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ABSTRACT

THE INFLUENCE OF TEACHERS' CARING BEHAVIORS
ON HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS' BEHAVIOR AND GRADES

Educators have limited ways of improving student performance while participating in No Child Left Behind (NCLB), which mandates extensive testing and eliminates enriching educational programs. This study examines whether teacher caring makes a significant difference in students' grades and behavior. Bulach's (1998), Deiro's (1996), and Nodding's (1992) research on caring demonstrates that when students perceive their teachers as caring, their grades and behavior are positively influenced. The researcher utilizes Bulach's survey, "Characteristics of Teachers Caring Behaviors," to analyze 26 teachers' caring behaviors. Results show the influence of teacher caring on students' grades and behavior. High levels of anxiety-reducing behaviors show statistical significance with academic grades. There is also a high correlation between each of the five caring factors and average caring. The selected school is a private/parochial high school.
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CHAPTER I

Introduction

General Background of the Study

Educators search for improved ways to educate the student population and close the achievement gaps in the education system. They seek programs that significantly improve student performance (grades) and behavior in order to make students more successful. Government policies on education require teachers to achieve measurable goals and objectives and to hold teachers accountable for student performance. In this study, the researcher attempted to identify specific variables that could influence student performance by improving grades and positively affecting behavior.

Chapter I introduces the problem, discusses the purpose of the study, and indicates its significance. Research questions indicate the direction, influence, and relationship of the variables. The limitations and delimitations of the study and definition of terms follow these questions.

Statement of the Problem

Due to state and federal government mandates, educators are required to demonstrate significant improvement in student performance as determined by rigorous academic testing. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) has resulted in increased standardized testing, academic testing at the beginning of the year, and student support services that are supposed to improve educational outcomes significantly, meet state standards and national requirements, and improve student performance. However, the results of these programs have not achieved acceptable levels in all schools (Finn, Julian, & Petrilli, 2006). According to Hess (as cited in Bracey, 2007), no research to date has shown that
choice, socio-economic status, corrective action, or restructuring will accomplish the
goals of NCLB. According to Casserly (as cited in Bracey, 2007), the law never had any
theories about how to improve student achievement; therefore, educators have sought
programs that increase scores, improve performance, and pass state and federal
guidelines. Current policies identify students who are the “most academically needy”
based on poor grades and report cards (Lakewood Board of Education, 2006).

Current government programs and policies do not mention the influence of the
teacher’s relationship to the student; instead, the government demands accountability,
more testing, and stronger sanctions for poor performance. Consequently, educators
continue their search for approaches that improve student performance levels.

Educators face challenges from students who misbehave or prevent others from
learning (Rose & Gallup, 2003). The educational system has focused on support,
counseling, and social work services as a remedy for poor students’ performance without
the degree of success that has been desired. This raises the question, “How might teachers
change student behavior and improve students’ performance?” The research of Bulach
(1998), Deiro (1996), and Noddings (1992) on caring has provided some answers to this
question. These researchers have discovered that when students perceive their teachers as
genuinely caring, the resulting relationship significantly influences their grades, class
work, homework, attitude, motivation, and behavior. When teachers clearly and
obviously care about their students, the students’ attitudes, motivation, and behavior
change in a positive direction because they want to please those who care about them.
Students work harder, increase their learning, and strive for success in school (Bulach,
1998; Deiro, 1996; Shann, 1999).
Some principals in mainly minority schools have said that they have serious problems with too many kids dropping out, acting disrespectfully, and slipping through the system without learning. Researchers found evidence that schools with caring teachers were exactly what disadvantaged or at-risk students needed to help break downward spirals of failure (Comer, 1989; Hobbs et al., 1984; Meier, 1991; Schorr & Schorr, 1988; Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko, & Fernandez, 1989). Educators broke the downward cycle by caring about each individual student.

According to Spady (2006), critics of NCLB, such as Berliner (2005), Bracey (2007), and Kohn (2000), pointed to evidence about the effects of mandated testing and accountability programs on schools and students. These effects include (a) lower educator motivation and morale, (b) loss of numerous talented and creative educators, (c) severe narrowing of curriculum offerings, (d) major increases in student stress, (e) dysfunctional behavior, (f) failure rates and dropout rates, and (g) wholesale suppression of nontraditional educational approaches.

According to Kohn (2000), higher scores on standardized tests required by NCLB do not reflect meaningful improvement in teaching or learning. As Neill (2003, p. 225-226) states, "Many schools will be declared failing and may be forced to drop practices that work well". Already, highly regarded schools are failing. According to Kohn (2004), schools are not receiving the funding needed to improve and more test preparation is replacing instruction. Educational think-tanks demand higher standards and more testing. In response, schools are becoming test-prep factories to meet the demands of NCLB. Developmentally appropriate education, project-based learning, music, art, and field trips are suffering due to NCLB. There is now increasing pressure to segregate schools by
ethnicity, group classes by ability, criminalize behavior, and retain greater numbers of students in grades. In contrast to its stated goals, the results of NCLB could be greater numbers of students dropping out and fewer numbers graduating.

America’s public schools could become caring institutions where everyone “receives positive affirmation for kindness, empathy, and concern” (Oliner & Oliner, 1988, p. 258). To accomplish an ethic of caring in schools, teachers should become the role models. Students can learn from teachers who know the subject matter, who are equipped with pedagogical techniques, and who practice caring behaviors. These teacher-student relationships could positively influence students’ performance and behavior.

An ethic of caring is needed in schools (Wolfgramm, 1995). There have been dramatic increases in stress, violent behavior, bullying, and fighting among youth in America. These problems have placed teachers in the position of helping students become responsible and caring. This is not an easy task when considering the increasing enrollments, limited finances, and academic testing. In spite of these challenges, studies have demonstrated that caring teachers who develop caring relationships could make a difference.

The problem identified for this study is that educators have limited ways of improving student performance while required to participate in NCLB. This government-mandated program is failing educationally and contributing to the downfall and demise of the public schools. NCLB requires educators and educational systems to take approaches that run contrary to the research and literature on teachers’ caring behaviors. The approach of NCLB drives down student performance.

According to Ky Vu, San Francisco’s district director of state and federal
programs, data on NCLB have demonstrated that the achievement gap is widening between schools (Institute for Language & Education Policy, 2006). African Americans, Latinos, and low-income students are having more difficulty achieving adequate yearly progress (AYP) than Anglo and Asian students. In addition, an increasing number of schools are not achieving the NCLB standards as the years pass, which is resulting in an increasing number of schools receiving sanctions for not meeting the standards. Ky Vu also stated that it would take more than federal legislation to close the achievement gap in a district that has a mix of classes, races, neighborhoods, cultures, and history. The reported goal of proponents of NCLB is to destroy public schools by discrediting them (Kohn, 2004). The approach utilized raises the score requirements and difficulty of standardized tests in order to bring about the greater failure rate of students and schools (Redd, 2003). According to Linn (2006), it will be statistically impossible to achieve full compliance with NCLB by 2014. Based upon the research, Linn stated that 100% of the U.S. schools would be failing by that deadline.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to determine the influence of teachers’ caring behaviors on student performance (grades) and student behavior when students perceive varying degrees of teacher caring. Behavior is evaluated by the student’s ability to follow classroom rules, the number of discipline referrals and teacher evaluations; grades are evaluations of student work (Cotton, 1996). The researcher examined whether teacher caring made a significant difference in students’ behavior. By analyzing the relationships between teachers’ caring behaviors and the five factors of reducing anxiety, criticism, listening, reward, and friend to determine which of the five areas have the strongest
relationships with students’ behavior. Finally, the researcher investigated whether teacher caring made a significant difference in students’ grades.

Significance of the Study

Teachers have limited ways to help students effectively build close and trusting relationships. Deiro stated that by 1996, the research had not yet identified how teachers could exhibit caring behaviors so that students would work harder and achieve more. Deiro also stated that caring requires teachers to be equipped with principles and practical skills for building close and trusting relationships. Teachers have to convey caring for their students and openness to emotional connections by focusing on individual students, giving them attention, and supporting them (Deiro, 1996).

Some teachers have formed powerful bonds with students, which subsequently have had significant effects on the pro-social development of students (Deiro, 1996). Deiro also stated that the teacher’s ability to influence students, sometimes called referent power (French & Raven, 1960), is based upon the students’ admiration and respect for the teacher. This referent power has the student identifying with the teacher as a role model. Deiro (1996) acknowledged that students are willing to adjust their behavior so that they will not lose their teachers’ love and respect.

Students are influenced by teachers and model the social interactions they display. Shann (1999) found that students work harder and adjust their behavior for teachers who care for them. Shann’s findings (1999) showed that a caring approach could influence students and improve the school environment, culture, climate, behavior, grades, and motivation, as well as the students’ desire to be in school, to work hard, and to behave.
Caring teachers can make a significant difference in each student. According to Elias et al. (1997), teachers who exhibit caring behaviors and have positive relationships with their students have been the missing piece in the educational system. Until caring and the nature of the teacher-student relationship are given importance, one can not expect progress in areas such as student discontent, rebelliousness, hostility toward those in authority, intolerance, or the high dropout rate.

A caring teacher-student relationship can provide students with the motivation to want to succeed (Noddings, 1988). Caring relationships are not only associated with a decrease in behavior problems, but they also illustrate an increase in social and academic skills (Comer, 2001; O'Donnell et al., 1995). Noddings (1992) noted that “The structures of current schooling have worked against care, and at the same time, the need for care was perhaps greater than ever” (p. 20). According to Noddings (1996), a caring relationship precedes any engagement with subject matter.

The evidence reveals that student achievement is directly associated with effective teacher-student relationships (Deiro, 1996). If relationships between teachers and students are problematic, then transformation will not take place (Rothman, 1992). According to Noblit, Rogers, and McCadden (1995, p. 683), “Without the connection, teachers may have their subject-matter, knowledge, and the technical ability to teach, but the opportunities for real learning will be scarce because what the teacher does not have is the student”.

Additional research about caring behaviors could benefit students, teachers, staff, and administration. Research could identify the specific teacher behaviors that help students perceive that their teachers care. The research conducted by Bulach, Brown, and
Potter (1998) and Deiro (1996) supports the theory of caring and shows the influence of caring on student achievement, which is evaluated by grade point average (GPA), and indicates attitude toward learning and failure rate, and behavior, which can be measured by discipline referrals or teacher evaluations. Jenlick and Kinnucan-Welsch (1999) also support the need for staff development, administrative support and encouragement, and the implementation of an ethic of caring.

This study is guided by the following research questions.

**Research Questions**

1. What is the difference in the average scores for the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors and the students who receive behavior grades A, B, C, or D?

2. What is the difference in the scores for each of the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors and the students who receive behavior grades A, B, C, or D?

3. What is the relationship between the average score of teachers’ caring behaviors and the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors survey?

4. What is the difference in the average scores of teachers’ caring behaviors and students who have A, B, C, D, or F academic grades?

5. What is the difference in the average scores of the five factors of teachers’ caring behaviors and students who have A, B, C, D, or F academic grades?

**Limitations of the Study**

Outside events or threats to internal validity may occur even though the teachers were not present in the research setting. It may be difficult to avoid or minimize students wanting to help their teachers look good on the survey because of bias, favoritism, or concern for their teachers’ reputation. Students also may not want to be truthful if they
think their teacher will see how they answered the questions on the survey form. Threats may invalidate or prevent the possibility of generating results, such as discussion between the teachers or the influence of teachers on their students to respond favorably to the survey. Students may not want to cooperate when taking the survey. In addition, they may have a negative attitude towards their teacher, they may not want to share the truth about their teacher, or they may not want to be open and honest.

Limitations may also evolve from the teacher’s side. For example, the teacher may not be objective when recording the students’ behavior grades. Teachers may overlook infractions or misbehavior in the classroom. Teachers may not want to be honest and open about their students’ behavior.

The selected private/parochial high school in this study stressed high academic achievement, maintained a strong discipline system, and encouraged parental involvement. The school administrator stated that faculty and staff prepared the majority of the school’s students for college. The selected school also expels students with behavior problems. In fact, the sample in this study only has three students with the behavior grade of D, and no students received a behavior grade of F. Thus, there are few C, D, and F students in this sample. Therefore, there is not a significant number of students in this study who received poor grades for behavior.

The findings of this study may differ from the results of a public school setting that has no admission standards and higher tolerance for retention. These standards and expectations may affect the behavior in the school as well as academic achievement. In this study, only four students received an academic grade of D and 12 students received a failing grade.
An additional area needing investigation relates to the influence of parents and peers on behavior. Murdock and Miller (2003) stated that parents’ and peers’ influence might affect the motivation and attitude of students. Consequently, it may be difficult to separate the influence that these two groups have over students.

Finally, the sample size contains too few students with C, D, and F grades. The size of the sample was determined by power analysis, which offered a smaller sample for a margin of error of 5% (alpha = .05), 95% confidence level and response distribution of 50%. Power was set at .80 and a standard deviation of 1.2. If \( n = 949 \), then a sample of about 274 would be required, based on a table for determining sample size from a given population (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970).

*Delimitations of the Study*

This study involved only one school. This school is not representative of all high schools in the Northeast. The researcher focused on six classes of approximately 30 students each in one private/parochial high school. The teachers in these six classes taught Algebra I, Algebra II, Biology, Geometry, Sociology, and U.S. History. Three of the classes were honors classes and three of the classes were regular classes. The study occurred during the first period after lunch and did not include any other periods of the day. The parochial school would not be a representative population for generalizations to other school populations.

The researcher did not focus on the need for teacher training to create a caring learning environment, nor did he include elementary school, middle school, or college levels. The researcher did not include special education, inclusion models, or principal-
teacher relationships. This study did not include the dependent variables of climate and culture or the variables of administration and staff.

Definition of Terms Relevant to the Study

Categories of caring behaviors. According to Bulach (1998), caring behaviors fall into five factors as follows: (a) ability to reduce anxiety, (b) willingness to listen, (c) rewarding good behavior, (d) being a friend, and (e) appropriate use of criticism. There is an overall score for caring. In addition, there are separate scores for each of the five factors.

Grades. Students are evaluated and given grades or scores in each of their subject areas and courses. The grades are categorized as follows: As and Bs are considered good grades and Cs and Ds are considered poor grades.

No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The No Child Left Behind Act requires that all children be assessed each year in order to show adequate yearly progress in reading and mathematics (Finn, Julian, & Petrilli, 2006).

Private and parochial school. A special part of private school education is a school based upon religious affiliation. Unlike other religiously affiliated schools, the parochial school is not necessarily supported by a church, but may be independent in nature. It is governed by a Board of Directors and funded through tuition, donations, and fundraisers. This structure of financing distinguishes this type of parochial school from other church-supported parochial schools, independent schools, and tax-supported public schools (Relic, 2000).

Student performance. This is student achievement and/or an evaluation of student work in the form of grades (Cotton, 1996).
Organization of the Study

Chapter I includes an overview of caring behaviors and the type of influence they could have on student performance. The following are the six areas in Chapter I: Introduction, Statement of the Problem, Purpose of the Study, Significance of the Study, Research Questions, Limitations and Delimitations of the Study, and Definition of Terms.

Chapter II summarizes a review of the research and literature. The chapter includes the research and literature covering the area under study as well as those areas on which studies have focused in the past. It also includes the variables that appear in the conceptual framework.

Chapter III describes the research design, research questions, subjects of the study, sample size, instrumentation, method of study, and method of analysis.

Chapter IV includes a detailed analysis of data collected, the nature of the study, the survey questions, and the results of the survey.

