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In the course of human existence, individuals frequently exert a notable amount of effort in trying to get others to like them. For example, individuals engage in "liking" behaviors when seeking intimate relationships, seeking support from peers, or as a means of motivating others to accomplish some task. A significant amount of research has focused on how liking is generated from a physical attractiveness perspective. Specifically, research posits that a positive relationship exists between an individual's perceived degree of physical attractiveness and his/her ability to generate liking (Berscheid & Walster, 1974; Berscheid, 1985; Byrne, 1971). This would suggest, then, that the process of liking is more of a passive activity; individuals have little control over getting others to like them.

However, recent studies have focused on the process of liking from a more dynamic standpoint. Specifically, current inquiry suggests that individuals have direct control in initiating degrees of liking (Bell, Tremblay, & Buerkel-Rothfuss, 1987). In particular, Bell and Daly (1984) have labeled this control as "affinity-seeking strategies." They define these strategies as "the active social-communicative process by which individuals attempt to
get others to like and to feel positive toward them" (p. 91). The purpose of the present study was to analyze student perceptions of instructor use of affinity-seeking strategies as a function of instructor gender and status by replicating the research of Bell and Daly (1984) and Roach (1992). First, Bell and Daly's ground-breaking research will be described. Following this will be a review of additional relevant literature and the results of a test of type and frequency of affinity-seeking strategies used by university instructors who differ by gender and status.

Review of Literature

Bell and Daly introduced and defined the term "affinity-seeking" in their ground-breaking study of 1984. Their purpose was to examine the process of liking from a more dynamic standpoint. Through a series of experiments, the researchers generated and tested a 25-item typology of affinity-seeking strategies. These strategies were based on the responses of 22 small brainstorming groups, composed of both classroom teachers and undergraduate students. Subjects within each group were directed to "produce a list of things people can say or do to get others to like them" (p. 96). The responses were then content analyzed and categories of affinity-seeking strategies developed based on the following criteria: (1) responses had to be "communicative" or refer to messages about the person's
style of presentation, and (2) responses had to occur consistently across groups.

In brief, the following is Bell and Daly's (1984) list of 25 strategies intended to increase affinity between persons: Altruism, being of assistance to another; Assume Control, has control over the situation; Assume Equality, presents self as an equal; Comfortable Self, acts comfortable around others; Concede Control, allows others to have control; Conversational Rule-Keeping, follows cultural rules for polite interaction; Dynamism, presents self as active and enthusiastic; Elicit Other's Disclosures, encourages and enforces others' conversational contributions; Facilitate Enjoyment, maximizes positiveness of relationship; Inclusion of Other[s], includes other[s] in social groups; Influence Perceptions of Closeness, makes other feel relationship is closer than actuality; Listening, listens actively and attentively; Nonverbal Immediacy, uses nonverbal cues to show interest in other[s]; Openness, discloses personal information; Optimism, presents self as a positive person; Personal Autonomy, presents self as independent and free-thinking; Physical Attractiveness, tries to look attractive in presence of other[s]; Present Interesting Self, presents self as interesting to know; Reward Association, has ability to offer rewards to other[s]; Self-Concept Confirmation, shows respect for
other[s]; Self-Inclusion, tries to come in contact with other[s]; Sensitivity, acts in a warm manner; Similarity, convinces other[s] of similarities; Supportiveness, shows support for other[s]; and Trustworthiness, presents self as honest and reliable.

Concerning the testing of their typology, Bell and Daly (1984) summarized their findings as follows:

First, the 25-strategy typology developed to address the preliminary question operationalized the affinity-seeking construct thoroughly and reliably. Second, people who were thought to use many affinity-seeking strategies were judged likable, socially successful, and satisfied with their lives. Third, personality and situational features influence both the number of strategies a person produces and the self-reported likelihood of using each strategy. Fourth, at least three dimensions underlie the affinity-seeking construct: activity level, aggressiveness, and focus of the strategies (p. 111).

In short, the process of liking using affinity-seeking strategies appears both useful to the individual and dependent on certain underlying variables surrounding the individual. Further, examination of these variables may prove instrumental to more fully understand the affinity concept.
In addition, Bell and Daly (1984) claimed that their typology could be generalized to a variety of contexts and situations, including interpersonal and classroom environments. A significant amount of research, then, has recently developed which tests whether or not it can indeed be generalized. A discussion of this research follows.

**Affinity and Interpersonal Relationships.**

As initially proposed by Bell and Daly (1984), one of the primary contexts for affinity building is in interpersonal relationships. Further, research has been conducted which tests this proposition. Tolhuizen (1989) questioned if differences exist in the use of affinity-seeking strategies as interpersonal relationships develop. Two hundred and ninety-two undergraduate college students were administered descriptions of four levels of relationship development. Subjects were requested to indicate the likelihood that they would use particular affinity-seeking strategies in the relationship described. On balance, subjects indicated higher overall affinity-seeking strategy use, and a greater variety of different strategies in fully developed friendships than in new acquaintances (p. 89). Significant to the present study is the apparent generalizability of affinity-seeking tests to various interpersonal situations.

Through a series of studies, Bell, Tremblay, and
Buerkel-Rothfuss (1987) attempted to discover if a relationship exists between affinity-seeking skill and social outcomes in interpersonal relationships. First, 125 students generated a list of possible social outcomes by comparing the definitions of a high-skilled affinity seeker with one who is low-skilled. Second, 74 students were given this list, along with a test of their own affinity-seeking skill. On the generated list, subjects were asked to mark which outcomes they had experienced in the last seven days. Correlations between the test of the students' affinity-seeking skill and generated social outcomes proved significant. Specifically, a competent use of affinity-seeking skills yielded positive social outcomes (p. 14). It is likely, then, that affinity-seeking skills are utilized in classroom encounters; the classroom environment is another interpersonal area with certain social outcomes.

