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ABSTRACT

The instructor-student relationship is an important predictor of students’ attitudes, motivation, and learning. Students benefit when they believe their instructor cares about them and instructors demonstrate caring for their students by supporting their needs. Instructors can support students’ emotionally or academically. However, little is known about instructor characteristics that influence instructors’ responsiveness to students.

Compassionate and self-image goals are powerful predictors of relationship dynamics because of their association with responsiveness (Canevello & Crocker, 2010). Compassionate goals, or goals focused on supporting others out of genuine concern for others’ well-being (Crocker & Canevello, 2008), initiate positive relationship cycles. I proposed two types of compassionate goals, focused either on supporting students’ learning or supporting students’ emotions. I hypothesized that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning would be most beneficial to students. Self-image goals, or goals focused on creating and maintaining a desired impression in others’ eyes (Crocker & Canevello, 2008), undermine healthy relationships. I proposed two types of self-image goals, focused on appearing either likable or competent and hypothesized that both forms of self-image goals would undermine the instructor-student relationship.

The present work was the first investigation of the association between college instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals and students’ experiences in the class. In Study 1, I created a scale to measure instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching. In Study 2, college instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching were used to
predict end-of-semester student evaluations. In Study 3, students’ interpretations of their instructors’ goals were measured and used to predict student evaluations.

Results indicated that students respond most positively to instructors’ goals to compassionate goals to support their learning. Instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions are largely unrelated to students’ experiences in the class. Surprisingly, instructors’ self-image goals are unrelated to student evaluations.

Overall, this research advances research in several domains. It advances understanding of effective teaching by indicating that instructors’ compassionate and self-image are important components of the college classroom. This research also advances theory on interpersonal goals, as this is the first time that a non-relationship compassionate goal has been identified.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Characteristics of Excellent College Teaching

Instructors play an important role in college students’ learning and motivation. Although students have the ultimate control and responsibility over their learning, instructors have the ability to create an environment that supports learning and encourages students to engage and succeed in the class (McKeachie, 2007). Instructors can influence learning both directly and indirectly. Instructors directly influence learning through the way they structure the class and course material. Instructors make it easier for students to learn when they present information in a clear and logical manner, answer questions thoroughly, and design effective assessment tools (e.g., Ambrose, Bridges, DiPietro, Lovett, & Norman, 2010). Instructors can also indirectly influence learning through the attitudes they inspire in their students. A plethora of research suggests that a positive instructor-student relationship motives students to exert effort.

Classic teaching and learning theorists have identified two important yet independent characteristics of excellent teachers, which both directly and indirectly influence student learning. Excellent instructors demonstrate effective teaching skills and establish rapport with students (Lowman, 1994/1995; Marsh & Dunkin, 1997; McKeachie, 2007). This dual emphasis on instructors’ teaching skills and ability to establish rapport is the basis of many student evaluation instruments (Feldman, 1997; Marsh, 1987).

Students and instructors tend to prioritize different aspects of teaching. When asked to rank the most important components of teaching, college instructors tend to rank behaviors that enhance information transmission higher than rapport-related behaviors. Students, on the other
hand, generally tend to rank rapport-related behaviors as most preferred in teachers (Buskist, Sikorski, Buckley, & Saville, 2002; Schaeffer, Epting, Zinn, & Buskist, 2003).

**Professional Competence**

Excellent instructors create an environment that facilitates learning. The most obvious way that instructors can influence their students’ learning and experience in the class is to engage in behaviors that support a learning environment. Instructors must be able to effectively transmit information and generate interest in the subject matter. Instructors who present information clearly, organize information logically, and control the classroom well are rated as better teachers than unclear, disorganized teachers who lose control of the classroom (Keeley, Smith, & Buskist, 2006). Instructors can be evaluated on a number of teaching competencies, including communication skills, depth of knowledge, technological competence, and preparedness.

