00	2.03

APPENDIX G

MEAN AGE AND STANDARD DEVIATION IN MONTHS FOR THE SEVENTH
GRADE SUBJECTS USED IN THE TEST-TEST OF THE
DEPENDENT VARIABLES

Mean Age and Standard Deviation in Months for the Seventh
Grade Subjects Used in the Test-Retest of the
Dependent Variables

N	M	SD
32	150.34	4.75

APPENDIX H
STIMULUS AND INSTRUMENT FOR THE DISCRIMINANT
ANALYSIS AND TEST-RETEST

Comments Made About the Boys

Boy (Negative)

He has continued to pick on and fight with the younger children at recess and after school. He is always complaining that the boys in the class are teasing and bothering him.

He does not do his homework or leaves it at home. His class-work is frequently late and almost unreadable.

He needs to learn how to get along with children his own age and to complete the work he starts.

Boy (Positive)

He is again on the honor roll. He was voted the most valuable player by the room baseball team. It's a pleasure to read his work. His help in working with the younger students who are having problems with arithmetic is greatly appreciated.

Comments Made About the Teachers

Teacher (Negative)

- 1st Boy: She is always yelling about something.
- 2nd Boy: Yep, if you get caught doing something wrong just once, she watches you and tries to catch you again.
- 3rd Boy: She only talks about what you did not do or what you could do better.
- 1st Boy: She doesn't explain very well and if you ask questions, she yells that you should learn to listen.

Teacher (Positive)

- 1st Boy: She makes you work hard, but if you have trouble with the work, she explains and talks nicely to you.
- 2nd Boy: She's the best teacher I've ever had. We do projects and other fun things.
- 3rd Boy: When something funny happens in class, she laughs with us. We have a good time.

Information. Name _____ Age _____ Birthday _____ Grade _____ Boy _____ Girl _____

Instructions. I am going to read a comment that was written on the back of a report card at the end of the year. I want you to listen to the comment and then indicate how well some words describe the boy in other situations. Then I will read some comments that were made to a new boy about his teacher by boys in the class. Listen to the comments and then indicate how well some words describe the teacher in other situations. The number you circle will indicate how much the word describes the person in other situations. The numbers mean:

1. Not at all
2. Only a little
3. Somewhat
4. Fairly well
5. Extremely well

After you have circled one of the five numbers put a circle around one of the groups of letters to indicate how sure you are that you are correct. NS means not sure, S means sure, and VS means very sure. Look at the example. If you do not think sweet describes sugar at all then you would circle the 1. If you think sweet describes sugar extremely well then you would circle the 5. After you have circled one of the numbers, circle one of the groups of letters to indicate how confident you are that you are correct. Now let's do sour.

Examples:

	Not at all	Only a little	Somewhat	Fairly well	Extremely well		Not sure	Sure	Very sure
Sugar can be described as:									
sweet	1	2	3	4	5		NS	S	VS
sour	1	2	3	4	5		NS	S	VS

The boy can be described as:						The boy can be described as:											
mean	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	quiet	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	sloppy	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
neat	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	kind	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
loud-mouthed	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	helpful	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
polite	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	friendly	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
thoughtful	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	talented	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
obedient	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	troublesome	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
selfish	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
honest	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	nice	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
unkind	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	disobedient	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS	rude	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS

APPENDIX I

INSTRUMENT FOR RATING TASK- AND APPROVAL-FOCUSED STATEMENTS
WITH MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS

As part of a doctoral dissertation, it is necessary to have some agreement as to what may be considered task-focused or approval-focused statements made by teachers to students.

Information. 1. Name _____ 2. Have you had any teaching experience? _____ 3. If so, how many years? _____

Instructions. You are asked to rate the following statements as to the degree you feel the statement reflects an emphasis upon task- or approval-focus. The following definitions are provided to aid in clarification.

1. Approval-focused. Approval-focused statements focus upon the teacher's approval (disapproval) of the child.
2. Task-focused. Task-focused statements focus upon the work or task the child is to do or has done.

Listed below are some statements made to children by teachers which you are to rate. Preceding each statement is a 5-point scale. On this scale, 1 is defined as approval-focused and 5 as task-focused with the other numbers representing statements falling between the extremes. Circle one number for each statement to indicate whether the statement is approval- or task-focused.