Continuing the research on affinity-seeking competence, Rubin, Rubin, and Martin (1993) explored its relationship to self-disclosure and self-awareness. The researchers posited that an individual who self-discloses should have higher affinity-seeking competence, up to a certain point (p. 115). Four hundred undergraduate students completed a set of three instruments which measured their levels of affinity-seeking competence, self-disclosure, and self-awareness. Statistical analyses revealed a linear relationship between
self-disclosing and affinity-seeking competence, but self-awareness was not a factor. The researchers concluded, "Affinity-seeking competence, then, reflects an ability to make oneself seem attractive in relationships by disclosing positive information" (p. 124). Affinity-seeking competence, then, is a varying factor in interpersonal relationships.

Overall, research has shown that affinity-seeking strategies are utilized in interpersonal relationships (Bell, Tremblay, & Buerkel-Rothus, 1987; Rubin, Rubin, & Martin, 1993; Tolhuizen, 1989). Further, studies have indicated that affinity-seeking skill and competence is both useful and valuable within these relationships (Bell, Tremblay, & Buerkel-Rothfuss, 1987; Rubin, Rubin, & Martin, 1993). One can suggest, then, that because classroom interactions are certainly degrees of interpersonal interactions, affinity-seeking strategies should be evident and valuable in generating positive outcomes in that context as well.

**Affinity and Learning in the Classroom.**

First, a general discussion of research on affinity and learning in the classroom is necessary. As noted earlier, Bell and Daly (1984) researched affinity generation in interpersonal contexts. However, they also proposed that their typology, and the subject of affinity in general,
could be generalized to the classroom environment; classroom interactions are certainly a form of interpersonal interactions. McCroskey and McCroskey (1986) researched this proposition. To determine extent and frequency of affinity use in the classroom, the researchers administered the Bell and Daly typology to 311 elementary and secondary school teachers enrolled in instructional communication classes. Subjects were directed to indicate if they had observed their peers using affinity strategies and if so, how often. Results confirmed that instructors did utilize certain affinity-seeking strategies in the classroom, with some strategies being more popular than others. This study built the foundation for future research on affinity in the classroom.

Though Gorham (1988) did not study the use of affinity-seeking strategies in particular, the researcher investigated the effect of general instructor behaviors such as smiling, vocal expressiveness, movement about the classroom, and relaxed body position on student learning (p. 41). Gorham chose to label such actions as "verbal teacher immediacy behaviors," though these are clearly affinity-type behaviors. Through self-report questionnaires, 387 undergraduate college students assessed perceived levels of instructor immediacy behaviors, student cognitive learning, and student affective learning. Utilizing Pearson
correlation and multiple regression analyses, results indicated the existence of "significant relationships between immediacy and learning" (p. 46). In particular, behaviors such as instructor self-disclosure, encouragement of student participation, and provision of feedback were strongly correlated with student learning. Again, though these were not labeled as affinity-seeking per se, one can observe strong similarities.

Further research continued to focus on the existence of affinity within the classroom. Gorham, Kelley, and McCroskey (1989) looked at the use of affinity-seeking strategies at the high school level. Specific research questions focused on major differences in the use of various strategies as a function of grade level taught, and an instructor-perceived degree of difficulty in generating affinity for themselves and for the subject matter (p. 19). Using a 10-point Likert-type scale, 229 elementary and secondary teachers were asked to rank the following two questions: (a) "How difficult is it for you to get the students in your class to like you as a teacher?", and (b) "How difficult is it for you to get the students in your class to like the subject matter you teach?" (p. 19). Subjects were also asked to provide examples of affinity-seeking strategies they use for both themselves and the subject matter.
Gorham et al. (1989) found 2,218 different affinity-seeking behaviors, with 1,172 designed to increase liking of the teacher and 1,046 designed to increase liking of the subject matter (p. 20). The four most popular strategies overall included Trustworthiness, Sensitivity, Self-Inclusion, and Elicit Disclosures. Also, teachers were found to be more concerned with generating affinity for themselves at lower grade levels, while creating affinity for the subject matter was emphasized more at higher levels. The use of affinity-seeking strategies, then, can be found in the classroom at the high school level.

Other research has focused on affinity generation in the college classroom. For example, Frymier (1994) further validated this line of research through the testing of two causal models of an affinity-seeking/learning relationship. For this particular study, the researcher generated a liking scale to measure which affinity strategies are associated with liking for instructors (p. 89). A total of 178 undergraduate students enrolled in communication courses participated in the study, referencing 105 male instructors and 67 female instructors. In sum, five variables were measured, affinity-seeking behavior of the instructor, level of liking of the instructor, student motivation, student affective learning, and student cognitive learning.

In general, results confirmed the use of affinity-
seeking strategies by instructors in the college classroom, and indicated that these are indeed associated with liking of the instructor. Particular strategies highly correlated with liking included Assume Equality, Dynamism, Elicit Other's Disclosure, and Facilitate Enjoyment (Frymier, 1994, p. 101). Further, results indicated that the use of affinity-seeking strategies facilitates student motivation, which in turn indirectly reinforces student learning (p. 102). In short, this study further justifies the study of affinity-seeking strategies as a means for instructional improvement within the classroom.

Overall, research in this section identifies the use of affinity-seeking strategies in the classroom and the generalizability of the Bell and Daly (1984) typology to this context. Specific studies found the existence of a wide range of affinity-seeking strategies in both high school and college classrooms (Gorham et al., 1989; McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986). Other research revealed a positive relationship exists between affinity-seeking and student learning (Gorham, 1988; Frymier, 1994). This section of research, then, justifies the need for further study of affinity building and its effects in the classroom environment.