**Interpersonal Rapport**

Even though instructors often discount the importance of the instructor-student relationship, research suggests that the nature of this relationship has a profound impact on students’ attitudes, motivation, and even learning. One of the most common ways to characterize the instructor-student relationship is through rapport. Instructors who establish rapport communicate a positive, rather than negative, attitude toward students (Lowman, 1994; Wilson, 2006). They demonstrate that they know who their students are and that they care about them and their learning (Lowman, 1995). They allow students’ voices to be heard and tailor the class to meet the needs of the students (Buskist et al., 2002; Lowman, 1994). They are encouraging, open-minded, approachable, and show a concern for students and fairness (Benson, Cohen, & Buskist, 2005).
When students feel rapport with their instructor, they engage in proacademic behaviors. For instance, students who feel rapport with their instructors are more likely to enjoy the class, attend class, and pay attention (Buskist & Saville, 2004). They are also more likely to study for class, attend office hours, and email the professor (Benson et al., 2005).

Instructors can establish rapport through immediacy, or behaviors that communicate psychological availability to students (Mehrabian, 1969; Wilson & Taylor, 2001). Immediacy behaviors establish a caring and supportive learning environment (Wilson & Taylor, 2001). Immediacy can be established either verbally or nonverbally. Verbal immediacy behaviors include addressing students by name, praising student work, and encouraging students to talk in class (Gorham, 1988). Nonverbal immediacy behaviors include looking at the class while talking, smiling at the class, and appearing relaxed while teaching the class (Gorham, 1988). Nonverbal immediacy is particularly effective, as it predicts positive student motivation (Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Rodriguez, Plax, & Kearney, 1996), learning (Rodriguez et al., 1996), attitudes toward the course and instructor (Christensen & Menzel, 1998), and beliefs that the instructor likes students (Wilson & Taylor, 2001).

Recent work suggests that the benefits of a positive instructor-student relationship distill down to an instructor’s ability to convey a positive attitude toward students. When students believe that the instructor cares about them, whether measured through scales of immediacy, rapport, or the single-item question “Does your professor like students,” students are more motivated and have a more positive attitude toward the course and instructor (Benson et al., 2005; Wilson, 2006). Students respond positively when they believe their instructor cares for them and wants them to succeed. These results indicate that students’ beliefs about their instructors’ caring are at the heart of a positive instructor-student relationship. In sum, students benefit when instructors demonstrate that they care about students.
Responsiveness

Instructors can demonstrate caring to their students through responsiveness. Although responsiveness hasn’t been directly studied in relation to rapport, it is clear that instructors who establish a positive instructor-student relationship are responsive to their students. Instructors who establish rapport are warm, caring, and student-centered (Lowman, 1994). They listen to students and tailor the class to meet students’ needs (Benson et al., 2005). Current measures and definitions of rapport imply that instructors who establish a positive relationship with students are responsive to students’ needs (e.g., Gorham & Christophel, 1990; Wilson, Ryan, & Pugh, 2010). Although these behaviors aren’t labeled as responsiveness, they closely fit the definitions of responsiveness.

Responsiveness is an important component of positive relationships. Responsive relationship partners demonstrate caring and warmth, and support their partners’ core needs (Gable & Reis, 2006). In fact, responsiveness has been called the foundation of a good relationship (Reis, Clark, & Holmes, 2004). People can create high quality relationships by being responsive to others. Similarly, people can undermine relationship quality when they are unresponsive to others’ needs (Reis et al., 2004). People report higher relationship quality and greater satisfaction and commitment to the relationship when they perceive that their partner is responsive (Reis et al., 2004). Presumably, instructor characteristics that enhance responsiveness can predict a positive instructor-student relationship. One likely candidate is the instructor’s goals for teaching. A person’s goal for a relationship can initiate a responsiveness pattern that ultimately affects others’ experience of relationship quality and attitudes about the relationship.
Interpersonal Goals

Compassionate and self-image goals are powerful predictors of relationship dynamics over time, partly because of their association with responsiveness. Compassionate goals, or goals focused on supporting others out of genuine concern for others’ well-being (Crocker & Canevello, 2008), initiate positive relationship cycles through their influence on responsiveness. Self-image goals, or goals focused on creating and maintaining a desired impression in others’ eyes (Crocker & Canevello, 2008), undermine healthy relationships through responsiveness.

Compassionate and self-image goals have been most thoroughly studied by tracking college roommate freshmen dyads over the course of their first semester in college. These studies reveal that the compassionate and self-image goals produce changes that persist over time for at least 10 weeks.