Chapter V summarizes this study and includes conclusions and recommendations for future research. This chapter also includes a discussion of the data and what the results section indicates. Chapter V is followed by the list of references and appendixes.
CHAPTER II
Research and Literature Review

Introduction

Studies have shown that teachers’ caring behaviors significantly influence students’ behavior, relationships, education, and lives. Research on caring behaviors could influence school personnel to make the necessary changes to improve the current educational environment. Research has suggested the need to expand the body of research regarding caring behaviors to determine their potential impact, which has not yet been fully realized or appreciated.

The research and literature reviewed in this chapter are labeled and organized according to the following topics: Definitions of Caring, The Importance or Influence of Teacher Caring, How Teachers Can Develop Caring Relationships, Strategies To Enhance Teacher Caring For Students, Teachers Require Practical Skills, Examples of Teacher Caring in the Literature, Examples of Caring Programs and Studies, Research on Alternatives To Caring, Synthesis of the Research and Literature on Teacher Caring, and the Conceptual Framework.

Definitions of Caring

Noddings (1984), an educational researcher and theorist stated that the theory of “caring describes a certain kind of relationship with others” (p. 91). She used the term “caring” to describe something one does in a relationship, not a specific set of behaviors. She stated that every interaction is an option to relate in either a caring or non-caring manner. Caring is not a program or strategy, but rather a way of relating to students, their families, and each other that conveys compassion, understanding, respect, and interest
Noddings (1988) defined an ethic of caring as “acts done out of love and natural inclination” (p. 1) with the goal of helping each student “grow and actualize him (her) self” (Mayeroff, 1977, p. 1).

Noddings (1984) stated that the concept of caring applies to the notion of developing caring abilities. When a person cares, s/he really hears, sees, and feels what the other tries to convey. When two people care, they consider the other’s point of view and the other’s wants, needs, and expectations. To care is to act by affection and regard for the other. Noddings (1992) stated that there is no recipe for caring.

Education and the emotional needs of children cannot be separated, insisted Comer (1992), a child psychiatrist at the Child Development Center at Yale University. Children have a deep desire to feel that they belong. Comer (1992) stated, “You’ve got to provide an environment that allows children to feel wanted, valued, and accepted and one that allows them to accept you” (p. 4). Children who have had positive developmental experiences before school acquire beliefs, attitudes, values, and connections that help them succeed in school. These children are best able to relate positively to people in school and bond with them (Comer, 2001). He was talking about caring relationships.

Comer (1992) noted that in real estate, location is important, whereas in education, relationships are important.

Researchers need to identify specific caring behaviors so that teachers can know what behaviors show students that teachers really care about them. Lambert (1995) stated that researchers must explore the elements and behaviors of caring. Lambert also identified five basic elements of the caring process: faith in the student, respect, trust, perceived sincerity, and attentiveness. Caring teachers are perceived to be fair and place
value on the students as individuals. Tarlow’s (1994) research concluded that a caring person must be sensitive to the needs of others, act in their best interest, be emotionally invested, and do things that are helpful for others.

While there are many interpretations of caring behaviors as described previously, this researcher has chosen Bulach’s, Brown’s, and Potter’s (1998) definition as a way to operationalize the concept. These researchers identified five factors or categories of behaviors that teachers can use to create a caring learning community, including the ability to reduce anxiety, willingness to listen, rewarding of appropriate behavior, being a friend, and the appropriate use of positive and negative criticism. Within each factor are specific behaviors measured by a survey that can be administered to students.

Bulach, Brown, and Potter (1998) point out that the use of the caring behaviors identified in their research aligned with Maslow’s theory of motivation. For example, Reducing Anxiety (factor #1) meets students’ security needs. Calling students by name, greeting them as they enter the room, Listening (factor #2) and Being a Friend (factor #4) meet their needs of belonging. Rewarding Good Behavior (factor #3) and Appropriate Use of Criticism* (factor #5) meet students’ needs for self-esteem, which allows a student to focus on self-actualization needs so learning can occur. The authors conclude that if teachers practice the five factors of caring behaviors identified in this research, a “caring learning community” will more likely result and hopefully increased learning will occur.

The Importance of Teacher Caring

The concept of school as community includes emotional connections that are labeled as “caring” (Grant, 1988; Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Lightfoot, 1984; Sizer, 1984). The research showed that when schools were high in “community”, students
demonstrated the following positive outcomes: (a) higher educational expectations and academic performance, (b) stronger motivation to learn, (c) greater liking for school, (d) less absenteeism, (e) greater social competence, (f) fewer conduct problems, (g) reduced drug use and delinquency, and (h) higher academic achievement (Battistich et al., 1997; Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Hom & Battistich, 1995). Bryk and Driscoll found that students achieved higher math scores when variables such as caring were present.

Research has revealed that caring behaviors are important if one wants to create a climate for learning. For example, Bulach, Malone, and Castleman (1995) discovered a significant positive correlation \( r = .52 \) between climate and achievement. Two of the climate subscales in their study assessed caring behaviors. One subscale measured the levels of trust in a school building, and the other measured environment. Correlation data for these two subscales with the overall climate scores demonstrated a strong positive relationship (Bulach & Malone, 1994). Since the two subscales are part of caring behaviors, one could conclude that caring behaviors are important to create a climate for learning (Bulach, Brown, & Potter, 1998).

Researchers Murdock and Miller (2003) stated that students' assessments of the quality of their relationships with their teachers are an important predictor of their commitment to schooling. These relationships exist because students internalize the values and standards of their teachers when the relationship is characterized by mutual respect and admiration (Battistich, Solomon, Watson, & Schaps, 1997; Connell & Wellborn, 1991). However, Murdock and Miller (2003) also stated that few researchers have examined the role that teacher-student relationships play in student motivation, since parents and peers also influence student motivation. There is a paucity of
longitudinal data on students' relationships, motivation, and achievement, constraining researchers' knowledge of whether students' reported relationships with teachers affect their motivation and behavior or whether students with higher motivation and achievement view their relationships with teachers more positively (Murdock & Miller, 2003). The researchers sought to separate the independent or unique effects on student motivation and behavior of groups such as teachers, parents, and peers through the use of regression analyses. Studies have focused on middle grade students because of the documented declines in both motivation and the quality of teacher-student relationships during this period (Eccles & Midgley, 1989; Eccles et al., 1993).

Studies confirmed that two components of caring predict students' school engagement (Farrell, 1990; Fine, 1991; Murdock, 1999; Wehlage & Rutter, 1986; Wentzel, 1997, 1998b). Students' perceived caring from teachers comprised both a demonstrated commitment to student learning and general respect and courtesy (Hayes, Ryan, & Zeller, 1994; Wentzel, 1997). Murdock and Miller (2003) found that teacher caring includes interpersonal support and respect, and behaviors that demonstrate a commitment to student learning, such as high expectations and coming to class prepared to teach.

The findings of Murdock and Miller (2003) indicated that teacher caring makes the largest unique contribution to intrinsic valuing of education, followed by self-efficacy and teacher-rated effort. In addition to teacher caring, the study also defined and assessed pedagogical caring, students' perceptions of teachers' willingness, preparedness, and competence to teach. The perceived teacher caring variable was positively associated with each of the three grade-eight motivational variables, accounting for 21% of variance
in academic self-efficacy ($r = .459$), 14% of the variance in intrinsic valuing ($r = .370$), and 6.8% of the variance in teacher-rated effort ($r = .262$).

The study suggested that a researcher should examine how perceived teacher caring and student motivational variables change over time. A perceived positive relationship with one’s teacher might help to compensate for the feeling of a lack of educational support from one’s friends and family members. Recent observational studies confirmed a high consistency between students’ reports of teachers’ caring behaviors and classroom observations of similar phenomena (Murdock, et al., 2002; Patrick, Turner, Meyer, & Midgley, 2001). Patrick et al. (2001) found evidence of decreased motivation in classes where less supportive teachers’ behaviors were evident. Therefore, teachers should recognize that students are good judges of teacher’s behaviors and react to teacher’s traits through their engagement in the classroom.

Research has indicated that a teacher’s respect and ethical use of power are key to the students’ perception of caring. With respect, teachers can communicate caring to students when disciplining them, correcting their assignments, lecturing, or playing with them (Deiro, 2003). The teacher’s power is based upon the student’s admiration and respect for the teacher. This referent power has the student identifying with the teacher as a role model. The student is willing to adjust his/her behavior because s/he does not want to lose the love and respect of his/her teacher (Deiro, 1996).

Teachers who have bonded with students have made powerful impacts on their lives. When that occurred, the students were confident that their teacher cared for them. They enjoyed being near their teacher and oriented toward their teacher’s likes and dislikes (Deiro, 1996). Successful adults in a longitudinal study (Werner & Smith, 1992)
reported that a favorite teacher really made a difference in their lives. The teacher was not only an academic instructor but also a confidant and a positive role model.

If people care for children and model positive social and ethical qualities, the children are likely to develop those qualities in themselves (Noddings, 2002). How good one can be is partly a function of how others receive and respond to the giver. The virtues one demonstrates are completed or fulfilled in the other (Noddings, 1984).

Research has indicated that students need to feel that their teachers care about them, want the best for them, and are invested in their success before students will give their full effort. According to Shann (1999), student and teacher perceptions support the findings that the highest achieving schools combine an emphasis on academics with a culture of caring that reflect higher rates of pro-social behaviors and lower rates of antisocial behaviors among students. Further, school differences favoring more positive perceptions of teacher caring and commitment have corresponded to higher rates of academic achievement in those schools.

**How Teachers Can Develop Caring Relationships**

Noddings (1992) stated that to build community relationships, people must care for each other. Sarason (1974) articulated the Psychological Sense of Community (PSoC), which focuses on the interaction of individuals and their social contexts. Sarason noted that this experience of individuals was awkward to define, similar to love, yet one knew when it was present or absent. He described and understood community as more hands-on or personal than quantitatively measured.

According to McMillan and Chavis (1986), PSoC has four elements: (a) membership or a feeling of belonging and acceptance, utilizing a personal investment and
boundaries; (b) integration, which includes a sense of making a difference to a group, with bidirectional influence; (c) integration and the fulfillment of needs involving a feeling that the community and individual will meet each others’ needs; and (d) a shared emotional connection that includes an emotional bond that builds over time with energy and effort. According to Larrivee (2000), putting community building into practice requires the following steps: (a) creating a means for open and ongoing dialogue with students; (b) getting to know students and their backgrounds by taking an interest in their life stories; (c) infusing the classroom with community-building experiences as part of the methods, structures, and content learning; and (d) responding to students with acknowledgment and acceptance, listening to students, soliciting their opinions, valuing their ideas, and demonstrating a belief that they are capable.

The literature has indicated that four critical teacher characteristics promote a caring learning environment among the members of the community (Larrivee, 1999). These four characteristics include respect, authenticity, thoughtfulness, and integrity. Respect is conveyed through respectful dialogues with students. Teachers who respect their students create trust. They are willing to understand their students’ points of view and opinions. Students value what each has to offer the other and expresses what is important to them without fear of judgment. From the experience of being shown consideration and care, children learn self-respect (Larrivee, 1999).

Authentic teachers know who they are and what they stand for. These teachers are real and “walk their talk.” They speak the truth with care and thoughtfulness. They respond honestly to students. Authentic teachers are not afraid to make mistakes and the students know it. They create a climate where students also feel safe enough to be
authentic. These teachers are open and accepting of students and encourage them to express their feelings and opinions, without interpretation, judgment, or trying to rescue. In a classroom where authenticity is valued, both the teacher and the students share and express what they care about (Larrivee, 1999).

Thoughtful teachers consider the emotional well-being of their students in every interaction. This includes showing tolerance and acceptance for their classmates. Students cooperate by working together for a common purpose and mutual goals. Students can rely on one another to be considerate of their needs, wants, desires, and fears (Larrivee, 1999).

Emotional integrity includes honest communication and mutual vulnerability. Teachers who have emotional honesty deal with emotions as they emerge and keep resentment from settling in to erode their relationships with students. They also validate students' rights to express their feelings, which helps build bridges to students. Teachers provide students with feedback regarding the impact of their behavior. Emotional integrity also means confronting students' behavior by respectfully challenging them and making them accountable (Larrivee, 1999).

According to Deiro (1996), a teacher-student relationship focuses on nurturing behavior and support to build close and trusting connections. In order to develop close and trusting relationships with students, teachers need to convey caring for students and openness to emotional connections. It is important for teachers to reach out and make connections with students, because this is what connects students to learning and their world (Darling-Hammond, 1998; Lieberman, 1996). Teachers need to reflect on and experiment with how to establish relationships of care and trust with their students and get to know their students better without intruding into their private lives and violating
their dignity (Noddings, 1996).

Students need adults who care about them. According to the UNICEF Report (2007), the United States is one of the worst places for children. The report includes the statement that the U.S. has the most children living with step-parents and in single-parent families and is low-ranking when it comes to families eating together for main meals. The United States is a nation that needs to do more for its children by caring for them.

What is critical is that students perceive their teachers as caring, a sentiment that is created by a respectful communication style (Deiro, 1996). Caring is shown by treating students respectfully, listening to them, knowing their names, dialoguing with them, soliciting their opinions, valuing their ideas, and believing they are capable. When teachers correct or guide them, showing them their mistakes provides students with additional opportunities to learn and develop the skills to become successful adults.

The literature has confirmed that a key criterion of the authoritative parenting model consists of treating children firmly with dignity and respect (Glenn, 1982; Glenn & Nelsen, 1988). This model includes such parental behaviors and attitudes as (a) controlling children by explaining rules and decisions and reasoning with them, (b) listening to their points of view even if they are not always accepted, (c) setting high standards for children's behavior and encouraging them to be independent, (d) being demanding of children in developmentally appropriate ways, (e) separating children's personal worth from their behavior, and (f) using discipline as an opportunity to teach children and to help them become independent (Briggs, 1977; Cole & Cole, 1989; Glenn, 1982). These behaviors communicate thoughtfulness and respect for children (Baumrind, 1971; Glenn, 1982; Glenn & Nelsen, 1988; Hoffman, 1970).
The authoritative model of parenting also provides insights into how to communicate caring to students. Education literature has little information about how teachers can develop caring relationships with students. However, parenting literature is rich with research that provides insights and guidance on how best to communicate caring to children (Deiro, 2003). One can apply the research that promotes closeness and trust between parent and child to the area of developing closeness and trust between teacher and student. Most behaviors and attitudes advocated by the authoritative model of parenting have been shown empirically to increase feelings of closeness and trust between child and parent (McNabb, 1990).

Darling-Hammond (1998) addressed what teachers need to know that supports student learning. She stated that a skillful teacher finds out what students know and believe and how learners hook into new ideas. She added that teachers should be able to inquire about, listen, and look at student work to create situations in which students write and talk about their experiences. According to Darling-Hammond (1998, p. 5), “Motivating students requires an understanding of what individual students believe about themselves, what they care about, and what tasks are likely to give them enough success to encourage them to work hard and to learn”. According to Wolfgramm (1995), educators can demonstrate caring by asking themselves the following questions:

1. How well do I know my students?
2. What do I know about their likes and dislikes, interests and goals, or special talents?
3. How often do I sincerely compliment individual students for work well done?
4. How much time do I spend one-on-one with each student?
5. When I do spend time with individual students; is it primarily disciplinary or is it a positive experience?

6. Does my interest in each student extend beyond the classroom to their out-of-school activities?

7. How often do I communicate with parents in sharing positive things about their child’s progress or in seeking their help in making school a more positive experience for their child?

An emotional attachment to teachers, peers, and school is essential for academic success (Hawkins et al., 1992; Solomon et al., 1992). How one demonstrates caring to students determines whether or not s/he is more likely to respond with caring toward him/herself and others (Elias et al., 1997). In a safe and caring environment, students feel open to express themselves and risk making mistakes because they know they are accepted. Teachers provide safe, firm boundaries and model respectful, supportive interaction with others. Educators accomplish this by communicating caring in their teaching, inspiring students to identify with them, and causing students to feel hopeful about their ability to learn.