**Instructor Motivation and Competence.**

Having established the existence of affinity-seeking
strategies in the classroom, one of the primary areas of research concerning affinity-seeking specifically is how the building of affinity with students affects student motivation and perceived instructor competence. In a study by Rubin and Feezel (1986), the relationships among student-teacher communication competence, knowledge, motivation, and skill were analyzed. Fifty student-teacher volunteers were examined using researchers' assessments, student teachers' self-assessments, and cooperating teachers' perceptions of communication effectiveness and appropriateness in the classroom (p. 258). Results indicated that first, motivation of student-teachers was not significantly related to skill, knowledge, or communication outcomes. Second, impressions formed by cooperating teachers were different from student-teachers' own impressions of their communication abilities. Third, skill, "the ability to communicate appropriately and effectively," was reported as the most important area in predicating teacher effectiveness (p. 260). Apparently, communicating well, a factor within affinity-seeking strategies, exists when attempting to increase positive student outcomes.

Similar to the research on communication competence in the previous study, Beatty and Zahn (1990) looked at the relationship between teacher credibility and various student perceptions about the instructor. Specifically, the
researchers were interested in determining if a difference exists between the credibility of instructors in the humanities and those in the physical sciences. Three hundred and forty-two undergraduates in humanities courses were administered a self-report questionnaire to determine their perceived instructors' credibility and their personal course performance. Results illustrated that student ratings of teacher credibility were not influenced by perceptions of personal course performance (p. 281). Rather, students' perceived performance levels were influenced by teachers' sociability factors. Significant to the present study, specific sociability factors included being nice, friendly, cheerful, and sociable (p. 281). These factors are certainly forms of affinity-seeking strategies.

To discover significant areas in student learning, Christophel (1990) studied the relationship between teacher immediacy behaviors and student motivation; immediacy behaviors are factors within affinity-seeking strategies. The researcher hypothesized, "Student perceptions of teacher verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors will be positively associated with student state motivation and learning" (p. 326). Students were given self-report instruments to determine their motivation levels, perceptions of teacher immediacy behaviors, and perceived learning. Examples of
immediacy behaviors included such actions as "uses humor in class" or "smiles at the class while teaching" (p. 328). Results confirmed that the use of immediacy behaviors, a form of affinity generation, led to higher levels of class motivation and learning.

Consistent with the previous studies, Frymier and Thompson (1992) investigated instructors' use of affinity-seeking strategies and their effect on instructors' perceived credibility in the classroom. The researchers hypothesized that a positive relationship exists between an instructor's use of affinity-seeking strategies and students' reports of teacher character, teacher competence, and motivation to study. Using standardized self-reports, 250 subjects were requested to determine which particular affinity-building strategies their teachers used, how often, and to what degree the teachers seemed credible. Results indicated the more affinity-seeking strategies instructors are perceived as using, the more credibility they are perceived to have (p. 397). Also, this increased credibility tended to be positively related to students' reports of motivation.

On balance, research suggests strong agreement exists when examining the relationships among instructor motivation, competence, and affinity-seeking strategies. Rubin and Feezel (1986), specifically, found teacher
communication skill to be most significant in predicting teacher competence. Further, other research suggests the use of affinity-seeking strategies is positively correlated with instructor competence (Beatty & Zahn, 1990; Christophel, 1990; Frymier & Thompson 1992). Though additional research is needed to further test the reliability of these results, the present study will not focus on the relationships among affinity-seeking, perceptions of motivation and learning, and instructor competence. However, the general study of affinity-seeking strategies and their practical application to the classroom environment is clearly justified by this research.

**Gender and Affinity-Seeking.**

Another one of the primary facets of affinity-seeking research is how the process of liking is dependent on the individual's gender. Further, research has examined this variable in both interpersonal and classroom contexts. Focusing on the interpersonal context, Flint (1992) hypothesized that both the gender of the agent (the one using the strategies) and the gender of the target would affect affinity strategy use. Two hundred forty-six high school students were administered a form of the Bell and Daly (1984) typology and were asked how likely they were to use each strategy when interacting with first, their mother, then with their father. Results demonstrated that a
significant difference does exist between male and female agent strategy use, regardless of the target's gender. Specifically, male agents were more likely to use strategies of Complimenting, Altruism, and Empathy than female agents.

To determine the choice of affinity-seeking tactics used by college students, Richmond, Gorham and Furio (1987) proposed several research questions. Relevant to the present study, the researchers questioned the degree to which college males and females differ when using affinity-seeking strategies (p. 338). Using a self-report questionnaire, 472 subjects indicated which affinity-seeking strategy they would likely use to attract a person of the opposite sex. Results indicated that significant differences do exist between male and female use of affinity-seeking strategies. Specifically, females were more likely to ask questions, be attentive, and be more sensitive to others' problems (p. 344). Likewise, males were more likely to compliment the other, treat others with importance, and give assistance (p. 344).

Focusing on the instructional setting, Wheeless and Potartti (1989) researched what effect differences of instructor gender have on student outcomes. The researchers hypothesized that instructor gender and student assessment of instructor gender characteristics would significantly affect student attitudes toward learning (p. 260). Two
hundred fifty-two students used self-report surveys to evaluate their instructor's perceived masculinity and femininity traits and their own degree of affective learning. Results illustrated that the gender of the instructor was not a factor. Specifically, the researchers found that attitudes toward learning were related to how the student assessed the gender characteristics of the instructor, regardless of whether the teacher was male or female (p. 261). Incidentally, those instructors who were categorized as androgynous, showing warmth and concern, produced the most positive attitudes toward affective learning. Strategies of showing warmth and concern bear similarities toward affinity-seeking.

Incorporating several variables, Roach (1992) concentrated on the relationships among instructor gender, instructor status (GTAs versus faculty), and the use of affinity-seeking strategies. Differences in gender and status were hypothesized to be significantly related to the use of different strategies (p. 75). Five hundred twenty-one students completed a questionnaire to determine instructor use of affinity-seeking strategies, affective learning of students, and self-perceived cognitive learning. Results illustrated that GTAs employed strategies that reflected equality and openness, while faculty used strategies which mirrored self-confidence and control (p.
However, results also indicated that students responded positively to both styles, that affective learning was increased through both. Further, gender was not found to affect significantly the instructors' use of strategies.