Compassionate Goals

Compassionate goals are a starting point for positive relationship dynamics. People with compassionate goals want to be a constructive force in their relationships with others and are attentive and responsive to others’ needs (Crocker & Canevello, 2008). They behave warmly, truly listen, and are sensitive to their relationship partners’ feelings (Canevello & Crocker, 2010). People with compassionate goals are responsive to their relationship partners and, as a result, both partners benefit. Partners of people with compassionate goals feel more responded to and consequently are more satisfied and committed to the relationship. Partners of people with compassionate goals even report higher esteem for their partners (Canevello & Crocker, 2011).
Self-Image Goals

People with self-image goals want to achieve a desired image. People often succeed at convincing unfamiliar others of their desired qualities in short-term interactions (Schlenker, 2003), but self-image goals often have unintended and undesired consequences in close, long-term relationships. People with self-image goals are less responsive to their relationship partners and, as a result, initiate relationships that are less beneficial to both relationship partners. When people have self-image goals, they spend energy maintaining and defending desired self-images rather than responding to others’ needs. As a result, partners of people with self-image goals feel less responded to and report lower relationship quality over time (Canevello & Crocker, 2010).

Interpersonal Goals for College Teaching

To date, compassionate and self-image goals have been mainly studied in the context of college students’ relationships with friends and roommates. The main purpose of this research is to examine implications of college instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching. I suggest that college instructors’ compassionate goals for teaching will initiate a positive instructor-student relationship, whereas instructors’ self-image goals will undermine the instructor-student relationship. I propose two types of compassionate goals and two types of self-image goals that instructors may have.

Compassionate Goals for Teaching

People with compassionate goals are responsive and supportive of their relationship partners (Canevello & Crocker, 2010). I suggest that instructors with compassionate goals for teaching will be responsive to their students’ needs in the classroom. There are two obvious ways that instructors support their students and I propose two types of compassionate goals that
correspond with the type of support they desire to provide. Instructors may have compassionate goals to support students’ learning or compassionate goals to support students’ emotions.

At the heart of both of these proposed goals is a student-centered classroom focused on supporting students’ needs. Instructors with compassionate goals will be responsive to their students’ needs. However, I suggest that instructors with goals to support students’ learning and goals to support students’ emotions will look different in the classroom and that students will infer different instructor attitudes from these seemingly similar goals.

**Compassionate goals to support student’ learning.** Instructors with compassionate goals to support students’ learning will prioritize students’ understanding of course material in all aspects of the class. Because the goal is to help students learn, instructors will provide clear learning support for students. Consequently, instructors with this goal are more likely to use effective teaching strategies. For instance, they may provide structured outlines to help students organize their knowledge, frequent summaries of the material that has been covered, or low-stakes opportunities for students to assess their knowledge. They may encourage students to apply the material to their own lives in an effort to make the material more relevant and memorable. In addition to obvious behaviors that will support learning, instructors with this goal will likely make it clear that they are available to students, perhaps through office hours, email, or before and after class. Instructors will communicate with students often to convey expectations of students and to ensure that students understand the material. In short, instructors with compassionate goals to support students’ learning will be responsive to students’ academic needs.

**Compassionate goals to support students’ emotions.** Instructors with compassionate goals to support students’ emotions will strive to make students feel comfortable and welcome in the class. Instructors with this goal presumably truly care about their students and want to connect with them on a personal level. They want to support students’ emotional needs in the classroom
and make a positive difference in students’ lives. Instructors may adopt this goal for a number of reasons. Instructors are often encouraged to establish rapport with students as a way to improve student motivation (e.g., Goss Lucas & Bernstein, 2005). Other instructors may want to support students’ emotions because they truly want a relationship with students. An instructor with this goal may learn students’ names, talk with students before and after class, use humor, or share personal examples of the course material (see Buskist & Saville, 2004, for more suggestions for instructors who want to establish rapport). In short, instructors with compassionate goals to support students’ emotions will be responsive to students’ emotional needs in the classroom.