*Strategies to Enhance Teacher Caring for Students*

Research has indicated that it is essential to identify not only what secondary teachers do to nurture bonds, but also how they communicate to students that they really care. Deiro (1996) expressed six strategies to develop a nurturing and caring environment through teacher behavior. High school teachers create one-on-one time with their students and maximize individual and small group activities, intersperse personal and academic talk and conduct personal conversations during non-class time, write comments
on students' papers and use nonverbal communication such as direct eye contact, and touch kids on the shoulder, arm, back, or other safe areas because physical closeness builds trust and rapport. Caring teachers disclose personal information about themselves that is pertinent to the needs of the students, but they exercise discretion about what information they share. Students feel an emotional link to teachers and trust that the teachers are attentive and responsive to the students' needs.

In an influential relationship such as a student-teacher relationship, a close, intimate bond is inappropriate. However, self-disclosure involves sharing and exposing the teachers' own feelings, attitudes, and experiences to students in a way that will be helpful to the students. The personal information enhances the learning process by building a bridge between the teachers and the students. Teachers can share stories that could have happened to anyone but not about their own personal lives (Deiro, 1996). Teachers establish and maintain high academic standards for their students and communicate a belief in their students' capacity to meet these expectations. Teachers network with parents, family, friends, and neighbors of students to establish a common ground with common histories on which to build caring connections. They encourage students to take risks, make honest disclosures, and share personal information with classmates. Teachers use rituals and traditions and have everyone participate, which helps build a sense of community by fostering a feeling of comfort and belonging. These strategies represent a variety of ways secondary teachers bond successfully with their students without compromising their primary responsibility for the cognitive development of students (Deiro, 1996).
Noddings (1984) stated that the field of education should set a goal of producing caring people. A teacher approaches this goal through modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation. Modeling demonstrates how to care in one's own relationship with those for whom they care. Dialogue is a common search for understanding, empathy, and appreciation. Dialogue helps both parties seek sufficient information to arrive at well-informed decisions (Noddings, 1992). Dialogue also provides individuals with knowledge of each other to form a caring relationship (Noddings, 2002). Participants in a caring relationship must maintain an openness to discuss any issue or topic. This takes the willingness to listen, share, and respond (Noddings, 1984). A participant can remind the other of his/her strengths, reminisce, express concern, have a good laugh, or connect with the other as cared-for. Dialogue always involves attention to the other participant, not just to the topic under discussion.

If one wants people to approach moral life prepared to care, then one needs to provide opportunities for them to gain the skills in care giving. As a result, many high schools have begun to require community service as a means of giving their students practice in caring. Furthermore, teachers can model caring effectively (Noddings, 2002). Confirmation is an act of encouraging the best in others (Buber, 1965). One identifies something admirable or struggling to emerge in each person. The person working toward a better self must see the goal as worthy and morally acceptable (Noddings, 1992).

In addition, caring requires continuity because caring is a loving act founded on a relationship of depth. To accomplish a deeper relationship, Noddings (1992) emphasized continuity in teaching. She stated that teachers and students should remain together over a period of three years. When one knows that a student responds positively to certain topics
and tasks, then one is in a better position to guide him/her sensitively. Noddings also suggested that teachers commit to teaching more than one subject to achieve a higher level of cognitive achievement and more caring (Noddings, 1984).

Success occurs when the teacher cares for the student and the student receives the teacher’s caring. The notion of reciprocity in a caring relationship means that the one cared for must be willing to receive the caring. When this is absent, so is caring (Noddings, 1984). The student has the greatest effect on the relationship as the one cared-for. If the student perceives the teacher’s caring and responds to it, then s/he is giving the teacher what s/he needs most to continue to care. The student rewards the teacher with responsiveness, questions, effort, comments, and cooperation, which complete the caring.

**Teachers Require Practical Skills**

According to Deiro (1996), teachers require principles and practical skills for building close and trusting relationships. Goodlad (1990) stated that the skills, understandings, and sensitivities necessary to make a caring relationship work are often not automatically acquired as one becomes an adult. Teachers require relational skills, such as effective communication, empowering skills, conflict resolution, negotiating skills, and accountability skills that are teachable, along with genuineness, a nonjudgmental attitude, and respectfulness. Teachers can model these skills in their own classrooms and use discussion time for students to reflect on teacher behaviors that helped them develop caring connections with their professors. A vital aspect of teaching nurturing behaviors is modeling nurturing behaviors (Deiro, 1996).

Teachers who care about their students hope to develop in their students an importance as well as capacity for caring and being cared for. As stated by Jenlick and
Kinnucan-Welsch (1999, p. 369), "An ethic of caring and a capacity for caring provided balance within the learning setting and demonstrated that caring for students needs to be balanced by caring about teaching practices and ideas of learning that are used by teachers' personal, practical knowledge to connect with students".

**Examples of Teacher Caring in the Literature**

Arrowsmith (1985) stated that teaching is an activity resembling love with a sense of compassion and care for the young and their fulfillment. One teacher stated that if one could not love students, one could not teach them (Wolfgramm, 1995). That teacher would give students a hug and a warm greeting. A bond of love and respect developed between the teacher and his students.

A high school teacher can make a difference in students' achievement and behavior. For example, Jaime Escalante's caring behavior influenced students' achievement and behavior. His caring approach to his underprivileged students along with his high expectations brought him love, respect, and high achievers in the High School Mathematics Advanced Placement program. He insisted that he needed three years of continuity with his students (Escalante, 1990). According to Noddings (1992), Escalante recognized that students needed to know that someone cared for them as people. In a low moment, they would continue to work on mathematics out of trust and love for their teacher until better times would come along.

One can question whether or not the students in Escalante's class were successful because of caring behavior and teacher continuity or because the students also possessed mathematical intelligence as developed by Gardner (1991). Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences advances eight different intelligences to account for a wide range of human
potential. Gardner stated that our teachers focus most of their attention on linguistic and mathematical intelligence. He said that we should also place equal value on students who show strengths in other intelligences. Many students who have these other intelligences do not receive attention for them in school. According to Gardner, these students end up being labeled “learning disabled,” “attention deficit disorder,” or underachievers when students do not learn by an approach which addresses linguistic or mathematical intelligence.

Examples of Caring Programs and Studies

Research has shown that effective caring programs tend to improve students’ behavior and help them develop better skills at managing interpersonal problems, which positively affect their ability to learn (Aber, Jones, Brown, Chaudry, & Samples, 1998; Caplan, Weissberg, Grober, Sivo, Grady, & Jacoby, 1992; Elias, Gara, Schuyler, Brandon-Miller, & Sayette, 1991; Hawkins, Catalano, Morrison, O’Donnell, Abbot, & Day, 1992; Weissberg, Barton, & Shriver, 1997; Weissberg, Gullotta, Hampton, Ryan, & Adams, 1997). The education marketplace is crowded with programs that are designed to create caring schools but lack a strong research base. The Collaborative for Academic Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL) based at the University of Illinois in Chicago was formed to advance the science and practice of caring by defining the field and providing a forum for high-quality scientific research. There have been no large quantitative studies describing the use of an ethic of caring in schools and what may result from such an approach. Small studies that are available include Mecca (1995), Noblit, Rogers, and McCadden (1995), and Shann (1999).
The literature has revealed that a caring atmosphere and effective classroom management foster children's development and guide them to respect other people, their environment, and their own learning. The positive change is achieved by implementing the Responsive Classroom approach, a social curriculum developed by the Northwest Foundation for Children in Greenfield, Massachusetts. This approach includes morning meetings, rules and logical consequences, guided discovery, classroom organization, academic choice, assessment, and reporting to parents. Students receive instruction in the social skills of cooperation, assertion, responsibility, empathy, and self-control within the context of daily classroom life. They help the teachers create a respectful, caring learning community that promotes both academic and social competence. The teachers read and discuss Teaching Children to Care: Management in the Responsive Classroom. This reading is followed by a three-day workshop to learn about the components of the Responsive Classroom approach. They explore how to use encouraging language and model desired social behaviors. This representative sample of school personnel validates their belief in the importance of allocating time at the beginning of the school year to create a safe, caring classroom environment to stimulate learning and community.

A midyear evaluation included teacher feedback, which was positive and supportive of the program. They observed more caring behavior and teamwork. Students appeared calmer, which gave them the opportunity to learn more. The principal recognized that something powerful was happening in the school (Horsch, Chen, & Nelson, 1999). After three years of school-wide implementation, the approach made a significant difference in the school. Students' behavior improved and children developed social skills, used friendlier language, looked forward to morning meetings, knew what to
expect during the day, felt a sense of stability, and were trusted to grow and improve. Parents noticed changes such as an expanded circle of friends and a greater sense of empathy and caring for peers. There were positive effects on academic achievement, improved standardized test scores, increased attendance, fewer discipline problems, and teachers could engage students in more learning activities (Horsch, Chen, & Nelson, 1999).

According to the research of Lewis, Schaps, and Watson (1996), who founded the Child Development Project, five principles can create environments where children care about one another and care about learning: (a) warm, supportive, stable relationships; (b) constructive learning, in which teachers support and extend children’s natural efforts to learn; (c) a challenging curriculum; (d) intrinsic motivation (prizes and rewards can diminish interest in the activity itself by focusing children’s attention on the reward, and by implying that the task is not inherently worthwhile (Kohn, 1994); and (e) attention to social and ethical dimensions of learning.

Research on Alternatives to Caring

One could investigate self-efficacy and its influence on student achievement, grades, and behavior to determine whether self-efficacy has a greater influence on the dependent variables. When self-efficacy is included in statistical models with self-concept, academic background, and gender, self-efficacy is a strong predictor of academic performance and mediates the influence of other determinants (Pajares, 1995). Bandura (1986) stated that individuals possess a self-system that enables them to exercise control over their thoughts, feelings, actions, and behavior. Human behavior results from the interplay between this self-system and external environmental sources of influence.
Perceptions of efficacy influence behavior in several ways. First, they influence the choice of behavior. Second, the greater the sense of self-efficacy, the greater the effort expended and the greater the persistence. Self-efficacy beliefs are important influences on behavior because they mediate the relationship between knowledge and action. Self-beliefs are strong predictors of individuals’ performance. Researchers have established that self-efficacy beliefs are correlated with other self-beliefs and with academic outcomes and that self-efficacy is a strong predictor of related academic outcomes (Pajares, 1995).

Murdock and Miller (2003) indicated that teacher caring makes the largest unique contribution to intrinsic valuing of education, followed by self-efficacy and teacher-rated effort. Data has suggested that higher-quality teacher-student relationships predict stronger motivation. Studies also indicated that perceived teacher caring is a much better predictor of the variance in values than either self-efficacy or teacher-rated effort.

Prillaman et al. (1994) stated that two divergent approaches exist on the subject of school reform. One approach focuses on standards and achievement and the other on caring. However, they may not be mutually exclusive. A school climate based upon a culture of caring may actually be a necessary condition for maximal school achievement (Shann, 1999). When schools focus on the social and emotional needs for caring, the academic success teachers strive for will happen naturally (Shann, 1989). Students learn better when these needs are met (Coleman, 1985a, 1987b; Earls, Beardslee, & Garrison, 1987).

Policymakers, who oppose the caring approach, argue that schools can be more effective by tightening controls, raising standards, and increasing competition.
Proponents of programs such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB), retention in grade, and testing in pre-school and kindergarten claim that these programs have been implemented to improve students' performance. However, the evidence has revealed that programs like NCLB can be detrimental in schools. As a result of NCLB, kindergarten and first-grade students are stressed from the pressures of testing, homework, and increased demands to improve performance. Hultgren, principal of Lafayette Elementary School in Boulder, Colorado, stated that district reading tests administered three times a year help teachers determine what is working. However, the pressure to improve scores makes it hard for teachers to remain sensitive to the important qualities in children that tests cannot measure, such as diligence, creativity, and potential. It is hard for these teachers to nurture those students who develop more slowly. Hultgren stated that educators are creating an environment that is less friendly to children. She added that by the third grade, students are burning out and beginning to resist, as reported in Newsweek (Tyre, 2006).

These programs point toward the academic criteria for making decisions about students. They do not take into account the whole child. The approaches were instituted to improve students' performance without affecting students' emotional needs or their need for caring behaviors. As part of their research, Nodding (1984, 1995), Bulach (1998), Comer (1992), Goleman (1995), and Deiro (1996) stated that educational programs must include caring to succeed.

McLaughlin and Talbert (1990) suggested that students' personal bonds with adults in school have a greater capacity to motivate and engage students academically than do the more traditional forms of social controls that emphasize obedience to
authority or conforming to rules. Referent power between teachers and students comes from the student liking or wanting to be like that teacher. It is the power of charisma. In wanting to be like others, people become close with others. Those with referent power can use it for coercion when it is used to threaten social exclusion (French & Raven, 1960). The research has indicated that referent power is the most effective approach, whereas coercive and legitimate powers are the least effective for changing behavior and learning (French & Raven, 1960; Golanda, 1990; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Stahelski & Frost, 1987). The latter two types of power alter behavior temporarily and do not induce long-term growth, change, and learning (Deiro, 1996). This researcher selected caring as an approach to students because it has long-term effects on the recipients of caring behaviors and has a significant influence on student performance.

Synthesis of the Research and Literature on Teacher Caring

Noddings (1984, 1988) and Gilligan (1982) stated that caring is a way of being in a relationship that cannot be determined by any one specific behavior. Unfortunately, Gilligan’s research may not be reliable. Hoff-Sommers (1994) stated that Gilligan does not have data for her research. She also stated that Gilligan used unreliable evidence, and researchers have not been able to replicate that work. In addition, samples were too small. Bulach (1998) and Deiro (1996) stated that caring could be determined by specific behaviors that teachers exhibit toward students. Latent variables such as teachers’ caring behaviors can quantitatively measure teacher caring and its influence on student behavior and performance.

Teachers could utilize their caring behaviors to influence student performance, behavior, and grades. They could strengthen their relationships with students and
influence them when students perceive that their teachers really care. The research has demonstrated that caring behaviors influence student performance, student behavior, grades, motivation, and attitudes toward learning.

Much of the research on caring behaviors has involved elementary education and middle school; there is limited research at the high school level. Therefore, the need exists for greater study in this area. In this realm, educators will have the opportunity to influence students who are still in school but will soon face the outside world and experience life on their own. The influence a teacher has on a high school student could make a significant difference in that student’s career and life. A researcher could take into account what the current research states about younger students and determine if those findings apply to the high school level.

The above research and literature review supports a conceptual and theoretical framework in which the major concepts or factors have been identified within the research and the literature. The research and literature review on caring has suggested the significant influence of caring on student performance, academic achievement (grades), and behavior. The researcher examined teachers’ caring behaviors and their influence on student performance.

The research and literature review combined with this study answered the five research questions. This study may point out the future direction of education and government policies in order to achieve greater success with students’ performance. For example, increasing latent variables and teachers’ caring behaviors could influence student performance.
After reviewing the research and literature on caring, one could say that the concept of caring is potentially a powerful tool in the teaching and learning process. The research has indicated the most widely implemented methods that help all students learn more successfully. The methods have been successful with students of all ages and ability levels, including those who do not learn in traditional ways. The following are some of the different teaching and learning strategies: accelerated learning techniques, arts in education, assessment alternatives, character education, cooperative learning, differentiated instruction, emotional intelligence, learning styles, multiple intelligences, and thinking skills. These strategies are most effective when they are applied in positive, supportive environments where there is recognition of the emotional, social, and physical needs of students and where individual strengths are recognized, nurtured, and developed. Educators need to continue to build the teaching and learning strategies area as an effective means for teachers and students to focus on improved academic achievement and strive to meet new academic standards. Teachers could use the knowledge gained in caring to influence their students’ achievement, behavior, and passion for learning.