While still focusing on gender, Basow and Distenfeld (1985) also incorporated the variable of teacher expressiveness. Teacher expressiveness was operationalized as the perceived degree of warmth expressed by the teacher through the use of hand gestures, smiles, and facial expressiveness (p. 45). Teacher expressiveness closely resembles affinity-type strategies. One hundred twenty-one students viewed one of four different videotapes of a male or female actor presenting identical information either expressively or non-expressively. Subjects were then asked to rate the effectiveness of the lecture using a seven-point Likert-type scale. Results confirmed that expressive teachers were evaluated more positively than non-expressive teachers. Also significant was that expressiveness was more of a determining factor when evaluating male instructors than for female instructors, with expressive female instructors receiving the highest evaluations (p. 50).

Undoubtedly, then, gender was a factor.

Continuing in the area of students' ratings of instructors, Kierstead, D'Agostino, and Dill (1988) investigated the variables of out of class social contact
between instructor and student, instructor's facial expression, and instructor gender. The researchers predicted that instructors who frequently "smiled or socialized" with students would receive more favorable ratings than those who did not, particularly female instructors (p. 342); "smiling and socializing" are affinity-type behaviors. Eighty students were asked to indicate how often a particular instructor in a hypothetical situation socialized with them out of class, smiled during class lectures, and to identify the effect this had on their ratings of this instructor. Results did not support the hypothesis that increased "smiling and socializing" increased favorable ratings of the instructor. However, results did indicate that female instructors, compared to male instructors, received higher ratings when using these socializing techniques. This, again, suggests a definite gender difference.

Contrasting research exists in the area of instructor gender and the use of affinity-seeking strategies. A portion of the research suggests that a significant relationship does exist between the variables of gender and affinity-seeking strategies (Flint, 1992; Basow & Distenfeld, 1985; Kierstead et al., 1988; Richmond et al., 1988). Other experiments have illustrated that such a relationship does not exist (Roach, 1992; Wheeless &
Potarti, 1989). Therefore, further research is warranted to examine this relationship between gender and affinity-seeking strategies.

**Instructor Status, BATs, and Affinity-Seeking.**

Another area in which research has generated significant results is how instructor status is an affinity-generating factor within the classroom environment. Similar to affinity-seeking strategies, Kearney, Plax, Richmond, and McCroskey (1985) researched the use of Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs) by instructors. BATs are "power-based strategies which teachers use to control or modify student actions" (p. 19). Although these are typically more coercive than affinity-seeking strategies, they are nonetheless similar. Kearney et al. attempted to identify what type of BATs are used by instructors, and also strategy effectiveness. In addition, instructor gender and the number of years teaching, or status, were factored into the study.

One hundred and seventy-seven college students generated a list of 18 possible BATs. Two hundred and four elementary and secondary teachers were given this list and asked to indicate which strategies they use and how effective the outcome was. The following seven BATs were most often used: Reward From Behavior, Reward From Source, Personal Responsibility, Expert, Self-Esteem, Altruism, and
Affinity-Seeking

Duty (p. 25). Upon inspection, these resemble certain affinity-seeking strategies. However, no significant correlations were found among instructor gender, the number of years teaching or status, and the use of BATs. Incidentally, this adds strength to the previous statement that further research is needed which examines the relationship between gender and affinity-seeking.

Plax, Kearney, and Tucker (1986) further explored the use of BATs. The researchers questioned the frequency of BATs used by prospective teachers, and also to what extent this use was a function of anticipated grade level of teaching (p. 36). One hundred and fifteen subjects completed a series of questionnaires which measured the grade level they expected to teach and also their intended BAT use based on four hypothetical scenarios. Results indicated that prospective teachers would infrequently use BATS to attempt to control classroom behaviors, only relying on Self-Esteem and Teacher Feedback strategies. These do, however, closely resemble affinity-building strategies. Further, these techniques differed sharply from those of experienced instructors generated in past research, a difference in status. This suggests, then, that instructor status is an underlying variable.

To offset the possible negative affects of using BATs, Richmond (1990) investigated the potential of affinity-
seeking strategies. Specifically, Richmond questioned the relationship between teachers' use of affinity-seeking tactics and students' motivation to study. Three hundred and sixty-six participants were asked to self-report their levels of motivation toward studying, and to determine the type and frequency of both BATs and affinity-seeking techniques used by their instructors. Richmond found BAT use to be negatively associated with student motivation. To the contrary, the employment of affinity-seeking strategies (Facilitate Enjoyment, Assume Equality, and Optimism) was found to increase significantly students' motivation to study. These results further solidify the previous discussion on the positive relationship between affinity and student motivation.

The use of BATs by Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTAs) was studied by Roach (1991). The researcher questioned which types of BATs are used by GTAs, their effect on student affective learning, and if they were different from those BATs used by faculty. Four-hundred fifty college students were asked to indicate if their teacher was a GTA or faculty member, and also the frequency of use of BATs from a 22 item list. Student affective learning was also measured. Results indicated that GTAs used BATs with greater frequency than did faculty, illustrating a significant difference in instructor status (p. 185). Also,
reward based BATs, those resembling affinity-seeking strategies, were found to increase significantly student affective learning, while negative based BATs did not.

Overall, research suggests the use of BATs, primarily those resembling affinity-seeking strategies, to be positively correlated with student motivation and affective learning (Richmond, 1990; Roach, 1991). This is not surprising given the previous discussion on affinity-seeking and student motivation. However, another variable, that of instructor status, has produced contrasting results. Some research has yielded the existence of a relationship between status and affinity-type tactics (Roach, 1992; Roach, 1991), while other studies have produced contradicting results (Plax et al., 1985). Further research is needed which tests if instructor status is indeed an underlying variable within the use of affinity-seeking strategies.