<u>Example:</u> 1					2	3	4	5
(Approval-focused)								(Task-focused)
<hr/>								
1	2	3	4	5	You haven't been paying attention.			
1	2	3	4	5	You're very pleasant.			
1	2	3	4	5	Would you show us how you got such an interesting effect?			
1	2	3	4	5	Be quiet and sit down.			
1	2	3	4	5	Think for a change.			
1	2	3	4	5	Other students cannot finish their work when you're doing that.			
1	2	3	4	5	You are violating a rule and will not have time to finish your assignment unless you stop.			
1	2	3	4	5	I like the way you explained it.			
1	2	3	4	5	I'm ashamed that you would do that in my class.			
1	2	3	4	5	I'm proud of you.			
1	2	3	4	5	It's a pleasure having you as a student.			
1	2	3	4	5	My, you have a nice attitude.			
1	2	3	4	5	I don't like students that act that way.			
1	2	3	4	5	You're keeping others from their work.			
1	2	3	4	5	Don't do that in my class again.			
1	2	3	4	5	If you need help, raise your hand.			
1	2	3	4	5	You will not get your work done if you continue that.			
1	2	3	4	5	You'd better get on the stick.			

Means and Standard Deviations for Task- and Approval-Focused Statements

Statement	Mean	SD
You haven't been paying attention.	2.76	1.46
You're very pleasant.	1.20	0.53
Would you show us how you got such an interesting effect?	3.74	1.24
Be quiet and sit down.	2.03	1.22
Think for a change.	2.37	1.47
Other students cannot finish their work when you're doing that.	3.37	1.52
You are violating a rule and will not have time to finish your assignment unless you stop.	3.80	1.23
I like the way you explained it.	2.31	1.41
I'm ashamed that you would do that in my class.	1.66	1.14
I'm proud of you.	1.40	1.01
It's a pleasure having you as a student.	1.63	0.91
My, you have a nice attitude.	1.54	0.98
I don't like students that act that way.	1.63	1.17
You're keeping others from their work.	3.09	1.34
Don't do that in my class again.	2.60	1.56
If you need help, raise your hand.	4.17	1.12
You will not get your work done if you continue that.	4.03	0.85
You'd better get on the stick.	3.14	1.29

APPENDIX J
MEAN AGE AND STANDARD DEVIATION IN MONTHS FOR
EACH EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

Mean Age and Standard Deviation in Months for
Each Experimental Group

Group	N	M	SD
Approval-focused boys	16	161.56	4.23
Approval-focused girls	16	162.75	3.61
Task-focused boys	16	162.06	7.31
Task-focused girls	16	168.56	11.84

APPENDIX K
DIALOGUES AND INSTRUMENT FOR THE TASK- AND
APPROVAL-FOCUSED TAPES

Dialogue of Tape for Task-Focused Desists

Teacher: Today, we're going to learn how to.....
 John, you won't get your work finished if
 you continue to do that and you know how
 important your work is. If you need help,
 raise your hand.

Student: All right.

Dialogue of Tape for Approval-Focused Desists

Teacher: Once you've finished this exercise, you'll
 Tom, think for a change. I'm
 ashamed that you would do that in my class.
 You know I don't like students that act that
 way.

Student: O.K.

Information. Name _____ Age _____ Birthday _____ Grade _____ Boy _____ Girl _____

Instructions. You are going to listen to a short tape-recording taken in a classroom. You will hear a teacher talking to a boy. You will then be asked how well some words describe the boy to whom the teacher is talking and then the teacher. After each word are the numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. Circle one of these numbers. The number you circle will indicate how much you think the word describes the person in other situations, not just the one you heard. The numbers mean:

1. Not at all
2. Only a little
3. Somewhat
4. Fairly well
5. Extremely well

After you have circled one of the five numbers put a circle around one of the groups of letters to indicate how sure you are that you are correct. NS means not sure, S means sure, and VS means very sure. Look at the example. If you do not think sweet describes sugar at all then you would circle the 1. If you think sweet describes sugar extremely well then you would circle the 5. After you have circled one of the numbers, circle one of the groups of letters to indicate how confident you are that you are correct. Now let's do sour.