At this time, government policies and school districts are demanding improved achievement test scores, teacher competence, and successful learning. Caring behaviors could make a significant contribution to these endeavors and goals. The influence of increased caring behaviors has not yet been fully realized and needs to be explored and implemented in schools across the nation.

*Conceptual Framework and Model*

How do teachers’ caring behaviors influence student performance? Teachers can relate to their students through varying degrees of caring behaviors. The different
behaviors and the intensity of those behaviors can be measured by means of a Likert-type survey instrument. The survey instrument generates data about students' perceptions of teacher caring. The data assists the researcher in analyzing whether or not teachers as perceived by students exhibit 26 caring behaviors measured by the survey. The data from this survey instrument helps the researcher determine whether their teacher has a high level of caring or low level of caring.

During class sessions, students may be off-task, may misbehave, or may not follow the rules. When these incidents occur, the teacher can redirect students. The teacher can grade the level of each student's behavior in the classroom. The researcher investigated the relationship between the student's behavior grade and the level of caring. The data analyses helped the researcher understand the relationship between the teachers' caring behaviors score and the student's behavior grade, which was determined by the teacher. This study supports the notion that increases in teachers' caring behaviors will decrease behavior problems during class and improve students' behavior.

The research and literature revealed that teachers' caring behaviors influenced attitudes towards learning, behavior, discipline, and grades. The researcher studied teachers' caring behaviors to investigate whether or not student performance can be improved by this variable. By surveying students (Appendix A) for the 26 caring behaviors that teachers can exhibit towards students, the researcher was able to determine which caring behaviors were used in each classroom and the strength of those behaviors. If the data reveals that caring behaviors influence student performance, then teachers can improve student performance by increasing teachers' caring behaviors toward their students. The goal is to increase the number and intensity of teachers' caring behaviors
and improve student performance, behavior, and grades.

Based on the research and the literature review, the following diagram depicts the conceptual model that undergirds this study.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 1. Conceptual model.*

Figure 1 depicts the findings of Bulach (1998), Deiro (1996), and Noddings (1992) that a relationship exists between teachers' caring behaviors and student behavior, and between teachers' caring behavior and the five factors (Bulach, 1998). Gay (1995, p. 361) wrote, “The basic causal-comparative design involves two groups differing on some independent variable” (grades) “and comparing them on some dependent variable” (teachers' caring behaviors scores). This model also shows that a change in teachers' caring behaviors and the five factors of teachers' caring behaviors can make a difference in students' grades (GPA).
CHAPTER III
Design and Methodology

Introduction

The research design presented in Chapter III is non-experimental and includes a combination of causal comparative and correlational methods. Also presented are the research questions that focus on the relationships between the variables and the difference between the variables within this study. The subjects, sample size, and instrumentation are described, followed by the methods of study and analysis.

Research Design

The design is non-experimental, indicating that the study does not have a comparison or control group. Although the strongest designs for studying cause and effect are experimental, educational researchers are often faced with situations where neither a randomized experiment nor quasi-experiment is feasible (Johnson, 2001).

The clearest way to classify non-experimental quantitative research is based on the primary research objective. The research objective of this study is explanatory for two reasons.

First, the researcher is trying to develop or test a theory about a phenomenon to explain how and why it operates. Second, the researcher is trying to explain how the phenomenon operates by identifying the causal factors that produce change in it. For these two reasons, this study design is identified as explanatory non-experimental research (Johnson, 2001).

The cross-sectional method (Johnson, 2001) is useful in situations where an experimental design is not feasible. The cross-sectional method is conducted one time
with no follow-up attempts. The data are directly applied to each case at that single time period and comparisons are made across the variables of interest.

In this study, a cross-sectional survey was administered to a convenience sample. This method is used in explanatory research when there are limited resources, time, and funding. As the name implies, the sample is selected because it is convenient. This non-probability method is often used during preliminary research efforts to get a gross estimate of the results when a random sample is not possible (Creswell, 2003).

This study includes a combination of causal comparative and correlational methods, which involve a categorical independent and/or dependent variable. The causal comparative method involves the comparison of two or more groups. The study also uses a correlational method that determines the relationship between the two quantitative variables.

This study intended to reveal what relationships might exist between perceived teacher caring and students' behavior as measured by teachers' grades. The researcher analyzed the relationships between the mean scores of the teachers' caring behaviors and each of the five factors to determine which of the five factors has the strongest relationships with students' behavior. Finally, the researcher investigated differences in the teachers' caring behaviors and students' academic grades. The teachers' caring behaviors were analyzed with the teachers' reported grades. The analyses of the data revealed to what extent a change in teachers' caring behaviors made a difference in students' grades.
Research Questions

This study was guided by the following questions:

1. What is the difference in the average scores for the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors and the students who receive behavior grades A, B, C, or D?
2. What is the difference in the scores for each of the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors and the student’s who receive behavior grades A, B, C, or D?
3. What is the relationship between the average scores of teachers’ caring behaviors and the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors survey?
4. What is the difference in the average scores of teachers’ caring behaviors and students who have A, B, C, D, or F academic grades?
5. What is the difference in the average scores of the five factors of teachers’ caring behaviors and students who have A, B, C, D, or F academic grades?

Subjects

The study population consists of students in grades 9-12, ages 14-17, who attend one private/parochial high school in the northeast United States. The sample population consists of a total of 131 students in six classrooms.

Sample Size

This study focused on 131 students in six classes. Calculation for the sample size was based on the normal distribution. The high school population size was 949 students. Selection of the confidence interval was 95 percent. The response distribution for each question was expected to be 50 percent, which was considered to be a conservative choice (Raosoft, 2006). The power was set at .80 and standard deviation was set at 1.2. This sample size would have achieved significant results if there had been sufficient
number of C, D, and F students. However, this sample lacked students with lower grades.

**Instrumentation**

The researcher selected “A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher” (Appendix A) because it had reliability and validity based upon Bulach’s (1998) research. The survey instrument was presented to students in the form of statements describing how frequently the students’ teacher used each behavior. The survey contained four geographic inputs and 26 caring behaviors that measured caring behaviors. The researcher collected data through a Likert-type survey instrument known as “A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher” (Appendix A). The analyses of the survey instrument determined the level of teachers’ caring behaviors, the resulting teachers’ caring behaviors’ scores, and the significance of the five factors of teachers’ caring behaviors. The survey was administered to consenting students in this high school. The survey required the students to assess 26 caring behaviors exhibited by their teachers to create a caring learning environment. Analyses of the resulting data from the survey provided information about the usage and frequency of these caring behaviors by each of their teachers in the classroom.

According to Bulach (1998), the reliability estimate of the total survey, “A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher,” using Cronbach’s alpha was around .77 in prior studies. Cronbach’s alpha has been shown to be an important estimate of reliability (Creswell, 2003). Internal consistency indicates the extent to which a set of test items can be treated as measuring a single latent variable, in this case caring. Latent variables, as opposed to observable variables, are variables that are not directly observed but are rather inferred from other variables that are observed and directly measured. A
psychometric instrument should be used in research if an alpha of 0.70 or higher is obtained on a sequential sample. Therefore, the Cronbach’s alpha of .77 demonstrates that the total survey for this study was reliable for the work required. Once survey data for this study were collected, the researcher conducted reliability estimates on the resulting data set.

The validity concerns itself with the subjective determination of validity, utilizing some form of expert judgment. Bulach (1998) collected the opinions of 116 practicing teachers and administrators to determine that the survey instrument had construct validity. The survey instrument does discriminate between those teachers who use the 26 caring behaviors frequently with students and those who use them less often (Bulach, Brown, & Potter, 1998). Data for the study of Bulach, Brown, and Potter (1998) identified five factors of behaviors that teachers can use to create a caring learning community. They include the ability to reduce anxiety, willingness to listen, rewarding of appropriate behavior, being a friend, and the appropriate use of positive and negative criticism. The survey instrument begins with four items that collect demographic data and is followed by 26 items that measure teachers’ caring behaviors. Two of the 26 items (items 24 and 29) were reverse scored. The survey (Appendix A) was used to assess the degree to which teachers’ caring behaviors were present in the study. When reviewing the responses, one should recognize that a negative response is scored as a 1.0 and a positive response is scored as a 5.0. Negative behaviors were reverse scored. For example, if students responded with “often” or “always” to the statement, “My teacher uses sarcasm” (item 29), a score of 4.0 became a 2.0 and a score of 5.0 became a 1.0. Scores
approaching a 2.0 can be interpreted as the weakest areas. Scores above a 3.0 and close to a 4.0 are the strongest areas. Scores approaching a 5.0 are definite strengths.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers’ Caring Behaviors (n=26) by Factors (n=5)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate Willingness to Listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward Students for Their Appropriate Behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a Friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize Students’ Behaviors or Appropriate Use of Criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Method of Study

Access to the classes was gained by contacting the principal of the building, requesting permission for the researcher to conduct a research study and to collect data from students. After the principal agreed to allow the school’s students to participate in the research study, the researcher met with teachers to explain the study (Appendix B) and handed them a letter of consent (Appendix C) requesting their participation in the research study. A letter (Appendix D) was handed to students, and a letter (Appendix E) was mailed to parents, requesting the written consent of the students (Appendix F) as well as the written consent of the parents (Appendix G) for students to participate in this research study.

The researcher prepared the survey instrument (Appendix A) and computer scan answer sheets for classes whose teachers agreed to participate. Only students who agreed to participate in the research study and who received parental permission answered the survey questions. A monitor distributed and collected the surveys and computer scan answer sheets from each participating class.

Students answered the survey during the first period after lunch. This period is during the time when behavior was expected to be more challenging, according to Bulach. The same instructions were given to all students in each classroom, and they followed the same procedures. The administrator read a script (Appendix H) to students regarding the survey instrument, the reason for the survey, and the procedures for completing the survey instrument. Each monitor, one of the school’s counselors, then handed out the survey instrument and a computer scan answer form to students whose parents had given permission for them to participate in the research study. The survey
took students approximately ten minutes to complete. The monitor then collected the computer scan answer forms and survey sheets. S/He placed them in an envelope, sealed it, signed his or her name on the sealed area, and delivered the envelope to the researcher.

The data were collected for analyses without students' or teachers' names. A coding system prevented the identification of the students and insured the confidentiality of the data. Each class was labeled with one of the letters of the alphabet (A, B, C, D, E, or F). Each student in each class was assigned with a numeric code (A1, A2, A3, etc.). The student’s behavior and academic grade and the teacher’s caring behaviors scores were matched up for the analysis.

Each classroom teacher evaluated each student’s behavior using five Likert-type responses. The behavior grade indicated the level of the student’s behavior in the classroom. In this study, performance referred to achievement, which was indicated by the teacher’s inputted grades. Behavior was indicated by the teacher’s behavior grade.

Teachers used the responses below to evaluate each student’s behavior by filling in the letter that came closest to describing how often the teacher had to redirect or discipline each student. The behavior grade took into account the student’s behavior in the classroom. The grade of A meant that the student never misbehaved in class. A grade of B meant that the student may misbehave several times a month, while C meant that the student may misbehave a couple of times a week. The letter grade of D meant that the student may misbehave on a daily basis. F indicated that the student misbehaves and must be redirected constantly.

Method of Data Analysis

Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), version 11.0, was used as an
analytical tool. The researcher conducted a Spearman rho correlation on the categories or factors in research question three to investigate if a significant relationship existed between the factors. Spearman rho correlation was selected as a method of analysis because it determines the relationship between factors, the strength of their relationship, and the direction.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed on research questions one, two, four, and five to determine if a statistically significant difference existed in caring behavior scores for students with high academic and behavior grades versus students with low grades. The ANOVA measured the difference in the average score of teachers' caring behaviors and students who received A or B (high), C or D (low) grades. ANOVA analyzed the difference in the average score for each of the five factors and their influence on students who received A, B, C, or D grades. A post hoc test of the independent variables is done when there are three or four categories or levels. The post hoc test determines which pair of factors was more significant using Tukey's HSD test.

Summary

The research design was presented in Chapter III. It includes a combination of causal comparative and correlational methods. Also presented were the research questions, which focused on the relationships between the variables as well as differences between the two variables within this study. The subjects, sample size, and instrumentation were described, followed by the methods of study analyses. Chapter IV includes results, the quantitative research approach, and a summary statement in general terms of the results obtained.
CHAPTER IV
Results and Analysis of Data

Introduction

Presented here are the purpose of the study, the results of the investigation, a comparison of caring teacher behavior factors, the independent variables, academic and behavior grades, the dependent variable, teachers’ caring behaviors scores, a comparison between caring scores and academic grades, and a comparison between caring scores and behavior grades. The chapter includes the research questions, which focus on the relationships between the variables as well as the difference between the variables within this study. Finally, the statistical data are presented related to each of the research questions. Chapter IV includes results from a combination of ANOVA and Spearman’s rho correlation methods.

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence of teachers’ caring behaviors on students’ performance and behavior. The significance of the relationships between teacher caring and students’ behavior could be beneficial to teachers who want to influence classroom behavior.

Following the methodology outlined in Chapter III, the researcher surveyed 131 high school students in the selected school. The students who filled out the survey represented 14% of the student body (n = 949). Six out of 18 teachers (33.3%) in the school volunteered to participate during the first period after lunch.

The “Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher” is divided into two distinct sections. The first section is designed for input of each student’s academic grade and behavior grade as determined by the teacher. The second section provides a listing of
26 caring behaviors that students perceive in their teachers that demonstrate that their teachers are caring. In this chapter are the results of the survey along with their relationship to students’ academic and behavior grades, reflecting performance and behavior in the classroom.

Results of the Teachers’ Caring Behavior Survey

Table 2, titled “Caring Behavior Report,” includes the 26 caring behaviors divided into five caring factors. To the left of each caring behavior is the mean score for that behavior based upon the students’ input. The mean score for each of the five caring factors also appears in the table. Mean scores of 4.0 or better indicate areas where that behavior tends to occur. Mean scores below 4.0 indicate areas that could be improved. Items 24 and 29 are reverse scored. Table 2 shows the strengths and weaknesses of the factors and their respective caring behaviors. The table shows which factors are strongest and which are weakest based upon the mean scores of the caring behaviors. The Anxiety factor is strongest with a mean of 4.18, followed by Criticism (3.18), Friendship (2.68), Listen (2.61), and Reward (2.31). The caring behaviors that comprise each factor are indicated with their respective means.