**Significance and Research Questions**

Overall, the aforementioned research illustrates that affinity-seeking strategies do exist. First, research indicated that affinity-seeking strategies are utilized in interpersonal relationships. Second, these same strategies were found to exist within the classroom environment as well. Third, the use of the strategies and others similar, such as BATs and immediacy behaviors, were significantly related with student outcomes, instructor motivation, and
instructor competence. Finally, the gender and status of instructors had varying degrees of influence on the types of strategies used. As a result, research on the use of affinity-seeking strategies in the classroom environment is justified and necessary. Specifically, research on the changes in instructor status and instructor gender are the most contradictory and require additional study.

Given that GTAs are part of the teaching faculty at many universities and given the inconclusiveness of research on instructor gender, instructor status and affinity-seeking strategies, the present study investigated these variables. Particularly, Roach's (1992) study on instructor gender and status was replicated to some extent. However, because the literature review illustrated a high degree of agreement among studies which tested student perceptions of learning, instructor motivation, and instructor competence, these variables were not examined. The present study allowed this researcher to determine if different affinity-seeking strategies are perceived to be used by instructors of different gender and status. Two research questions derived from Roach's research were addressed:

RQ1: What differences are there, if any, between faculty and GTAs in frequency of affinity-seeking strategy use as rated by their students?
RQ2: To what extent do student ratings of their GTA or faculty instructors' use of affinity-seeking strategies vary as a function of faculty/GTA gender?

In addition, minimal research has been conducted which measures whether or not differences in instructor gender and status interact with each other and the use of affinity-seeking strategies. Investigating this relationship may add to a more complete understanding of how affinity-seeking strategies function within the classroom and how different instructors can more effectively utilize them. Therefore, a third research question was proposed to address this concern.

RQ3: Does an interaction effect exist among differences in instructor gender, instructor status, and the perceived use of affinity-seeking strategies?
CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY

Pilot Study

A pilot study was first conducted to test the two research questions; interaction effects were not considered, however. A total of 147 subjects from Eastern Illinois University were given Bell and Daly's (1984) 25-item typology to measure their perceived instructor's use of affinity-seeking strategies. Utilizing ANOVA procedures for statistical analyses, Graduate Teaching Assistants were found to use affinity-seeking strategies more often than faculty, specifically those emphasizing social equality and feedback. Further, female instructors were found to use certain strategies more often than male instructors, specifically those emphasizing caring and feedback. Based on these results and their contradiction with those from past research, the present study was initiated. Also, a larger subject pool and a larger number of Graduate Teaching Assistants were determined necessary to ensure more significant results.

Subjects

Subjects for the present study were 483 undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in various communication courses at three midwestern universities. Two hundred thirty-eight of the subjects were male students, while 245
were female students. By classification, 35% were freshmen, 21% were sophomores, 20% were juniors, 22% were seniors, and 2% were graduates. Though these demographic data were not utilized in statistical analyses, they were calculated to ensure an adequate sample distribution; this appears to have been achieved. Incidentally, one upper-level classroom was surveyed, which may account for the subjects who were graduate students. Participation in the study was voluntary and confidentiality of responses was stressed throughout the survey process.

Procedure

Data were acquired through a survey questionnaire distributed at each university during the last three weeks of the semester (see Appendix A). This time frame was chosen because at that point in the semester, subjects should have been familiar enough with the instructor to provide for a fair evaluation. In sum, the questionnaires were administered to the classrooms of 14 Graduate Teaching Assistants and 14 tenured or tenure-track faculty. The number of students per classroom generated a mean score of 17.25, an adequate number for meaningful evaluations. Instructor gender was distributed relatively evenly; 13 female instructors and 15 male instructors were identified.

Instructions for the survey directed participants to base their answers on "the perceptions of the instructor you
have for this class." This method was used due to the nature of the universities participating and the overall lack of an adequate number of Graduate Teaching Assistants across the entire curriculum. Therefore, GTA classrooms were sought out, rather than left to random selection. Further, the single discipline of Speech Communication rather than multiple disciplines was chosen as a matter of convenience to the study, and as an attempt to prevent skewness of results. Skewness is in reference to the possibility that different instructors from different disciplines may naturally utilize more affinity than others. Therefore, only the Speech Communication field was selected.

Instrument

Bell and Daly's (1984) typology of 25 affinity-seeking strategies was used for primary measurement. The strategy labels were omitted from the questionnaire, leaving only the affinity descriptions. Subjects were directed to indicate how likely their instructor was to employ each strategy based on a seven-point scale (from 1 = Very Unlikely to 7 = Very Likely). In addition, subjects were instructed to indicate their instructor's gender and status (Graduate Teaching Assistant or faculty member).

Reliability

The Bell and Daly (1984) instrument has been proven to be a reliable and valid tool of measurement. Concerning
reliability, the typology has consistently produced high levels. For example, past research has documented the instrument with Cronbach Alpha reliability levels of .77, .87, .89, .90, and .96 (Frymier & Thompson, 1992; Richmond, 1990; Roach, 1992; Rubin, Rubin, & Martin, 1993; Tolhuizen, 1989). Therefore based on these examples, no additional test of reliability was performed for the present study.

Validity
In the area of validity, Bell and Daly conducted a series of experiments which showed that the typology accurately measures levels of affinity. In addition, Gorham, Kelly, and McCroskey (1989) produced an intercoder reliability of 98.9% between the affinity strategies they generated in their study and those of the Bell and Daly instrument. Finally, other researchers have also made statements that the instrument is valid (Bell, Tremblay, Buerkel-Rothfuss, 1987; Richmond, Gorham, & Furio, 1987). Therefore, no additional test of validity was conducted for the present study.