I suggest that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and goals to support students’ emotions both center around supporting students and responding to their needs. As such, I expect that these two compassionate goals for teaching are correlated with each other. However, they may have some distinct benefits for students because of the way that students react to each type of support. I predict that students of instructors with both types of compassionate goals will feel responded to and infer that their instructor cares about students. However, compassionate goals to support students’ learning may have some unique benefits. Students’ presumed purpose in the classroom is to learn and to achieve specific grades. Instructors’ goals to support students’ learning are closely aligned with students’ goals for the class, whereas instructors’ goals to support student’ emotions refer to secondary needs in the class. I predict that students will respond most positively to instructors who want support their learning because their most important need is met. In fact, students likely infer a positive attitude from instructors who support their learning because they’re responding to their needs. One piece of supporting evidence comes from research on the content of syllabi. Students infer that their teacher has more positive attitudes toward them when they receive a detailed, compared to a brief, course syllabus (Saville, Zinn, Brown, & Marchuk, 2010). In sum, while students do report that they want
emotional support in the classroom (Buskist et al., 2002; Schaeffer et al., 2003), I predict that emotional support without learning support is largely irrelevant to students. As such, students may not respond as positively to instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions because their needs are not met as well.

**Self-Image Goals for Teaching**

Instructors are constantly evaluated, both formally and informally. They likely value students’ evaluations and want to be seen positively because student evaluations often comprise the sole evidence of teaching effectiveness for tenure and promotion decisions (Emery, Kramer, and Tian, 2003; Havelka, Beasley, & Neal, 2005). Some instructors may feel the need to manipulate students’ impressions of them because of the weight of student opinion. In fact, some instructors defensively manage their images by inflating grades and pandering to students to protect their tenure and promotion possibilities (Crumbley & Reichelt, 2009). New instructors are sometimes even coached on how to manage their image in the classroom (e.g., Goss Lucas & Bernstein, 2005).

Students are often asked to formally evaluate instructors’ teaching skills and the quality of the instructor-student relationship (Crumbley & Reichelt, 2009; Feldman, 1997). I propose two types of self-image goals that instructors may have, which correspond to the way in which instructors are most often evaluated. Instructors may have self-image goals to appear likable or to appear competent.

Self-image goals are likely to undermine instructors’ responsiveness to students and, ultimately, the instructor-student relationship because an important component of self-image goals is the need to make sure that others see that one has the desired quality (Crocker & Canevello, 2012). It is not enough to simply be competent or likable; instructors with self-image
goals want students to recognize that the instructor has the desired quality. When instructors have a desired image, they will expend attention and energy to ensure that their desired image comes across. This need to monitor their status will take attention away from instructors’ presumed purpose in the classroom – to teach the material and respond to students’ needs. Rather than being the focus of the class, students are a tool for helping the instructor create and maintain a desired self-image.

**Self-image goals to appear likable.** Instructors with self-image goals to appear likable want to convince students to like them. This goal stems from a desire to receive positive student evaluations or gain admiration and not a desire to establish a connection with students (Crumbley & Reichelt, 2009). They may engage in behaviors that typically build rapport with students, such as learning student names and using humor in class (e.g. Buskist & Saville, 2004). However, I expect that instructors who want to appear likable will not convey a warm tone to students despite engaging in behaviors that typically improve rapport. Instructors who want to get students to like them may ironically focus less energy on establishing a real relationship because of the need to manipulate students’ impressions. In sum, instructors with self-image goals to appear likable will not be responsive to students’ emotional needs because of a superficial connection with students.

**Self-image goals to appear competent.** Instructors with self-image goals to appear competent want students to recognize their abilities. This goal likely stems from a fear that students won’t respect the instructor or a fear of not knowing the material well enough. In order to appear competent, instructors may use terminology that students can’t understand, ignore students’ questions, or talk over students’ heads. These behaviors are unresponsive to students’ learning needs.

Self-image goals often do not produce their desired effect. In fact, they sometimes produce the opposite of their intended effect (Crocker & Canevello, 2012). I predict that
instructors’ self-image goals will undermine student evaluations and the instructor-student relationship. While instructors with self-image goals to appear likable may be rated as funny or entertaining, students are likely to report that such instructors are not responsive to their needs. Similarly, instructors’ self-image goals to appear competent are likely to predict negative evaluations of responsiveness. I predict that self-image goals to appear competent are unrelated to evaluations of instructors’ competence because this goal likely does not improve instructors’ competence, despite the instructor’s intentions.