Each graph and figure in this chapter contains mean scores based upon the students’ responses to each survey item on the Teachers’ Caring Behavior survey. Mean scores are derived by averaging the total score of all of the students’ responses to each item.
Table 2

_Caring Behavior Report (caring mean = 2.99; n = 131)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Behaviors That Reduce Anxiety (mean = 4.18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>My teacher greets students when they enter my room.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>My teacher calls students by their name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>My teacher gives students positive reinforcement for good behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>My teacher enforces the same rules for all students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>My teacher provides an orderly classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>My teacher creates an environment where students feel safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>My teacher teaches students at their ability level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>My teacher maintains eye contact with students when I talk to him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>My teacher gives students cues when they don't understand or respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>My teacher is positive with students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Behaviors That Demonstrate a Willingness to Listen (mean = 2.61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>My teacher takes a personal interest in what I do outside my classroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>My teacher gives students opportunities to make decisions that affect them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>My teacher makes time for students before and after school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>My teacher asks students for their opinions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Behaviors That Reward Students for Appropriate Behavior (mean = 2.31)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>My teacher informs parents about their students' progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>My teacher displays students' work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>My teacher asks students to help with classroom tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>My teacher provides students with &quot;treats&quot; and &quot;goodies&quot; on special occasions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Behaviors That Show Friendship (mean = 2.68)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>My teacher eats lunch with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>My teacher returns work promptly with comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>My teacher allows me to have fun at his/her expense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>My teacher intervenes when students pick on each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Behaviors That Recognize Student Behavior (mean = 3.18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>My teacher recognizes students for academic achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>My teacher recognizes students for extra-curricular achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>My teacher uses negative criticism with students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>My teacher uses sarcasm with me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A Comparison of Caring Behavior Factors

Table 2 demonstrates that the teachers’ behaviors that reduce anxiety are quite strong, as demonstrated by seven mean scores above 4.0. The behaviors in the other four factors indicate that teachers do not practice these behaviors as often, which is demonstrated by mean scores below 3.0.
Figure 2. Comparison of the five caring behavior factors and the caring average
Figure 2 indicates the average score of each caring factor. The mean scores for the Listening, Reward, and Friend factors approach 2.5, which indicates that teachers use little listening, reward, and friend behaviors. The mean score for Criticism approaches 3.0, which demonstrates that teachers use more of the criticism behaviors than listening, reward, and friend behaviors. These factors are followed by Anxiety, which has a mean score above 4.0, indicating that teachers frequently practice these behaviors more than the other four factors.

The caring average includes all five factors and has a mean score of 2.99. This caring average demonstrates that students perceive that their teachers are demonstrate neither a weak level nor a strong level of caring in the classroom.

A Comparison of Caring Scores with Academic Grades

The bar graphs in figures 3 and 4 group the teachers’ caring behaviors into the five factors and show strengths and weaknesses in each factor. Figures 3 and 4 compare caring factors with academic grades.
Figure 3. Comparison of reward, friend, and criticism factors with academic grades
The bar graphs in figure 3 group the teachers’ caring behaviors into the three factors and show strengths and weaknesses in each factor. Figure 3 exhibits a comparison of academic grades with the caring factors Reward, Friend, and Criticism. The mean scores for the Reward and Friend factors approach 2.5, which indicates that students perceive that teachers do not use a lot of reward or friend behaviors. This is followed by Criticism, which has a mean score approaching 3.0, indicating that students perceive that teachers practice these behaviors more than the Reward and Friend factors. Students with an academic grade of A scored higher than B, C, or D students. Students with an academic grade of F, on the other hand, scored higher than A students.
Figure 4. Comparison of Anxiety and Listening with academic grades and a graph depicting the caring average for all five factors.
Figure 4 shows a comparison of students' \( n = 131 \) academic grades with the average score for the caring factors Anxiety and Listening and for the Caring Average. The mean score for the Listening factor approaches 2.5, which indicates that students perceive that teachers do not use a lot of listening behaviors. This is followed by Anxiety, which has a mean score above 4.0, indicating that students perceived that teachers frequently practice these behaviors. Students with an academic grade of A had higher perceived anxiety scores than did students who had academic grades of B, C, or D. Students with an academic grade of F, on the other hand, had a perceived Anxiety average score that was nearly identical to students with an academic average of A.

Figure 4 also shows the caring average, which is derived by averaging all five factor means for each academic grade. The mean score for the caring average approaches 3.0, indicating that teachers practice caring on a limited basis.

\textit{A Comparison of Caring Scores with Behavior Grades}

The bar graphs in figures 5 and 6 group the teachers' caring behaviors into the five factors and show strengths and weaknesses in each factor. Figures 5 and 6 compare caring factors with behavior grades.
Figure 5. Comparison of Reward, Friend, and Criticism with behavior grades
Figure 5 shows a comparison of behavior grades with the factors Reward, Friend, and Criticism. The mean scores for Reward and Friend approach 2.0, which show that teachers use a limited amount of reward and friend behaviors. This is followed by Criticism, which has a mean score approaching 3.0, indicating that teachers practice these behaviors more than the Reward and Friend factors. B students had higher scores than A or C students. D students, on the other hand, had lower scores than all other students.
Figure 6. Comparison of Anxiety and Listening with behavior grades and a graph showing caring average.
Figure 6 demonstrates the comparison of caring scores and behavior grades for Anxiety and Listening. The mean score for the Listening factor approaches 2.5, which indicates that teachers do not use a lot of listening behaviors. This is followed by Anxiety, which has a mean score above 4.0, indicating that teachers frequently practice behaviors that reduce anxiety levels. A, B, and C students had similar scores. D students, on the other hand, had scores that were lower than all other students.

Figure 6 also shows the caring average, which is derived by averaging all five factor means for each behavior grade. The mean score for the caring average approaches 3.0, indicating that teachers practice caring on a limited basis.

Research Questions

This study is guided by five research questions, which will be answered based upon the statistical data:

1. What is the difference in the average scores for the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors and students who receive behavior grades A, B, C, or D?
2. What is the difference in the scores for each of the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors and students who receive behavior grades A, B, C, or D?
3. What is the relationship between the average scores of teachers’ caring behaviors and the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors survey?
4. What is the difference in the average scores of teachers’ caring behaviors and students who have A, B, C, D, or F academic grades?
5. What is the difference in the average scores of the five factors of teachers’ caring behaviors and students who have A, B, C, D, or F academic grades?
Presentation of Data for Question One

What is the difference in the average score for the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors and students who receive behavior grades A, B, C, or D?

Table 3

Differences between the Groups for Caring Based on Behavior Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.950</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>.203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine whether or not there is a significant difference in the average scores of the five factors of teachers’ caring behaviors and students who have A, B, C, or D behavior grades, a one-way ANOVA was run. The results from the one-way ANOVA appear in Table 3 and indicate that there are no significant differences between the groups of the five factors.
Table 4

*Differences between the Groups for Behavior 8 Based on Behavior Grades*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.889(**)</td>
<td>5.328</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01

There are significant differences, however, in scores between the groups for behaviors 8 and 11. Table 4 focuses on behavior 8 (My teacher enforces the same rules for all students). The data indicate a significant difference between the groups. The *F* value of 6.889 is significant (*p* < .01). In order to determine if there was a significant difference between the groups, post hoc tests were conducted.
As shown in Table 5, when one examines the mean differences between the groups, one finds three significant differences based on student behavior between A and D, B and D, and C and D behavior grade students. For example, students who have behavior grades of D have a mean score of 2.33 based on behavior 8 (see Table 6) compared to other students who have mean scores above 4.0, suggesting that D students perceive that their teacher does not enforce the same rules for all students.
Table 6

Means Based on Behavior Grades for Behavior 8 (My teacher enforces the same rules for all students.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Behavior Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.027</td>
<td>.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.370</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 6, students who received a behavior grade of A from their teachers have a mean score of 4.56, B-graded students have a mean score of 4.35, and C-graded students have a mean score of 4.10, compared to D students with a mean score 2.33, indicating that D students do not perceive that their teachers enforce the same rules for all students.
Table 7

*Differences between the Groups Based on Behavior Grades for Behavior 11 (My teacher recognizes me for extra-curricular achievement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 11 Between Groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.440(*)</td>
<td>5.654</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p = <0.05

Table 7 examines Behavior 11 (My teacher recognizes me for extra-curricular achievement). The data indicate one significant difference between the groups. The *F* value of 3.440 is significant (*p* < .05).
### Table 8

*Mean Differences Based on Behavior Grades for Behavior 11 (My teacher recognizes me for extra-curricular achievement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Behavior Grades</th>
<th>Behavior Grades</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-.784(*)</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.858</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.784(*)</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.159</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-.375</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.159</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.233</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p* < 0.05

In order to determine if there was a significant difference between the groups, post hoc test results were reported in Table 8. When the mean differences between the groups are examined, there is one significant difference based on behavior grades between A and B behavior grade students.
Table 9

*Means Based on Behavior Grades for Behavior 11 (My teacher recognizes me for extra-curricular achievement.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Behavior Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.175</td>
<td>.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.557</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.318</td>
<td>.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 9, students who received a behavior grade of A had a mean score of 2.04. Students who received a behavior grade of B had a mean score of 2.83. Students who received a grade of C had a mean score of 2.90, indicating that A students perceived that their teachers did not recognize them as much for extra-curricular achievement as did B students. Students who received a behavior grade of C had an even higher score than B students, but because the \( n \) is only 10, their data are not statistically significant.

*Presentation of Data for Question Two*

What is the difference in the scores for each of the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors and students who receive behavior grades A, B, C, or D?
Table 10

*Mean Differences in the Factors Based on Behavior Grades*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Between Groups df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.858</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>.273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>.604</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>.410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>.368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.671(*)</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td>.437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
In order to determine whether or not there is a significant difference in the scores for each of the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors and students who received A, B, C, or D behavior grades, a one-way ANOVA was run. The results of the one-way ANOVA are presented in Table 10 and indicate no significant differences in levels between the groups based on behavior grades for Anxiety, Listening, Reward, and Friend. There is a statistically significant difference in the data for Criticism. The data relating to Criticism indicate a significant difference between the groups. The $F$ value of 2.671 is significant ($p < .05$).
Table 11

*Mean Differences Based on Behavior Grades for Criticism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Behavior Grades</th>
<th>Behavior Grades</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-.29828</td>
<td>.15363</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02237</td>
<td>.21978</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73070</td>
<td>.38766</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.29828</td>
<td>.15363</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32065</td>
<td>.25041</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.02899</td>
<td>.40581</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-.02237</td>
<td>.21978</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.32065</td>
<td>.25041</td>
<td>.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>.70833</td>
<td>.43518</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-.73070</td>
<td>.38766</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.02899</td>
<td>.40581</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.70833</td>
<td>.43518</td>
<td>.367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to determine if there are significant differences between the groups, post hoc tests were conducted. As observed in Table 11, of the mean differences between the groups, not one is significant based on behavior grades.
Table 12

*Means Based on Behavior Grades for Criticism*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.1474</td>
<td>.62685</td>
<td>.06431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.4457</td>
<td>.78319</td>
<td>.16331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>.58035</td>
<td>.18352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4167</td>
<td>1.01036</td>
<td>.58333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.1813</td>
<td>.67372</td>
<td>.05886</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon examining Table 12, the mean score for A-grade behavior students is 3.14 versus 2.41 for D-grade behavior students, indicating that D students were less positive on this behavior than A students, but because of the $n$ of 3, it is not statistically significant.

*Presentation of Data for Question Three*

What is the relationship between the average score of teachers’ caring behaviors and the five factors of the teachers’ caring behaviors survey?
Table 13

*Relationship between the Five Caring Factors*

*Spearman’s rho*

*Students (n = 131)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ANXIETY</th>
<th>LISTEN</th>
<th>REWARD</th>
<th>FRIEND</th>
<th>CRITICISM</th>
<th>CARING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ANXIETY</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.432(**)</td>
<td>.203(*)</td>
<td>.421(**)</td>
<td>.371(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LISTEN</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.432(**)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.496(**)</td>
<td>.451(**)</td>
<td>.307(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REWARD</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.203(*)</td>
<td>.496(**)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.281(**)</td>
<td>.401(**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIEND</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.421(**)</td>
<td>.451(**)</td>
<td>.281(**)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.205(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CRITICISM</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.371(**)</td>
<td>.307(**)</td>
<td>.401(**)</td>
<td>.205(*)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARING</strong></td>
<td>Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.632(**)</td>
<td>.784(**)</td>
<td>.682(**)</td>
<td>.673(**)</td>
<td>.641(**)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Question three investigates the relationship between each of the factors to determine which ones are most strongly related. Table 13 data show the results of correlation and indicate significant correlations between the five factors of the teachers' caring behaviors.

As shown in Table 13, the data indicate significant positive relationships between all five factors of caring behaviors ranging from a high of +.496 ($p < .01$) for Listening and Reward factors to a low of +.205 ($p < .05$) for Friend and Criticism factors. The caring factor with the highest correlation at +.784 ($p < .01$) with the overall caring mean score is the Listening factor. The positive association between the variables Criticism and Anxiety is .371 ($p < .01$). At .371 there is a correlation between the variables. The shared variance is 13.8%, which means that 13.8% is shared between the variables and 86.2% is unexplained.

There is a relationship between the variables Criticism and Listening of .307 ($p < .01$), which is positive. The shared variance is 9%, which means that 9% is shared between the variables and 91% is unexplained.

The positive relationship between the variables “Criticism” and “Reward” is .401 ($p < .01$). At .401 there is a correlation between the variables. The shared variance is 16%, which means that 16% is shared between the variables and 84% is unexplained.

The positive association between the variables Criticism and Friend is .205 ($p > .05$). At .205 there is a correlation between the variables. The shared variance is 4%, which means that 4% is shared between the variables and 96% is unexplained.

According to Table 13, there is a strong relationship between the variables Criticism and Average Caring Behaviors of .641 ($p < .01$), which is positive. The shared
variance is 41%, which means that 41% is shared between the variables and 59% is unexplained.

The data indicate significant positive relationships between the variables Anxiety and Listening of .432 \((p < .01)\). At .432 there is a moderate correlation between the variables. The shared variance is 18.7%, which means that 18.7% is shared between the variables and 81.3% is unexplained.

The association between the variables Anxiety and Reward is .203 \((p < .05)\) is positive. At .203 there is a correlation between the variables. The shared variance is 4%, which means that 4% is shared between the variables and 96% is unexplained.

Table 13 demonstrates a positive relationship between the variables Anxiety and Friend is .421 \((p < .01)\). At .421 there is a moderate correlation between the variables. The shared variance is 17.7%, which means that 17.7% is shared between the variables and 72.3% is unexplained.

According to Table 13, there is a strong positive relationship between the variables Anxiety and Average Caring Behaviors of .632 \((p < .01)\). The shared variance is 39.9%, which means that 39.9% is shared between the variables and 60.1% is unexplained.

The association between the variables Listening and Reward of .495 \((p < .01)\) is positive. At .496 there is a moderate correlation between the variables. The shared variance is 24.6%, which means that 24.6% is shared between the variables and 75.4% is unexplained.

The relationship between the variables Listening and Friend of .451 \((p < .01)\) is positive. At .451 there is a moderate correlation between the variables. The shared
variance is 20.3%, which means that 20.3% is shared between the variables and 79.7% is unexplained.

Table 13 also demonstrates a strong positive relationship between the variables Listening and Average Caring Behaviors is .784 ($p > .01$). The shared variance is 61.5%, which means that 61.5% is shared between the variables and 38.5% is unexplained.

The positive association between the variables Reward and Friend is .281 ($p < .01$). At .281 there is a correlation between the variables. The shared variance is 7.9%, which means that 7.9% is shared between the variables and 92.1% is unexplained.

Table 13 indicates a strong relationship between the variables Reward and Average Caring Behaviors (.682), which is positive. The shared variance is 46.5%, which means that 46.5% is shared between the variables and 53.5% is unexplained.

Table 13 also indicates a positive relationship between the variables Friend and Average Caring Behaviors is .673 ($p < .01$). At .673 there is a strong correlation between the variables. The shared variance is 45.3%, which means that 45.3% is shared between the variables and 54.7% is unexplained.

**Presentation of Results for Question Four**

What is the difference in the average score of teachers’ caring behaviors and students who have A, B, C, D, or F academic grades?
In order to determine whether or not there is a significant difference in the average score of teachers' caring behaviors and students who receive A, B, C, D, or F academic grades, a one-way ANOVA was run. Table 14 shows the results from the one-way ANOVA indicating no significant differences as a result of academic grades for the average caring behavior score.

**Table 14**

* Differences between the Groups for Average Caring Based on Academic Grades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caring Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15**

* Mean Differences between the Groups Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 5 (My teacher greets me when I enter the room.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable Behavior 5</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.624**</td>
<td>4.842</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01**
There are significant differences, however, in scores between the groups for behaviors 5, 14, 18, 21, and 23. Table 15 focuses on Behavior 5 (My teacher greets me when I enter the room). The data indicate a significant difference between the groups. The $F$ value of 3.624 is significant ($p < .01$).