Statistical Analysis
All three research questions were tested with a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). An ANOVA, essentially, is a statistical procedure applied to a large sample of observations which tests for significant differences, or the variance, among groups of data. The mean scores of the
affinity-seeking strategies were calculated for faculty, GTAs, males, and females. Individual mean scores were compared within differences of instructor status and within differences of instructor gender to determine if main effect relationships exist. In addition, interaction effects were calculated among the three variables. According to correct ANOVA procedures, main effects were not considered if interaction effects were significant (Monge & Cappella, 1980). The significance level for each research question was set at the $p < .05$ level.
CHAPTER 3
RESULTS

Due to the significance of the results, the third research question will be first discussed. The third research question inquired if an interaction effect exists among differences in instructor gender, instructor status, and affinity-seeking strategies. Overall, ANOVA procedures yielded no significant interactions among the variables for any of the 25 strategies (p < .05). Apparently, instructor status and gender do not interact with each other enough to alter significantly the perceived use of affinity-seeking strategies. Therefore, all subsequent main effects could be considered significant. Results from the remaining two research questions will be discussed and documented as if a simple two-way ANOVA had been performed, with no interaction tables being reproduced here.

The first research question addressed if differences exist between faculty and GTAs in frequency of perceived affinity-seeking strategy use. Again, ANOVA procedures yielded minimal significance (see Table 1). Overall, Graduate Teaching Assistants were likely to utilize a single strategy, that of Assume Equality (F = 6.15, df = 1/477, p < .01), more than faculty. Further, the faculty variable did not generate any significance whatsoever; faculty members were not perceived likely to use any of the 25
### Table 1

**Mean Use of Affinity-Seeking Behavior as a Function of Instructor Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Faculty Mean ($\bar{X}$)</th>
<th>GTA Mean ($\bar{X}$)</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 483

df = 1/477

*Indicates significant at p < .01
strategies more than GTAs. What these results convey about instructor status and the use of affinity-seeking strategies will be analyzed in more depth in the next chapter.

Finally, the second research question dealt with the extent to which GTA or faculty instructors' perceived use of affinity-seeking strategies varied as a function of faculty/GTA gender. Contrary to the other two research questions, differences in instructor gender produced several significant results (see Table 2). Specifically, at the $p < .05$ level, female instructors, both GTAs and faculty, were perceived more likely to utilize strategies of Elicit Disclosures ($F = 4.03, df = 1/477, p < .05$), Listening ($F = 5.07, df = 1/477, p < .05$), Personal Autonomy ($F = 4.11, df = 1/477, p < .05$), Physical Attractiveness ($F = 5.42, df = 1/477, p < .05$), Reward Association ($F = 4.29, df = 1/477, p < .05$), and Self Inclusion ($F = 4.47, df = 1/477, p < .05$) more than male instructors.

In addition, at the $p < .01$ level, female instructors were perceived more likely to utilize strategies of Dynamism ($F = 11.13, df = 1/477, p < .01$), Nonverbal Immediacy ($F = 6.93, df = 1/477, p < .01$), Openness ($F = 9.68, df = 1/477, p < .001$), Present Interesting Self ($F = 9.14, df = 1/477, p < .001$), Sensitivity ($F = 6.81, df = 1/477, p < .01$), and Similarity ($F = 6.63, df = 1/477, p < .01$) more than male instructors. Finally, none of the 25 affinity-seeking
Table 2

Mean Use of Affinity-Seeking Behavior as a Function of Instructor Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>F-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>11.13**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>4.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>5.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.93**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>9.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>4.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>9.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>4.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>6.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>6.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$n = 483$

$df = 1/477$

* Indicates significant at $p < .05$

** Indicates significant at $p < .01$
strategies were found to be used significantly more by male than female instructors.

Due to the nature of the design and the results thus far, the present study also allowed the researcher to perform a post hoc factor analysis to comprehend more fully the gender patterns associated with the use of affinity-seeking strategies. Specifically, a factor analysis was executed on the female instructor variable independent of the other variables. Rotated factor loadings (VARIMAX rotation method) were used for primary data interpretation. For a factor to be significant, an item had to have a primary loading of at least ±.60, with no secondary loading exceeding ±.40. Further, the factor had to have an eigenvalue of at least 1.00 and account for a significant amount of the variance.

Overall, the rotated factor analysis yielded four significant loadings, which accounted for 63.45% of the variance (see Table 3). Loading on factor one and accounting for 45.33% of the variance were the strategies of Comfortable Self (.77), Conversational Rule-Keeping (.75), Dynamism (.79), Elicit Disclosures (.64), Facilitate Enjoyment (.70), and Nonverbal Immediacy (.64). Clearly, these loadings suggest a dimension of direct communication exists within female instructors' use of affinity-seeking strategies. Therefore, this factor, the strongest of the
Table 3

Results From Rotated Factor Analysis of Female Instructor Use of Affinity-Seeking Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>.77*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>.75*</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.72*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.79*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.62*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.75*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.75*</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.63*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue: 11.33  2.07  1.32  1.14
Percent of Variance: 45.33  8.26  5.30  4.56
Cumulative Percent: 45.33  53.59  58.59  63.45

*Indicates significant factor loading
four, was labeled as Communication.

Loading on the second factor and accounting for 8.26% of the variance were the strategies of Inclusion (.72), Similarity (.75), and Supportiveness (.63). Upon inspection, each of these strategies is concerned with bringing others in, either through including the other or showing how similarities exist, to involve the other. Therefore, this factor was labeled as Involvement.

The third factor accounted for 5.30% of the variance. Loading on it was the single strategy of Openness (.79), and it was labeled as such.

Finally, accounting for 4.56% of the variance, the strategies of Altruism (.69), Physical Attractiveness (.62), Present Interesting Self (.76), and Self-Concept Confirmation (.75) loaded on factor four. These strategies suggest the existence of an outward character dimension. The strategies of Altruism and Self-Concept Confirmation are focused on showing concern for the other, while the strategies of Physical Attractiveness and Present Interesting Self suggest more of a concern for self or an attempt to make self more presentable. When these strategies are combined, this factor illustrates a pattern of showing concern, and was labeled as such. A more in-depth analysis of these factors and those results from the ANOVA is undertaken in the discussion chapter.
CHAPTER 4
DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to determine if different affinity-seeking strategies are perceived to be utilized by instructors of different gender and status in the classroom environment. Three research questions were proposed, two were adopted from Roach (1992), to address this inquiry. Those questions were: (1) What differences are there, if any, between faculty and GTAs in frequency of affinity-seeking strategy use as rated by their students?; (2) To what extent do student ratings of their GTA or faculty instructors' use of affinity-seeking strategies vary as a function of faculty/GTA gender?; and (3) Does an interaction effect exist among differences in instructor gender, instructor status, and the perceived use of affinity-seeking strategies? On balance, significant differences were found.