**Overview of Studies**

Three studies were designed to explore the effect of college instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals on students. The main aim of these studies was to provide evidence that the four proposed goals exist in college instructors and to determine the ways in which college instructors’ teaching goals impact students’ attitudes toward their instructors and evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and teaching ability.

In Study 1, I developed a measure of college instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching. I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning, compassionate goals to support students’ emotions, self-image goals to appear likable, and self-image goals to appear competent would emerge as separate and independent goals for teaching. However, I predicted that the two types of instructor compassionate goals would be correlated with each other and the two types of instructor self-image goals would be correlated with each other, indicating that they share underlying characteristics. I did not expect instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals to be significantly correlated.

Study 2 was designed to investigate the association of college instructors’ goals with students’ evaluations. Introduction to Psychology instructors reported their compassionate and self-image goals for teaching at the beginning of the semester. At the end of the semester,
students evaluated their instructors’ teaching skills and responsiveness. I tested the total effect of each type of instructor goal and also the unique effects of instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and to support students’ emotions.

Because compassionate goals are positively associated with responsiveness (Canevello & Crocker, 2010), I hypothesized that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and goals to support students’ emotions would predict positive evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness. However, I hypothesized that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning would also predict positive evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills, while instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would be unrelated to instructors’ teaching skills. Further, I hypothesized that the effects of instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions would go away when instructors’ goals to support learning were taken into account.

Instructors’ self-image goals were expected to interfere with effective teaching, just as self-image goals typically undermine healthy relationships. Self-image goals are associated with low responsiveness in part because they require getting the other person (in this case, students) to get that one has the desired image (Canevello & Crocker, 2010; Crocker & Canevello, 2012). Instructors with self-image goals likely selectively monitor the class to assess their desired self-image rather than monitoring and responding to students’ true needs. Consequently, I predicted that instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable and to appear competent would be negatively associated with evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness. Instructors’ self-image goals to appear competent and likable were expected to be unrelated with instructors’ teaching skills.

Study 3 was designed to test students’ sensitivity to their instructors’ goals. Despite an expectation that instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals would have observable impacts on instructors’ teaching and influence teaching evaluations, it is unclear whether students are able to recognize instructors’ goals. It is possible that instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals
for teaching affect student evaluations without students’ conscious awareness of instructors’ goals for teaching. Students may simply respond to their experiences in the class rather than a conscious reflection on instructors’ goals for teaching. In this study, Introduction to Psychology students reported their perceptions of their instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching. Students’ perceptions of instructors’ goals were then matched with their instructors’ self-reported goals for teaching to test students’ sensitivity to their instructors’ goals. Students also reported their attitudes toward the course and instructor. Notably, Studies 2 and 3 were conducted concurrently with many of the same instructors.

I hypothesized that students would demonstrate sensitivity to their instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and emotions because instructors’ compassionate goals likely manifest themselves in obvious behaviors that students can observe and reference while reflecting on instructors’ goals. However, I hypothesized that students would not demonstrate sensitivity to their instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable or to appear competent because behaviors stemming from instructors’ self-image goals are likely less obvious and identifiable. Further, instructors may be skilled at hiding their self-image goals and students are not as accustomed to considering their instructors’ self-image goals.

I also expected students’ perceptions of their instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals to influence their attitudes toward the course and instructor. Because compassionate and self-image goals predict partners’ perceptions of responsiveness and reports of relationship quality (Canevello & Crocker, 2010), I hypothesize that they predict students’ reports of instructors’ liking of students. Students will likely infer a positive attitude from instructors with compassionate goals and a negative attitude from instructors with self-image goals.

These studies represent the first time interpersonal goals have been investigated in the classroom context. To the best of our knowledge, these studies also represent the first look at
instructors’ goal orientations and attempt to tease apart self-focused instructor goals from student-focused goals.
CHAPTER 2: STUDY 1

Overview

The purpose of Study 1 was to create a measure of instructors’ interpersonal goals for teaching. I predict that instructors can have and report compassionate goals to support students’ learning, compassionate goals to support students’ emotions, self-image goals to appear likable, and self-image goals to appear competent. To develop this measure, I created items that I predict relate to each proposed goal.