Examples:

	Not at all	Only a little	Somewhat	Fairly well	Extremely well	Not sure	Sure	Very sure
Sugar can be described as:								
sweet	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
sour	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS

The boy can be described as:

mean	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
neat	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
loud-mouthed	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
polite	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
thoughtful	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
obedient	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
selfish	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
honest	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
unkind	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS

The boy can be described as:

quiet	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
sloppy	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
kind	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
helpful	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
friendly	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
talented	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
troublesome	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
dishonest	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
nice	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
disobedient	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
rude	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS

The teacher can be described as:

sincere	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
polite	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
unfriendly	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
strict	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
kind	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
forgiving	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
mean	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
dull	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS

The teacher can be described as:

calm	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
unkind	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
bossy	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
honest	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
annoying	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
grouchy	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
helpful	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS
friendly	1	2	3	4	5	NS	S	VS

APPENDIX L
SUMMARY STATISTICS

Multivariate Analysis of Variance on: the Personality-Traits
of the Child (PRC), Confidence in the Ratings of the
Child (CRC), Personality-Traits of the Teacher
(PTT), and Confidence in the Ratings of
of the Teacher (CRT)

Source	Log (Generalized Variance)	<u>df</u>	<u>U</u>
Type of desist (A)	34.74	4,1,60	.5759*
Sex of rater (B)	34.30	4,1,60	.8990
A x B	34.27	4,1,60	.9276
Error	34.19		

* $p < .001$.

Cross Product Matrix for Type of Desist

Variable	PTC	CRC	PTT	CRT
PTC	2437.89			
CRC	-536.95	118.27		
PTT	2826.72	-662.59	3277.56	
CRT	314.77	-69.33	364.97	40.64

Cross Product Matrix for Sex of Rater

Variable	PTC	CRC	PTT	CRT
PTC	319.52			
CRC	-15.64	0.77		
PTT	-151.94	7.44	72.25	
CRT	163.11	-7.98	-77.56	83.27

Cross Product Matrix for the Sex of Rater x Type
of Desist Interaction

Variable	PTC	CRC	PTT	CRT
PTC	17.02			
CRC	-42.80	107.64		
PTT	83.53	-210.09	410.06	
CRT	-2.58	6.48	-12.66	0.39

Cross Product Matrix for Subjects Within Groups

Variable	PTC	CRC	PTT	CRT
PTC	9892.78			
CRC	-2811.86	5230.36		
PTT	-1194.51	959.57	9053.74	
CRT	-1859.36	2372.61	1279.82	3015.92

Means and Standard Deviations for the Experimental Groups on
the Dependent Variables: Personality-Traits of the Child,
Confidence in the Ratings of the Child, Personality-
Traits of the Teacher, and Confidence in the
Ratings of the Teacher

Dependent Measure	Group			
	Approval-Focused		Task-Focused	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Personality-Traits of the Child				
M	53.25	49.81	66.63	61.13
SD	14.76	13.18	10.97	12.15
Confidence in Ratings of the Child				
M	65.38	63.00	60.06	62.88
SD	11.26	8.08	7.71	9.86
Personality-Traits of the Teacher				
M	42.19	49.38	61.56	58.63
SD	9.83	14.25	13.01	11.59
Confidence in Ratings of the Teacher				
M	49.31	46.88	50.75	48.63
SD	7.50	6.40	6.32	8.00

ANOVA on the Personality-Traits of the Child

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Type of desist (A)	1	2437.89	14.79*
Sex of rater (B)	1	319.52	1.94
A x B	1	17.02	.10
Error	60	164.88	

* $p < .001$.

ANOVA on the Confidence in the Ratings of
the Child

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Type of desist (A)	1	118.27	1.36
Sex of rater (B)	1	.77	.01
A x B	1	107.64	1.23
Error	60	87.17	

ANOVA on the Personality-Traits of the Teacher

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Type of desist (A)	1	3277.56	21.72*
Sex of rater (B)	1	72.25	.49
A x B	1	410.06	2.72
Error	60	150.90	

* $p < .001$.

ANOVA on the Confidence in the Ratings of the Teacher

Source	<u>df</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>
Type of desist (A)	1	40.64	.81
Sex of rater (B)	1	83.27	1.66
A x B	1	0.39	.01
Error	60	50.27	