Results of the present study indicate that minimal differences exist between Graduate Teaching Assistant and faculty perceived use of affinity-seeking strategies. To the contrary, several meaningful differences were realized between male instructor and female instructor perceived affinity strategy use. Finally, no significant differences were found for an interaction effect among instructor status, instructor gender, and affinity-seeking strategies.
Overall, results from the present study validate and also contradict existing research on affinity seeking strategies. For example, Roach (1992) found no significant differences based on instructor gender, while instructor status was found to be highly significant. These results are directly opposite to those from the present study. Results from the present study strengthen research which showed significant differences based on instructor gender, such as the work of Flint (1992), Basow and Distenfeld (1985), and Richmond et al. (1988). In addition, the present study is in agreement with Kearney et al. (1985) and their conclusion that instructor status is not a determining factor. However, conclusions made by Roach (1991) and Wheeless and Potarti (1989) contradict what has been found here. Suffice it to say that based on the results from the present study and the lack of fit among existing research, further study of affinity-seeking strategies is necessary. What follows is this researcher's interpretation of the results. As per the previous chapter, individual research questions will be discussed beginning with number three.

The present study revealed that differences in instructor gender and status do not interact with each other to alter the perceived use of affinity-seeking strategies. Since previous studies had not turned toward such an avenue of research, this researcher was curious about such
interaction. Though this question did not yield significant results, it still provided insight into the affinity-seeking paradigm. To explain, this lack of significance occurs because gender and status differences appear to be two distinct variables. Though differences in gender and status were observed individually, one's gender and one's status were not found to have a meaningful bearing on each other.

For the researcher, this suggests that the status one has is minimally associated with one's gender when initiating attempts of liking; the inverse is also true. These results may have strong implications for future research on such subjects as superior/subordinate relationships, marital relationships, and generally any interpersonal relationships. In addition, further research should address why an interaction effect was not significant. Future study should focus on replicating the interaction variable and testing if the same holds true in other interpersonal relationships as well.

Likewise for the educator, these results may have strong implications for future research when instructor gender and status vary between each other. Though no interaction effect was found in the present study, future study needs to focus on different combinations of instructor gender and status, and especially their effect on student outcomes. For example, research needs to address such
questions as, "Is a female GTA's style of affinity-seeking strategies more effective than a female faculty member's style?", "More effective than a male GTA?", "More effective than a male faculty?", and the like. Research in such areas could prove highly useful for the field of pedagogy.

The first research question dealt with differences between GTA and faculty perceived use of affinity-seeking strategies. Overall, GTAs were perceived more likely to utilize a single strategy than faculty, that of Assume Equality. To interpret accurately these results, it is necessary to first examine a few characteristics of the average Graduate Teaching Assistant.

The average GTA is much closer in age to his/her students than the average faculty member. Further, because of this age factor, GTAs are more likely to perceive themselves similar to their students in terms of likes, dislikes, attitudes, and values; the inverse is also true. Therefore, the use of an affinity-seeking strategy, which attempts to make the student feel more equal to the instructor, appears only natural and instinctive. The GTA is merely taking advantage of the present state of conditions to produce affinity between him/herself and the student. Future study is needed which controls this age factor up to a certain limit, such as 23 to 24 years old, to further test the validity of this presumption.
One may also presume that faculty members do not utilize this strategy because they want social distance between themselves and their students, and want the student to realize who is in charge. To the contrary, perhaps those same aforementioned characteristics which cause the GTA to appear similar also cause the faculty member to appear distant; recall that student perceptions of instructor behavior were measured, not actual behaviors. In addition, perhaps this distance is so great that instructors choose to utilize other strategies more frequently, even though none were significant here. Whichever the case, if a GTA desires to increase liking between him/herself and the students, s/he is well advised to take advantage of the existing similarities on the level of social equality to do so. Finally, future research is needed which investigates the effectiveness of this strategy, whether actual liking is produced or not and, if so, was teaching effectiveness affected thereby.

The second question dealt with the extent to which GTA or faculty instructors' perceived use of affinity-seeking strategies varies as a function of faculty/GTA gender. Contrary to the other two research questions, differences in instructor gender produced several significant results. The ANOVA results will be first discussed, followed by the results from the factor analysis, and finally the two will
be combined and deliberated. Due to the limited size of the sample, the present study took a more conservative approach and only considered those ANOVA results which were significant at the \( p < .01 \) level.

Based on the results from the ANOVA procedures, female instructors were perceived more likely to exhibit strategies of Dynamism, Nonverbal Immediacy, Openness, Present Interesting Self, Sensitivity, and Similarity. Upon first inspection, these tactics are varied and constitute a range of dimensions. However, a closer examination does reveal similarities. To explain, both Dynamism and Nonverbal Immediacy are strategies which focus on some communication aspect. Dynamism, for example, includes being active, enthusiastic, animated, and using a range of vocal qualities; this is clearly a form of direct communication. Behaviors of Nonverbal Immediacy, essentially, are patterns of feedback, another direct form of communication. Female instructors, then, are perceived to utilize strategies which involve direct, open communication. This does not seem unlikely, since females have often been regarded as the more conversationally, or communication oriented gender. Past research has shown females to be more open and to engage more frequently in conversation than males.

Two additional strategies, Openness and Sensitivity, are behaviors which emphasize a dimension of character of
the instructor. Openness, for example, involves the disclosure of personal information to the student, perhaps to make the student feel trusted. To be open, then, requires a certain degree of confidence and trust in the recipient, as well as in oneself. Further, Sensitivity involves showing concern and caring for the student. This theme of concern might be explained by society's tendency to cast females in nurturing or mothering roles. Females for some time have been raised and portrayed as the more caring and supportive sex. Therefore, given society's interpretation, female instructors are merely using strategies which are more consistent and logical. In short, female instructors are perceived to be more open and concerned for their students in the classroom.