Table 16

*Mean Differences Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 5 (My teacher greets me when I enter the room)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-.368</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-.682</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.432(**)</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-.420</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.170(*)</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-.315</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-1.065</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.750</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.432(**)</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.170(*)</td>
<td>.374</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.794</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** $p < 0.01$
* $p < 0.05$
In order to determine if there is a significant difference between the groups, post hoc tests were conducted. As observed in Table 16, when the mean differences between the groups are examined, there are two significant differences based upon academic grades between A and F and B and F academic grade students.
Table 17

*Means Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 5 (My teacher greets me when I enter the room.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.015</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.957</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.953</td>
<td>.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 17, students who received an academic grade of A from their teachers have a mean score of 2.57, compared to F students who have a mean score of 4.00, indicating that F students perceived that their teachers greeted them more often than A students.
As observed in Table 18, the data on Behavior 14 (My teacher provides an orderly classroom), indicate a significant difference between the groups. The $F$ value of 3.662 was significant ($p < .01$).
### Table 19

*Mean Differences Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 14 (My teacher provides an orderly classroom.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.432(**)</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.432</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
<td>0.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.207</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.277(*)</td>
<td>0.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.484(**)</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-1.432(**)</td>
<td>0.425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.277(*)</td>
<td>0.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.484(**)</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.000</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td>0.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.277</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.484</td>
<td>0.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01
*p < 0.05

In order to determine if there is a significant difference between the groups, post hoc tests were conducted. In Table 19, when the mean differences between the groups were examined, three significant differences were found based on academic grades between A and D, B and D, and C and D academic grade students.
As indicated in Table 20, students who received an academic grade of A from their teachers have a mean score of 4.43. Students who received an academic grade of B have a mean score of 4.28, and C students have a mean score of 4.48, compared to D students who have a mean score of 3.00, indicating that D students perceived that their teachers provided an orderly classroom less frequently than students who received A, B, or C academic grades.
Table 21

*Mean Differences Between the Groups Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 18 (My teacher teaches students at their ability level.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.565**</td>
<td>4.999</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**$p < 0.01$**

Table 21 indicates a significant difference between the groups on Behavior 18 (My teacher teaches students at their ability level). The $F$ value of 4.565 was significant ($p < .01$).
Table 22

*Mean Differences Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 18 (My teacher teaches students at their ability level.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-.576</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2.155(**)</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.348</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.750(*)</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-1.580(*)</td>
<td>.545</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-1.750(*)</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-1.583</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>-.167</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1.583</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01
*p < 0.05

In order to determine if there was a significant difference between the groups, post hoc tests were conducted as shown in Table 22. When the mean differences between the groups are examined, there are three significant differences based on academic grades between A and D, B and D, and C and D academic grade students.
Table 23

*Means Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 18 (My teacher teaches students at their ability level.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>.096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As demonstrated in Table 23, students who received an academic grade of A from their teachers have a mean score of 4.41, B students have a mean score of 3.83, C students have a mean score of 4.00, and D students have a mean score of 2.25. This indicates that D students perceived that their teachers taught them at their ability level less frequently than students who received A, B, or C academic grades.
Table 24

*Mean Differences between the Groups Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 21 (My teacher asks students for their opinions.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 21</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.705(**)</td>
<td>5.252</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01

From Table 24, the data on Behavior 21 (My teacher asks students for their opinions) suggest a significant difference between the groups. The $F$ value of 3.705 was significant ($p < .01$).
In order to determine if there is a significant difference between the groups, post hoc tests were conducted as seen in Table 25. When the mean differences between the groups are examined, two significant differences arise based on academic grades between A and D and between B and D academic grade students.
Table 26

Means Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 21 (My teacher asks students for their opinions.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.239</td>
<td>.108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 26, students who received an academic grade of A from their teachers have a mean score of 3.57 and B students have a mean score of 3.28, compared to D students who have a mean score of 1.50, indicating that D students perceived that their teachers asked for their opinions less frequently than students who received A or B academic grades.
Table 27

*Mean Differences between the Groups Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 23 (My teacher gives students clues when they don’t understand or respond.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 23</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.878(**)</td>
<td>3.389</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < 0.01

The data in Table 27 indicate a significant difference between the groups on Behavior 23 (My teacher gives students clues when they don’t understand or respond). The $F$ value of 3.878 was significant ($p < .01$).
In order to determine if there was a significant difference between the groups, post hoc tests were conducted as shown in Table 28. When the mean differences between the groups were examined, there are four significant differences based on academic grades between A and D, B and D, and C and D, and F and D academic grade students.
Table 29

Means Based on Academic Grades for Behavior 23 (My teacher gives students clues when they don’t understand or respond.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior 23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.732</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 29, students who received an academic grade of A from their teachers had a mean score of 4.43, B students had a mean score of 4.23, and C students had a mean score of 4.26. F students had a mean score of 4.17, compared to D students who had a mean score of 2.50, indicating that D students perceived that their teachers gave students clues when they didn’t understand or respond less frequently than students who received A, B, C, or F academic grades.
Presentation of Data for Question Five

What is the difference in the average scores of the five factors of teachers' caring behaviors and students who have A, B, C, D, or F academic grades?
Table 30

*Differences in Means Based on Academic Grades for the Five Factors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>df</th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.698(*)</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listen</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>.875</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criticism</td>
<td></td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p < 0.05
In order to determine whether or not there is a significant difference in the average scores of the five factors of teachers’ caring behaviors and students who had A, B, C, D, or F academic grades, a one-way ANOVA was run as observed in Table 30. The results from the one-way ANOVA indicate no significant differences between the groups based on academic grades for Listening, Reward, Friend, and Criticism. There is one statistically significant difference in the data for Anxiety. The data relating to Anxiety indicate a significant difference between the groups. The $F$ value of 2.698 is significant ($p < .05$).
**Table 31**

*Mean Differences Based on Academic Grades for Anxiety*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.18229</td>
<td>0.11167</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.16536</td>
<td>0.12372</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.81231(*)</td>
<td>0.26744</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.02528</td>
<td>0.16880</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.18229</td>
<td>0.11167</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.01693</td>
<td>0.11757</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.63002</td>
<td>0.26465</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-0.15701</td>
<td>0.16434</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.16536</td>
<td>0.12372</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.01693</td>
<td>0.11757</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.54695</td>
<td>0.26995</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-0.14008</td>
<td>0.17275</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>-0.81231(*)</td>
<td>0.26744</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-0.63002</td>
<td>0.26465</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-0.64695</td>
<td>0.26995</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-0.78704</td>
<td>0.29336</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>-0.02528</td>
<td>0.16880</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.15701</td>
<td>0.16434</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>0.14008</td>
<td>0.17275</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.78704</td>
<td>0.29336</td>
<td>.062</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.05*

In order to determine if there is a significant difference between the groups, post hoc tests were conducted as shown in Table 31. When the mean differences between the groups are examined, there is one significant difference based on academic grades between A and D academic grade students.
Table 32

*Means Based on Academic Grades for Anxiety*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Grades</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.3123</td>
<td>.41889</td>
<td>.06887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.1300</td>
<td>.55667</td>
<td>.08120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.1470</td>
<td>.47261</td>
<td>.08488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5000</td>
<td>.70565</td>
<td>.35283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.2870</td>
<td>.58499</td>
<td>.16887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>4.1807</td>
<td>.52122</td>
<td>.04554</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 32, students who received an academic grade of A from their teachers have a mean score of 4.31, compared to D students who have a mean score of 3.50, indicating that D students perceived that their teachers used anxiety-reducing behaviors less frequently than with students who received A academic grades.
Summary Statement in General Terms of the Results Obtained

In general, Chapter IV includes descriptive data and the statistical results of the survey of high school students’ perceptions of their teachers’ caring behaviors’ as reported on the survey form. The findings indicate significant results within the caring factor of reducing anxiety in order to influence academic grades. Students who received an academic grade of D perceived that their teachers used anxiety-reducing behaviors less frequently than did students who received A academic grades. The statistical results also indicate a significant correlation between each of the five factors of teachers’ caring behaviors. Chapter IV also includes the results, the quantitative research approach, and a summary statement in general terms of the results obtained. Chapter V will discuss this research study and will include conclusions and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER V
Conclusions, Summary, Implications, and Recommendations

Summary

Due to state and federal government mandates, educators are required to show significant improvement in student performance. No Child Left Behind (NCLB) has mandated increased testing and student support services that are supposed to improve educational outcomes significantly and improve student performance. However, the results of these programs have not achieved acceptable levels in all schools (Finn, Julian, & Petrilli, 2006). According to Casserly (as cited in Bracey, 2007), the law never had any theories about how to improve student achievement. Therefore, educators need to seek programs that increase student education outcomes.

Educators face challenges from students who misbehave (Rose & Gallup, 2003). The educational system has focused on support, counseling, and social work services as a remedy for poor students' performance without achieving the desired degree of success. This raises the question, how might teachers change student behavior and improve students' performance? The research of Bulach (1998), Deiro (1996), and Noddings (1992) on caring has provided some answers to this question. These researchers have discovered that when students perceive their teachers as genuinely caring, the resulting relationship significantly influences their grades and behavior. When teachers care about their students, the students' attitudes, motivation, and behavior change in a positive direction because they want to please those who care for them. Students work harder, increase their learning, and strive for success in school (Bulach, 1998; Deiro, 1996; Shann, 1999).
Thus, the problem for this study is that educators have limited ways of improving student performance while participating in NCLB. NCLB requires educators and educational systems to take approaches that run contrary to the research theory and literature on caring and on other long-term and carefully researched improvement processes.

The purpose of this study was to determine the influence of a teacher's caring behaviors on a student's grades and behavior, based upon the student's perception that the teacher demonstrates varying levels of caring. The significance of the relationship between teacher caring and student behavior could benefit teachers who want to affect classroom behavior. The strength of the relationship between caring behaviors and the five factors could indicate which of the five areas need more emphasis. Finally, the difference in teacher caring in relationship to the difference in students' grades could demonstrate the influence of caring on a student's academic grades.

The subjects of this study were students in grades 9-12, ages 14-17, who attend a private/parochial high school in the northeast. Most of the students are college-bound. The students were surveyed to determine perceptions of their classroom teachers' caring behavior scores. The sample consisted of a total of 131 students in six classrooms.

Following the methodology outlined in Chapter III, the researcher surveyed 131 high school students in the selected school using "A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher" (Bulach, 1998). This survey measures the level of students' perceptions of their teachers' caring behaviors in the high school students' classes. Statistical analyses were run to analyze the data relative to students' perception of the teachers' caring behaviors and academic grades, and between students' perception of
teachers’ caring behaviors and students’ behavior.

Summary of the Findings

Based upon the tables in Chapter IV, one finds the following significant results from this study. Behaviors 8 (My teacher enforces the same rules for all students) and 11 (My teacher recognizes me for extra-curricular achievement) are significant based on behavior grades. There is also a very strong correlation between average caring and each of the five factors (Anxiety, Listening, Reward, Friend and Criticism). In addition, Behaviors 5 (My teacher greets me when I enter the room), 14 (My teacher provides an orderly classroom), 18 (My teacher teaches students at their ability level), 21 (My teacher asks students for their opinions), and 23 (My teacher gives students clues when they don’t understand or respond) are significant based on academic grades. Finally, the one factor that is significant with academic grades is Anxiety.

In this study, average caring does not influence students’ academic grades or behavior grades. There is also no significant correlation between students’ academic grades and students’ behavior grades.

Conclusions

Noddings (1984, p. 91) described caring as something one does in a relationship, not as a specific set of behaviors. She stated that every interaction was an option to relate in either a caring or non-caring manner. Caring was not a program or strategy, but rather a way of relating to students, their families, and each other that conveyed compassion, understanding, respect, and interest (Noddings, 1988). Noddings (1992) stated that there was no recipe for caring.
Comparing Caring Behaviors with Academic Grades

When one compares the students’ perceptions of teachers’ caring behaviors with academic grades, one finds that A students (n=37) have higher mean scores than B, C, or D students. Students who received F grades (n=12), on the other hand, perceived levels of teachers’ caring behaviors that were nearly identical to the perception of A students. Lower academic grades correspond to lower perceptions of caring with the exception of the F students who scored as high as the A students. There may not be a sufficient number of F students to achieve significant differences in the mean scores between A and F students. Also, the F students were taking a math class during the time they were surveyed. These students may have been achieving low grades in math because they did not have the math skills, background, or support to achieve passing grades. These students may have accepted the fact that they were weak or lacked ability in this subject matter. The scores indicate that all 12 students perceived their teacher as having the same level of caring as A students.

Research indicates that students needed to feel that their teachers cared about them, wanted the best for them, and were invested in their success before students were willing to give their full effort. According to Shann (1999), student and teacher perceptions supported the findings that the highest achieving schools combined an emphasis on academics with a culture of caring that reflected higher rates of pro-social behaviors and lower rates of antisocial behaviors among students. Further, school differences favoring more positive perceptions of teacher caring and commitment have corresponded to higher rates of academic achievement in those schools.

Several possibilities may exist for the results of the students who received an
academic grade of F. Their teacher indeed may have cared for them, which may reflect their excellent behavior grades of A and B. However, there is no correlation between academic grades and behavior grades. The students may also have felt so positive about the school that they did not want to raise any issues in the survey. These students also may have possessed strong interpersonal intelligence and weak mathematical intelligence (Gardner, 1999). It is also possible that the teacher had a positive relationship with the students but did not have the ability or skills to teach this subject matter to these students.

This survey was conducted after the teachers and students had only spent six weeks together. Different results may have occurred later in the semester, with more time for the teachers and the students to form caring relationships. These results are different from the findings of Bryk and Driscoll (1988), who found that students achieved higher math scores when variables such as caring were present. In addition, Escalante (1990) gave so much time, effort, love, and caring to his students that they rose above their shortcomings and became high achievers in math. It is possible that this study did not produce the same results because there were too few C, D, and F students included.

Perhaps the difference in results relates to the following research. Studies have confirmed that two components of caring predict students' school engagement (Farrell, 1990; Fine, 1991; Murdock, 1999; Wehlage & Rutter, 1986; Wentzel, 1997, 1998b). Students' perceived caring from teachers comprised both a demonstrated commitment to student learning and general respect and courtesy (Hayes, Ryan, & Zeller, 1994; Wentzel, 1997). Murdock and Miller (2003) found that teacher caring included interpersonal support and respect and behaviors that demonstrated a commitment to student learning, such as high expectations and coming to class prepared to teach. Perhaps the teachers of
F students were not coming to class with a strong commitment to student learning or were unprepared to utilize an approach that met the needs of these particular students.

Comparing Caring Behaviors with Behavior Grades

When one compares the results of caring behaviors with the grades for student behavior, B students have higher mean caring scores than A or C students. D students, on the other hand, have lower mean caring scores than all other students. It is difficult to determine from this study the reason for these results. However, B students perceived extra caring from the teacher. The results for A, C, and D students concur with the research on caring and behavior. Shann (1999) found that the highest achieving schools combined an emphasis on academics with a culture of caring that reflected higher rates of pro-social behaviors and lower rates of antisocial behaviors among students. According to Comer (1992), children have a deep desire to feel that they belong. Children who have had positive developmental experiences before school acquire beliefs, attitudes, values, and connections that help them succeed in school. These children are best able to relate positively to people in school and bond with them (Comer, 2001). Comer was talking about caring relationships.