Previous studies measuring relationship goals found that compassionate and self-image goals are correlated with each other \( r = .53 \); Crocker & Canevello, 2008). Thus, I predicted that instructors compassionate and self-image goals will be moderately correlated. I also predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and to support students’ emotions would be correlated, while instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable and to appear competent would be correlated.

Method

Participants and Procedure

College instructors were recruited through email listservs and personal contacts to participate in a brief survey intended to validate a new scale assessing instructors’ goals for the classroom. Instructors were told that their participation would require less than 15 minutes of their time and that their responses were completely anonymous. Participants completed a 66-item
questionnaire and then provided the voluntary demographic information. Finally, instructors were thanked for their participation and were invited to contact me with any questions or comments.

Instructors were not required to provide any demographic information and many participants declined to answer one or more questions regarding demographics. Three hundred eighty instructors (98 male, 248 female, 33 unknown) voluntarily participated. Participants ranged in age from 20 to 75 (M = 38) and had a wide variety of teaching experience. Participants represented a broad range of academic disciplines, from chemistry to art history. Psychology (169), foreign languages/linguistics (58), and women’s studies (19) were the most strongly represented disciplines.

**Materials**

I created 66 items measuring our 4 hypothesized interpersonal goals by modifying items in the existing General Compassionate and Self-Image Goal scale (Canevello & Crocker, 2010, Study 1; Crocker & Canevello, 2008, Study 1; Crocker, Canevello, Breines, & Flynn, 2010, Study 1) to fit the teaching context. To avoid confounding with approach and avoidance motivation, items were worded to reflect both approach and avoidance orientations (see Appendix A).

**Results**

**Analysis Plan**

The purpose of this study was to create a scale that would measure college instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching. The final scale would be completed voluntarily by instructors, so my goal was to create a relatively brief scale while maintaining high reliability
within each subscale. I also wanted the final measure to have a relative balance of approach and avoid items.

One of the core predictions of this study was that instructors would report both compassionate and self-image goals for the instructor-student relationship. The second prediction of this study was that students would report compassionate goals to support students’ learning and competence as well as self-image goals to appear competent. To test these predictions, I conducted two exploratory factor analyses (EFAs). The first EFA contained items designed to measure the instructor-student relationship, representing the proposed compassionate goals to support students’ emotions and self-image goals to appear likable. The second EFA contained items designed to measure instructors’ concerns with students’ and their own competence. For both EFAs, I used the maximum likelihood method with a promax rotation and specified two factors. I accepted items with factor loadings greater than .40 and cross-loadings lower than .20.

**Relationship Goals**

I predicted that instructors’ relationship goals would factor into compassionate goals to support students’ emotions and self-image goals to appear likable. This prediction was supported. The EFA yielded the two predicted factors representing compassionate goals to support students’ and self-image goals to appear likable (see Table 1). After reducing the scale to an acceptable length and reliability using the criteria described above, seven items representing instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions and 5 items represented instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable (see Table 2).
Competence Goals

I predicted that instructor would report compassionate goals to support students’ learning competence and self-image goals to appear competent. This prediction was supported. The EFA yielded two factors representing instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ competence and self-image goals to appear competent (see Table 3). My scale reduction strategy yielded 14 items measuring instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ competence and 10 items measuring instructors’ self-image goals to appear competent (see Table 4).

Descriptive Statistics

I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions and to support students’ learning would be correlated with each other and that instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable and to appear competent would be correlated with each other. Zero-order correlations supported these predictions (see Table 5).

I also predicted that instructors would report higher compassionate goals on average, compared to self-image goals. This prediction was also supported (see Table 5). Instructors reported the highest levels of compassionate goals to support student learning, followed by compassionate goals to support students’ emotions. Instructors reported relatively low self-image goals to appear likable and to appear competent.

Discussion

The purpose of Study 1 was to create a measure of instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions, compassionate goals to support students’ competence, self-image goals to appear likable, and self-image goals to appear competent. I predicted that these four
goals would emerge as separate but related factors. This prediction was supported by two exploratory factor analyses.