Finally, the strategies of Present Interesting Self and Similarity also appear complementary. Present Interesting Self is an attempt to initiate liking through the portrayal of self as someone worthy of knowing, such as demonstrating intelligence and knowledge. Similarity, then, is complementary because it involves the instructor showing how s/he and the student share similar attitudes and interests, or a person also worthy of knowing. It would appear, again, that female instructors are more open with their students than male instructors. However, why female instructors utilize this combination more than male instructors is still
unclear. Perhaps this ties in to females' use of other strategies which also emphasize openness and trust. Further research is needed which outlines in more detail why these strategies are female-typical.

While the ANOVA results provided certain informative value, the factor analysis added strength to the interpretation. Through factor analysis, four underlying factors were generated for female instructors' use of affinity-seeking strategies. These factors were labeled as Communication, Involvement, Openness, and Concern. From the ANOVA, certain strategies were combined and interpreted to mean that female instructors utilized more direct communication, were more open, and showed more concern with their students. Upon examination one can see definite similarities between the factor analysis results and those from the ANOVA. On balance, results from the factor analysis serve as a form of triangulation and reinforce what has been discussed thus far, that definite differences exist between female and male instructors' use of affinity-seeking strategies.

Implications

The results from the present study may have significant implications for future research, as well as pragmatic potential. Given that the body of research emphasizing the existence of gender differences has been strengthened by the
present study, future research is needed which explores the
effectiveness of these differences for the benefit of
education. Though past research has shown that the general
use of affinity-seeking strategies significantly increases
positive student outcomes, further study needs to focus on
specific strategies and which ones are more effective than
others. Knowledge of why different instructors utilize
different strategies should prove beneficial to those in the
field of pedagogy. Questions need to be raised such as,
"Can such liking strategies improve teaching?", "Are female
patterns of affinity-seeking strategies effective in
producing liking?", "Can these same strategies be effective
for males also?", and the like.

Given that relationships have been found to exist,
certain limitations to the present study need to be
discussed. For example, the subject of causality needs to
be addressed. Though the present study found patterns of
strategy use and gave an interpretation of these patterns,
future research needs to ask, "What actually causes female
instructors to utilize strategies different from males?"
Also, because the present study measured student perceptions
of instructor behavior, future research is needed which
observes actual instructor behavior before a true
theoretical base can be established.

Other possible limitations to the present study include
both the size of the instructor population and the sampling procedure itself. The present study surveyed the classrooms of 28 different instructors. Given this small size, a future study is needed which surveys a larger classroom population. Though reasons for the sampling procedure of the present study were justified, a future study needs to sample classrooms across the curriculum in other majors and disciplines. In short, a more random sampling procedure to generate the population is needed. Also, research focusing on how instructors in certain fields utilize affinity-seeking strategies compared to those in other fields is a possibility.

Overall, the present study has shown that different instructors are perceived to utilize different methods of presentation to get their students to like them and the course material. Also, the present study revealed certain patterns of perceived strategy use by different instructors, especially as a function of instructor gender. What becomes of concern now is whether these methods are effective, and if so which ones are more effective and why. The study of affinity-seeking strategies in the classroom shows great potential for future researchers, as well as educators.

Research has shown the ability to increase liking is a powerful and useful one in a variety of interpersonal contexts, including the classroom environment. When
students describe their instructor as one whom they like, more often than not this accompanies a variety of other positive relationships and outcomes. If not for anything else, future study of affinity-seeking strategies is warranted as a means of understanding these relationships and how they can be used to better the discipline of teaching and the field of education as a whole.
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APPENDIX
Appendix A

Questionnaire

Instructions: Please complete the following questionnaire based upon your perceptions of the instructor you have for this class. This questionnaire is completely confidential and your instructor will never see your results. For questions 1-25, rate the instructor using the following scale:

1 = Very Unlikely
2
3
4 = Neutral
5
6
7 = Very Likely

1. The instructor strives to be of assistance to you in whatever you are currently doing.

2. The instructor presents himself or herself as a person who has control over whatever is going on.

3. The instructor operates on a level of social equality with you.

4. The instructor acts comfortable and relaxed in settings shared with you.

5. The instructor allows you to assume control over certain class activities.

6. The instructor adheres closely to cultural rules for polite, cooperative interaction with you.

7. The instructor presents herself or himself as an active, enthusiastic person.

8. The instructor encourages you to talk by reinforcing your conversational contributions.

9. The instructor tries to maximize the positiveness of class related encounters with you.

10. The instructor includes you in her or his social groups.
11. The instructor uses the term "we" when referring to the class more often than "you and I."

12. The instructor listens actively and attentively to you.

13. The instructor signals interest in you through various nonverbal cues.

14. The instructor discloses personal information to you.

15. The instructor presents himself or herself to you as a positive person.

16. The instructor presents herself or himself to you as an independent, free-thinking person.

17. The instructor tries to look and dress as attractively as possible in your presence.

18. The instructor presents herself or himself to you as someone who would be interesting to know.

19. The instructor presents himself or herself in such a way that you perceive the instructor can reward you way.

20. The instructor demonstrates respect for you and helps you to "feel good" about yourself.

21. The instructor arranges the environment so as to come into frequent contact with you.

22. The instructor acts in a warm, empathic manner.

23. The instructor seeks to convince you that the two of you share many similar tastes and attitudes.

24. The instructor supports you in classroom arguments.

25. The instructor presents herself or himself to you as an honest, reliable person.

26. Your gender: A. Male B. Female

27. Year in school: A. Freshman B. Sophomore C. Junior D. Senior E. Graduate

28. Gender of your instructor: A. Male B. Female

29. Your instructor is a: A. Faculty Member B. Graduate Teaching Assistant