The results of this study demonstrate that there is a difference in the perception of teacher caring and the level of academic grades and behavior grades. An important point to acknowledge is that this particular school screens incoming students and the school utilizes a process for removing students who exhibit behavior problems. In addition, researchers have not known whether students’ reported relationships with teachers affected their motivation and behavior or whether students with higher motivation and
achievement viewed their relationships with teachers more positively (Murdock & Miller, 2003).

Research Question One

The research questions that achieve significant results identify specific areas that relate to the research and literature. Research question one identifies two statistically significant items. Behavior 8 demonstrates that students perceived that their teacher enforced the same rules for all students. Students who received higher behavior grades of A, B, and C perceived their teachers were doing so on a regular basis, whereas the students who received the lower behavior grade of D did not view their teachers as enforcing the same rules for all students. The results of this behavior item concur with the research. Shann (1999) found that a culture of caring reflects high rates of pro-social behavior.

Behavior 11 demonstrates that teachers recognize their students for extra-curricular achievement. Students who received B and C behavior grades perceived their teacher as doing so on a limited basis. Students who received an A perceived this behavior less often than B and C students. However, D students rarely felt that their teacher recognized them for extra-curricular achievement. It is possible that D students may have been ineligible for extra-curricular activities or were uninterested in participating. It is interesting to note that B and C students believed that their teachers acknowledged their extra-curricular achievements more than A students. The results of Behavior 11 concur with Shann’s (1999) research.
Research Question Two

The factor of Criticism has no significant relationships between students who receive A, B, C, or D behavior grades even though the ANOVA shows borderline significance. The statistics do indicate a pattern between the students with A, B, C, and D behavior grades. B students perceived that their teachers were least critical, A and C slightly more critical, followed by D students who perceived their teachers as more critical. These research findings agree with Shann's (1999) findings.

Research Question Three

Research question three shows the strength and positive relationship between the five factors of caring behaviors. Each factor relates significantly and positively to the other four caring factors. Therefore, increasing the occurrence of one factor positively affects another factor. In addition, all five factors make a significant difference in the level of the average caring. If one factor of caring is increased, that incurs a positive change in the caring average. The statistical data indicate that students perceived that teachers reduced student anxiety, which had a significant effect on the amount of caring that occurred in the school and the atmosphere or climate within the school. Although the level of caring in this school, according to this study, was moderately low, the anxiety factor was significantly high, which increases the caring average and reduces anxiety in the school.

Research Question Four

Research question four identifies five behaviors that significantly relate to academic grades. Behavior 5 demonstrates that a significant number of students perceived that their teacher greeted them when they entered the classroom. The ANOVA
shows that there is a significant difference in the perception between A and F students. The descriptive statistics indicate that A students with a mean of 2.57 perceived a very low occurrence of this teacher behavior, while F students perceived that the teacher greeted them frequently, as indicated by a mean score of 4.0. The descriptive statistics indicate that students perceived an inverse relationship between this teacher behavior and their grades. The reason could be that higher-achieving students arrived to class, were serious about learning, and were prepared to work immediately, whereas low-achieving students spent time relating to the teacher before the class began. The low-achieving students may have been using their interpersonal intelligence to relate to the teacher and may have been weak in mathematical intelligence (Gardner, 1999). The question becomes, how would a significant increase in teacher caring affect the F students' grades? That is something for future investigation.

Behavior 14 identifies students' perceptions about the teacher providing an orderly classroom. The descriptive statistics show that A, B, C, and F students perceived that this behavior occurred frequently. Students who received a D perceived that this behavior occurred significantly less frequently. However, students who received a grade of F gave the same response as the high achievers. Since these students were failing the course, they may have focused on classroom orderliness rather than on the subject matter. It is possible that the teacher had these students running constant errands or used them to organize the classroom to keep them busy.

Behavior 18 states that students perceived that their teacher taught students at their ability level. There is a significant difference between the D students and the higher achieving A, B, and C students. The D students perceived that their teacher targeted the
high achievers. However, the students who received F grades had almost as high a perception as the A, B, and C students. The F students may have perceived that their teacher was teaching to their academic level, but they were not grasping the subject matter. If the teacher was actually teaching F students at their academic level, one would think that they should have achieved passing grades. It is possible that F students were not giving honest answers to the survey or may not have cared to give a true response. This teacher may have created a positive environment, but may not have had the skills or ability to teach.

Behavior 21 questions whether teachers asked students for their opinions. A significant difference exists between the perception of A and B students when compared with D students. The data for C students does not achieve a significant difference from the A, B, D, or F students. However, the data does indicate students’ perceptions about the decrease in this behavior as students received lower academic grades. F students’ responses indicate, however, that their teacher asked them for their opinions as often as A, B, and C students. Yet, D students responded that this teacher behavior occurred much less frequently. It is difficult to understand why students who received an academic grade of F scored so high.

Behavior 23 asked students if their teacher gave them clues when they didn’t understand or respond. The descriptive statistics indicate that all students except the D students perceived that their teacher exhibited this behavior frequently. Once again, F students did not appear to respond as expected. If their teacher gave them clues, then they should have done better in this subject. Although the statistics indicate that F students received clues from teachers, that help did not make a difference in their academic grade.
Perhaps the teacher needed to use a different approach or spend more time with the students.

*Research Question Five*

The data relating to the factor of reducing anxiety indicates a significant difference between the A and D students. When looking at the descriptive statistics, these caring behaviors occurred frequently for A, B, C, and F students and less frequently for D students. The majority of students perceived that their teacher reduced anxiety in the classroom. Perhaps D students felt that they could do better and were anxious about their academic grade in the class. Students who received an academic grade of F gave the answer that was expected and did not care about their grade.

*Additional Caring Behaviors That Were Not Measured*

There were strategies for developing caring behaviors that could not be determined by this study. For example, Deiro (1996) expressed the following six strategies teachers can use to develop a caring environment through their behavior: (a) create one-on-one time with their students (b) maximize individual and small group activities (c) intersperse personal and academic talk (d) conduct personal conversations during non-class time (e) write comments on students’ papers and (f) use nonverbal communication such as direct eye-contact and touching kids on safe areas. What is critical is that students perceive the teacher as caring, which is created by a communication style that is respectful (Deiro, 1996). Caring is also shown by treating students respectfully and believing they are capable, in addition to other behaviors that were measured by the survey.

Teachers also establish and maintain high academic standards for their students
and communicate a belief in their students’ capacity to meet these expectations. Teachers network with parents, family, and friends. These are some of the ways teachers bond with their students without compromising their primary responsibility for the cognitive development of students (Deiro, 1996). Perhaps the teacher of the F students bonded with students but neither maintained high expectations nor met his or her primary responsibility for cognitive teaching.

The school staff at the high school involved in this study maintains a strong discipline policy and expels any student who continuously misbehaves. The statistical input data show that students who received an academic grade of F also received very high behavior grades of A and B. The two school policies of tracking and discipline may skew the results of this study. Therefore, this researcher recommends studying a public school setting using heterogeneous classes of students and conducting the study later in the semester.

**Implications**

Bulach, Brown, and Potter (1998) pointed out that the use of the caring behaviors identified in their research aligned with Maslow’s theory of motivation. For example, Reducing Anxiety (factor #1) meets students’ security needs. Calling students by name, greeting them as they enter the room, Listening (factor #2) and Being a Friend (factor #4) meet their needs of belonging. Rewarding Good Behavior (factor #3) and Appropriate Use of Criticism (factor #5) meet students’ needs for self-esteem. This allows a student to focus on self-actualization needs so learning can occur. The authors concluded that if teachers practice the five factors of caring behaviors identified in this research, a “caring learning community” will more likely result and hopefully increased learning will occur.
However, Noblitt, Rodgers, and McCadden (1995) stated the need for a balance between caring and quality teaching. Genuine caring, however, can raise student achievement. Lewis, Schaps, and Watson (1996) stated that schools with high caring ratings observed higher academic performance and fewer behavior problems.

After reviewing the results of this study, one could say that teacher caring may influence academic grades and behavior grades. However, more variables are required than teacher caring. The results of this study appear to indicate that the influences on students’ grades and behavior are not limited to teacher behaviors or caring. In the selected school, students appear to be influenced by other matters, such as high expectations, supportive and caring parents, an atmosphere that is conducive to learning, and a discipline code that sets boundaries, limitations, and consequences on behavior. According to the research of Lewis, Schaps, and Watson (1996), five principles can create environments where children care about learning: (a) warm, supportive, stable relationships; (b) constructive learning, in which teachers support and extend children’s natural efforts to learn; (c) a challenging curriculum; (d) intrinsic motivation; and (e) attention to social and ethical dimensions of learning. The present study suggests that good grades and behavior require caring teachers who also exhibit the talent and skill to teach. Further, such teachers benefit from goal-oriented, resilient students who can meet the challenges of school and achieve success.

Recommendations for Future Research

The researcher recommends conducting the study at the end of the semester. One may want to determine whether continuity over time between teachers and students makes a difference in the results, as suggested by Noddings (1992). The results may also
differ by studying a public school setting which has more C, D, and F students. Some of the results of this study are not significant because of the relatively small number of students who received lower academic grades. One may also add a qualitative component to the study to explain anomalies, such as the relatively high mean scores for students who received an F in academic grades.

From this study, a principal may realize that other elements influence students’ achievement and behavior. For example, discipline policy, code of conduct, expectations, entrance screening, and tracking can make a difference in current students’ behavior and grades (Shann, 1999).

Additional studies need to be conducted to investigate the influence of administrators’ support staff’s caring behaviors. Studies on caring may encourage more openness in schools now afraid to support closer relationships among administration, teachers, staff, and students (Deiro, 1996).

Although the results of the students who received the academic grade of F seem amazing, one ought to compare students’ academic grade in math with their academic grades in other subjects. Perhaps this grade only occurred in the math class as a result of math anxiety, insufficient background, or a lack of mathematical intelligence (Gardner, 1999).

Another study may also compare the instrument that measures the caring behaviors with actions and relationships between people, as described by Noddings (1984). One could compare the level of teacher caring according to Noddings with the results of the measurements of Bulach (1998).
Research may have students respond to “A Survey of the Behavior Characteristics of a Teacher” at the beginning of the academic year, followed by staff development that helps teachers encourage and increase their caring behaviors and positive relationship with students. The training program would be followed up by having students fill in the instrument at the end of the academic year to determine if a caring environment has been created or increased. The results may then be compared with changes in behavior and academic grades (Horsch, Chen, & Nelson, 1999).

Another study could measure the level of caring coming from the administration, faculty, staff, and students and determine the impact of the various staff levels within the school setting (Jenlick & Kinnucan-Welsch, 1999). One could observe their relationships to student performance, behavior, grades, attendance, and dropout rate (Bulach, Brown, & Potter, 1998; Deiro, 1996).

According to Bulach, Brown, and Potter (1998), there has been a need to measure the effect of caring behaviors on school climate, achievement, and discipline. In addition, educators ought to commit time, effort, and resources to make caring behaviors a part of the teaching repertoire to influence students.

The research states that one has to learn how to be cared for and to care for oneself before learning to care for others (Noddings, 2002). If one wants to show teachers how to care, then one must demonstrate to them how to care for others. Noddings stated that teachers would not achieve even meager success unless students believed that they themselves were cared for and learned to care for others (Noddings, 1995). Therefore, education professors, principals, and supervisors could demonstrate caring for teacher trainees and employees so those individuals might demonstrate caring for their students.
Principals and supervisors could encourage teachers to use caring behaviors to improve student achievement, performance, behavior, and grades. The improvement may reflect well on teachers and principals who are evaluated based upon the achievement scores that students receive on testing required by NCLB.

The findings of this study might encourage other studies and thereby influence policy, programs, methods, and interventions to encourage caring behaviors in the school environment. Findings might contribute to improvements and changes over the long run. Evidence might encourage districts and school communities to initiate programs to intensify the presence of caring behaviors in the school community. The results of further study might encourage a more caring learning community, which might result in improved academic achievement, a positive attitude towards learning, better behavior, an enhanced culture and climate, an improved response to education, better relationships with teachers, adults, and peers, and improved educational outcomes.

In addition, there are not many studies addressing the educational experience in school from the adolescents' point of view. Studies need input from the youth about the schools in which they learn and spend many hours per week (Pope, 2001).

Chapter V includes the purpose of the study, the statement of the problem, a description of the participants, the method of research, a summary of the findings in relationship to the literature and research. This chapter concludes with implications and recommendations for future research.


Appendix A

SURVEY OF THE BEHAVIORAL CHARACTERISTICS OF A TEACHER

Part I
1. DO NOT FILL IN - Leave blank
2. DO NOT FILL IN - Leave blank
3. DO NOT FILL IN - Leave blank
4. DO NOT FILL IN - Leave blank

Part II--Survey Items
Directions: Use the scale below to respond to each item by filling in the circle completely on the computer scan sheet for the response which comes closest to describing how often your teacher uses the behavior. Be sure that you are on the correct number on the computer scan sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>SELDOM</td>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>OFTEN</td>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. My teacher greets me when I enter the room.
6. My teacher calls me by my name.
7. My teacher rewards or compliments me for good behavior.
8. My teacher enforces the same rules for all students.
9. My teacher informs my parents about my progress.
10. My teacher recognizes me for academic achievement.
11. My teacher recognizes me for extra-curricular achievement.
12. My teacher displays my work.
13. My teacher eats lunch with me.
14. My teacher provides an orderly classroom.
15. My teacher takes a personal interest in what I do outside the classroom.
16. My teacher gives me opportunities to make decisions that affect me.
17. My teacher creates an environment where I feel safe.
18. My teacher teaches me at my ability level.
19. My teacher makes time for me before and after school.
20. My teacher maintains eye contact with me when s/he talks to me.
21. My teacher asks for my opinion.
22. My teacher returns work promptly with comments.
23. My teacher gives me help when I don't understand or respond.
24. My teacher uses negative criticism with me.
25. My teacher asks me to help with classroom tasks.
26. My teacher is positive with me.
27. My teacher provides "treats" and "goody's" on special occasions.
28. My teacher allows me to have fun at his/her expense.
29. My teacher uses sarcasm with me.
30. My teacher intervenes when students pick on each other.
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APPENDIX B

Script for presentation of research study at a teachers' meeting:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Education at Seton Hall University. I am here to invite you to participate in a research study for my dissertation. The title of this dissertation is: “The Influence of Teachers’ Caring Behaviors on High School Students’ Behavior and Grades.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of teachers’ caring behaviors on students’ behavior and grades when students perceive varying degrees of teacher caring. I will explore the relationship between teachers’ caring behaviors and students’ behavior and grades. This research is for the general population and not just for this school. I am collecting data to help schools make changes and improvements. I will use this information to determine what relationships exist, what influences occurs, and what differences teachers’ caring can make in students’ behavior and grades.

This study will use a student “survey” as a method of gathering data from students. The survey will take students approximately ten minutes and student monitors will administer the survey form entitled, “A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher” on one day during the first period after lunch. The date of the administration of this survey will be on March 12, which was recommended by the school’s administration. You will be asked to give me the student’s academic grade in the course and the behavior grade. You will not view the student’s survey. Only I will have access to the data and grades. No one other than me will view the student’s grades. I will input the grades.

All high school level students who have received written parental consent to be approached and who have agreed to participate will be surveyed about teachers’ caring behaviors during the first period after lunch. This survey will assist me in determining whether or not perceived teachers’ caring behaviors have an influence on students. This survey will not have any identifying information on it so no one will know your identity or the identity of your students. It is important for students to answer each question honestly and openly. The results of this study will not be shared with your school’s administration or staff. The purpose of this survey is for research to improve education and may make a difference in students’ behavior and grades.

Students will be instructed how to answer the survey and fill in the computer scan form by a student monitor in each of the classrooms. Each student monitor will distribute and collect the material, seal it in an envelope, sign the sealed portion, and deliver it to me so that no one can view the answers.

You will be asked to submit to me each student’s academic grade in this class as well as their behavior grade in this class. Only I will have access to this information.

I am inviting you to participate in this study. No personal information will be required for this study. I will explain the survey and grade input components of this study, and answer any questions at the end of this presentation.

Participation in this research is purely voluntary and refusal to participate or to discontinue your participation will in no way incur a penalty to you or your school. You have the right to withdraw from this study at any time by notifying me in person, by phone, or in writing.

The confidentiality and anonymity of the participants will be preserved. No identifying data on subjects will be recorded so that no one will be able to link the data to any individual. The identity of the individuals involved in the study will remain anonymous by using an alphanumeric coding system. The data collected from the survey will be placed in a locked location. Only I will have access to these collected data.

Be assured that this research project will pose no risk or discomfort to you.
I will be handing you a letter with an “Informed Consent Form”. If you agree to participate in this research study, please sign it and return it to me in the self-addressed stamped envelope this week, so that I can request begin the research process. Thank you for your time.
Informed Consent Form for Teachers

The researcher is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Education Leadership, Management, and Policy at Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey. This form is to invite you to participate in a research study for my dissertation. The title of this dissertation is: "The Influence of Teachers' Caring Behaviors on High School Students' Behavior and Grades.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of teacher caring on students' grades and behavior when students perceive different levels of teacher caring. The researcher will explore how teacher caring influences students' behavior and grades. The time involved to participate in this study will be this 20-30 minute teachers' meeting and the time it takes to fill out a grade sheet on your students in the first period after lunch. No other time will be required of the teachers. This research survey will take approximately ten minutes of the students' time.

Procedure

This study will use a "survey" to gather information from students. The survey will take students approximately ten minutes during class time. Student monitors will administer the survey form on one day during the first period after lunch. The date of the administration of this survey will be at the convenience of the school's schedule. In addition, the teacher will be asked to give the researcher the student's grade in the course and behavior grade in this one class.

Instrumentation

Students will fill out a survey instrument entitled, "A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher". This survey instrument will have no identifying information on it, so that no one will know the identity of the student or the teacher. The survey questions will determine the level of teacher caring in each classroom by asking students specific questions, such as "My teachers call me by my name."

Voluntary Participation

Participation in this research is purely voluntary and refusal to participate or to discontinue your participation will in no way incur penalty to you or the school. The teacher may discontinue participation at any time by notifying the researcher by phone or in writing.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

The confidentiality and anonymity of the participant will be preserved. No identifying data on subjects will be recorded so that no one will ever be able to link the data to any individual. The identity of the individuals involved in this study will remain anonymous by using a coding system. The data collected from the survey will be placed in a locked location. Only the researcher will have access to these collected data.

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

DEC 1 2 2007

Approval Date

College of Education and Human Services
Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy
Tel. 973.761.9397
400 South Orange Avenue • South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685

Expiration Date
DEC 1 2 2008
Permission

The University's Internal Review Board and the government require the protection of the rights of the faculty and students. Therefore, the researcher is required to get written permission from teachers, parents, and students prior to the study. No personal information of faculty or students will be required for this study. This researcher is asking for the teacher's permission to have one trained adult sit in class to count group counts. Again, the identity of faculty and students will be protected and little class time will be needed to determine the information needed for the specific students and classes being studied. Should a teacher agree to this survey, and if at any time wish to review all or any portion of it, or request to destroy it, the teacher will be within his/her right. The teacher may withdraw at anytime by contacting the researcher by phone, in writing, or in person. These collected data and other materials pertaining to the study will be stored in a secure place for three years after the completion of the research.

Risk or Discomfort

This research project will pose no risk or discomfort to the teacher.

Benefits

There are no personal benefits derived from this research project by the teacher individually or for the school.

Contact Information

In the event that one needs further information or clarification concerning this project, one may contact the researcher at 609-652-4441 or my mentor, Dr. Charles A. Mitchell at 973-761-3997. In the event that one may have questions directed to the Institutional Review Board Involving Human Subjects of Seton Hall University, the telephone number is 973-313-6314.

Approved by the IRB (Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research)

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at 973-313-6314.

I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research realizing that I may withdraw without prejudice at any time.

Consent to participate is indicated by returning this form, signed and dated. The date and time of the survey will be at the convenience of the school. You will receive a copy of this signed and dated document. Thank you very much.

_________________________            ____________________________
Teacher                               Date

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

DEC 12 2007

Expiration Date
DEC 12 2008

Approval Date
February 25, 2008

Dear Student at [Redacted] High School:

I am receiving a doctorate degree in Education at Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey. I am asking you to participate in a research study. The title of the study is: “The Influence of Teachers’ Caring Behaviors on High School Students’ Behavior and Grades. Even if your parents give me permission to include you in the study, you will have to decide if you wish to participate. You will have the right to remove yourself at anytime by not taking the survey or by having the survey removed from the study.

The purpose of this study is to find out the influence of teacher caring on students’ grades and behavior. I will look at caring teaching and learning in high school and will try to find out how teachers who care affect students’ behavior and grades.

This study will use a “survey” to find out information from students. The survey will take about ten minutes during class time. No personal information will be needed for this study. Student monitors will give you the survey form named, “A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher” on one day during the first period after lunch. The date of this survey will be decided by the school’s Principal. Teachers will give me the student’s academic grade in the course and behavior grade. The teacher will not view the student’s survey. Only I will have access to the data. I will input the grades.

Participation in this study is voluntary and if you refuse to participate or to stop your participation you and your school will not receive a penalty.

No identifying information on students or teachers will be recorded so that no one will ever be able to link the information to anyone. The identity of the individuals involved in this study will remain anonymous by using a coding system. The information collected from the survey will be placed in a locked area. Only I will have access to this information.

This research project will pose no risk or discomfort to you.

You and your school will not benefit from this research project.

If you agree to participate in this study to gather the necessary information, please sign the enclosed “Informed Consent Form” and return it to me this week in the self-addressed stamped envelope, so that I can begin the study.

I thank you for your time. If you wish more information, I can be reached at 609-652-4441.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Miller
Doctoral Candidate
February 25, 2008

Dear Parents of a Student at [redacted] High School:

I am a doctoral candidate in the Department of Education at Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey. I am asking for your permission to approach your child to participate in a research study for my dissertation. The title of the dissertation is: “The Influence of Teachers’ Caring Behaviors on High School Students’ Behavior and Grades. Even if you give me permission to approach your child, your child will have to decide if s/he wishes to participate. Your child will have the right to withdraw at anytime by not taking the survey or by having the survey removed from the research.

The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of teachers’ caring on students’ grades and behavior when students perceive different levels of teacher caring. I will explore how teacher caring influences students’ behavior and grades.

This study will use a “survey” to gather information from students. The survey will take approximately ten minutes during class time. No personal information will be needed for this study. Student monitors will administer the survey form entitled, “A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher” on one day during the first period after lunch. The date of the administration of this survey will be at the convenience of the school’s schedule. Teachers will give me the student’s academic grade in the course and behavior grade. The teacher will not view the student’s survey. Only I will have access to the data. I will input the grades.

Participation in this research is purely voluntary and refusal to participate or to discontinue participation will in no way incur penalty to your child or the school.

No identifying data on students or teachers will be recorded so that no one will ever be able to link the data to any individual. The identity of the individuals involved in this study will remain anonymous by using a coding system. The data collected from the survey will be placed in a locked location. Only I will have access to these collected data.

If you agree to allow me to approach your child in school to gather the necessary information, please sign the enclosed “Informed Consent Form” and return it to me in the enclosed stamped self-addressed envelope this week, so that I can begin the study.

I thank you in advance for your time and consideration. Should you require more information, I can be reached at 609-652-4441.

Sincerely,

Richard M. Miller
Doctoral Candidate
Informed Consent Form for Students

The researcher is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey. This form is to invite you to participate in a research study for my dissertation. The title of this dissertation is: "The Influence of Teachers' Caring Behaviors on High School Students' Behavior and Grades. Even if your parent gives me permission to approach you to conduct the study, you have the right to decide whether or not to participate.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of teacher caring on student grades and behavior when students perceive different levels of teacher caring. The researcher will explore how teacher caring influences student behavior and grades. This research survey will take approximately ten minutes of the students' time.

Procedure

This study will use a "survey" to gather information. The survey will take approximately ten minutes during class time. Student monitors will administer the survey on one day during the first period after lunch. The date of the administration of this survey will be at the convenience of the school's schedule. In addition, the teacher will be asked to give the researcher the student's grade in the course and behavior grade in this one class.

Instrumentation

Students will fill out a survey instrument entitled, "A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher". This survey instrument will have no identifying information on it, so that no one will know the identity of the student or the teacher. The survey questions will determine the level of teacher caring in each classroom by asking students specific questions, such as "My teachers call me by my name."

Voluntary Participation

Participation in this research is purely voluntary and refusal to participate or to discontinue your participation will in no way incur penalty to you or your school. A student may discontinue participation at any time by not filling out the survey form or by notifying the researcher by phone or in writing.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

The confidentiality and anonymity of the participant will be preserved. No identifying data on subjects will be recorded so that no one will ever be able to link the data to any individual. The identity of the individuals involved in this study will remain anonymous by using a coding system. The data collected from the survey will be placed in a locked location. Only the researcher will have access to these collected data.
Permission

The University's Institutional Review Board and the government require the protection of the rights of the faculty and students. Therefore, the researcher is required to get written permission from teachers, parents, and students prior to the study. The research accomplished within the school will take a small amount of the students' time (approximately ten minutes). No personal information of faculty or students will be required for this study. Should you agree to take this survey, and if at any time you wish to review all or any portion of it, or request to destroy it, you will be within your right. These collected data and other materials pertaining to the study will be stored in a secure place for three years after the completion of the research.

Risk or Discomfort

This research project will pose no risk or discomfort to you.

Benefits

There are no personal benefits derived from this research project by you individually or for the school.

Contact Information

In the event that you need further information or clarification concerning this project, you may contact me at 609-652-4441 or my mentor, Dr. Charles A. Mitchel at 973-761-9397. In the event that you may have questions directed to the Institutional Review Board Involving Human Subjects of Seton Hall University, the telephone number is 973-313-6314.

Approved by the IRB (Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research)

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at 973-313-6314.

I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research realizing that I may withdraw without prejudice at any time.

Consent to participate is indicated by returning this form, signed and dated. The date and time of the survey will be at the convenience of the school. You will receive a copy of this signed and dated document. Thank you very much.

Student __________________________ Date __________________________

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

DEC 12 2007

Approval Date

Expiration Date

DEC 12 2006
APPENDIX G

Informed Consent Form for Parents

The researcher is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Seton Hall University, South Orange, New Jersey. This form is requesting your permission for me to approach your child to participate in a research study for my dissertation. The title of this dissertation is: "The Influence of Teachers' Caring Behaviors on High School Students' Behavior and Grades. Even if you give me permission, your child has the right to accept or refuse to participate in this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of teacher caring on students' grades and behavior when students perceive different levels of teacher caring. The researcher will explore how teacher caring influences behavior, discipline, and grades. This research survey will take approximately ten minutes of the students' time.

Procedure

This study will use a "survey" to gather information. The survey will take students approximately ten minutes during class time. Student monitors will administer the survey on one day during the first period after lunch. The date of the administration of this survey will be at the convenience of the school's schedule. In addition, the teacher will be asked to give the researcher the student's grade in the course and behavior grade in this one class.

Instrumentation

Students will fill out a survey instrument entitled, "A Survey of the Behavioral Characteristics of a Teacher". This survey will have no identifying information on it, so that no one will know the identity of the student or the teacher. The survey questions will determine the level of teacher caring in each classroom by asking students specific questions, such as "My teachers call me by my name."

Voluntary Participation

Participation in this research is purely voluntary and refusal to participate or to discontinue your participation will in no way incur penalty to your child or the school. Your child may discontinue participation at any time by not filling out the survey or by notifying the researcher by phone or in writing.

Anonymity and Confidentiality

The confidentiality and anonymity of the participant will be preserved. No identifying data on subjects will be recorded so that no one will ever be able to link the data to any individual. The identity of the individuals involved in this study will remain anonymous by using a coding system. The data collected from the survey will be placed in a locked location. Only the researcher will have access to these collected data.

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

DEC 12 2007

Approval Date

Expiry Date

College of Education and Human Services
Department of Education Leadership, Management and Policy
Tel. 973.761.9397
400 South Orange Avenue * South Orange, New Jersey 07079-2685
Permission

The University's Internal Review Board and the government require the protection of the rights of the faculty and students. Therefore, the researcher is required to get written permission from teachers, parents, and students prior to the study. The research accomplished within the school will take a small amount of the students' time (approximately ten minutes). No personal information of faculty or students will be required for this study. These collected data and other materials pertaining to the study will be stored in a secure place for three years after the completion of the research.

Risk or Discomfort

This research project will pose no risk or discomfort to your child or the school.

Benefits

There are no personal benefits derived from this research project by your child or for the school.

Contact Information

In the event that you need further information or clarification concerning this project, you may contact me at 609-652-4441 or my mentor, Dr. Charles A. Mitchell at 973-761-9397. In the event that you may have questions directed to the Institutional Review Board Involving Human Subjects of Seton Hall University, the telephone number is 973-313-6314.

Approved by the IRB (Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research)

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board for Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject's privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at 973-313-6314.

I have read the material above, and any questions I asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research realizing that I may withdraw without prejudice at any time.

Consent to permit the researcher to approach your child is indicated by returning this form, signed and dated. The date and time of the survey will be at the convenience of the school. You will receive a copy of this signed and dated document. Thank you very much.

Parent or Guardian of Student __________________________ Date ____________

Seton Hall University
Institutional Review Board

DEC 12 2007

Approval Date

Expiration Date

DEC 12 2008
APPENDIX H

Script for monitors to read before handing out the surveys and computer scan answer forms to students:

A research study is being conducted in our high school to determine the influence of teacher caring on students’ behavior and grades. This research is for the general population and not just our school. The person doing the research is collecting information to help schools make changes and improvements. He will use this information to help make schools more enjoyable for students to attend. So be honest as you respond to each item on the survey.

You are going to complete a survey about teachers’ caring behaviors. This survey will assist the person doing the research in determining whether or not teachers who care have an influence on students. This survey does not have any identifying information other than a code on it so no one will know your identity or the identity of your teacher. A code will be utilized to match up your survey with your grade in the class in the area of academics and behavior. Only the researcher will know the code that identifies the student. It is important for you to answer each question honestly and openly. The specific results of this study will not be shared with our school. The purpose of this survey is for research to improve education and to help make a difference in teaching and learning.

I will hand out your computer scan answer form. Please do not write your name or any other identifying information on the computer scan answer sheet. Please remove the post-it note with your name on it before turning in the form. You will begin with number 5. Be sure that the number you are reading on the survey form is the number you are filling in on the computer scan answer sheet. You are to fill in only the answer that most accurately describes you and the teacher that you have this period for each question on the survey form. Completely fill in the circle on the computer scan answer sheet using a #2 pencil. If you must erase an answer, please do so neatly and leave that erased area completely clean. Only the dark, pencil marked areas will be counted by the computer.

When you are done filling in all of the circles of items number 5 through number 30 on the survey form, I will come around and collect each form and each questionnaire and seal it in this envelope. I will deliver it to the researcher so that no one has an opportunity to view any of your answers to the questions.

The person doing the research thanks you for participating and taking the time to share your honest thoughts and perceptions.
APPENDIX I

Professional Development and Assessment Center

June 22, 2007

To Whom It May Concern:

This letter confirms that Richard M. Miller has my permission to use the "Characteristics of Teachers' Caring Behaviors" survey.

Sincerely,

Clete Bulach, Director

Data Based Decision-Making to Improve the Quality of Instruction