As expected, instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and compassionate goals to support students’ emotions were highly correlated. Similarly, instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable and self-image goals to appear competent were highly correlated. Instructors’ averaged compassionate goals and averaged self-image goals were significantly correlated because of the large sample size as well, but the actual correlation is relatively small. Not surprisingly, instructors report stronger compassionate goals to support students’ learning and emotions than self-image goals to appear likable and competent. This is possibly a function of social desirability, which was not measured for the sake of time. Future research will more carefully explore the role of experience teaching, gender, and course subject material in instructors’ goals for teaching.
CHAPTER 3: STUDY 2

Overview

Study 1 revealed that instructors experience compassionate goals to support students’ learning, compassionate goals to support students’ emotions, self-image goals to appear likable, and self-image goals to appear competent. But how do instructors’ goals influence students’ evaluations? Study 2 investigated the association between instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals on student evaluations of instructors. Student evaluations are by far the most common method of evaluating instructors (Feldman, 1997; Halvelka et al., 2005) and are typically reliable indices of instructors’ competence and students’ experiences in the class (Marsh, 1987).

This study had two main purposes. First, it investigated the correlation between each type of instructor goal and student evaluations. Second, it further investigated the relationship between instructors’ goals for teaching to reveal the unique effects of each type of instructors’ goals, as revealed by partial correlations. These goals were accomplished in a semester-long study of Introduction to Psychology instructors and their students. At the beginning of the semester, Introduction to Psychology instructors reported their compassionate and self-image goals for teaching. At the end of the semester, Introduction to Psychology students completed an evaluation of their instructors’ teaching skills and responsiveness.

Compassionate goals are associated with responsiveness and, ultimately, high relationship quality in close relationships (Canevello & Crocker, 2010). Instructors with compassionate goals to support students’ emotions are likely responsive to students’ emotional...
needs in the classroom, whereas instructors with compassionate goals to support students’ learning may be responsive to students’ academic needs in the classroom. Consequently, I hypothesized that both compassionate goals to support students’ learning and compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would predict positive ratings of responsiveness. However, I expect that compassionate goals to support students’ learning and goals will have different effects on student evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills. I do not expect instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions to influence their teaching style. However, when instructors want to support students’ learning, they will create a supportive learning environment that facilitates students’ learning and enables them to succeed. Consequently, I hypothesized that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning would predict positive evaluations of teaching skills, but hypothesized that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would be unrelated to instructors’ teaching skills.

I expected that instructors’ self-image goals for teaching also influence students’ evaluations. Self-image goals are associated with low responsiveness in relationships, so instructors with self-image goals may not be responsive to their students’ needs in the classroom. Instructors with self-image goals may be preoccupied with maintaining their desired image, which could decrease their responsiveness to students. Consequently, I predicted that instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable and to appear would be negatively associated with students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness. Research on self-image goals in relationships suggests that self-image goals often do not produce their desired effect. Consequently, I predicted that instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable and to appear competent would be negatively associated with students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills.

The second aim of this study was to disentangle the individual effects of each type of goal instructors could adopt. Because instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’
learning and emotions are highly correlated, it is possible that the total effect of the goals on students’ evaluations stems from the shared variance between instructors’ compassionate goals to support learning and emotion rather than the unique aspects of each goal. To test for this possibility, I entered instructors’ compassionate goals to support learning and emotions as simultaneous predictors of students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and teaching skills from simultaneously. This analysis could remove the meaningful aspect of both instructors’ goals to support learning and emotions, but I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning would be significantly associated with students’ evaluations of responsiveness and that instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions would not be associated with students’ evaluations of responsiveness. I did not expect that the effects of compassionate goals on students’ evaluations of instructors’ skills would stem from the same variance, so I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning would be positively associated with students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills while instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions would remain unassociated with students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills.

**Method**

**Participants**

**Instructors.** Twenty-three Introductory Psychology graduate teaching associates (8 male, 15 female) at a large Midwestern university participated in this study. These instructors had varying amounts of teaching experience, ranging from 0 – 10 completed courses (M = 5). The majority of instructors reported that they were either comfortable (52.2%) or extremely comfortable (26.1%) with teaching. Experience and comfort with teaching were not significantly correlated (r = .24, p = .27).
Students. To protect student confidentiality, no identifying information was collected. The average age, gender, and race of participants is unknown.

Procedure

Instructors were recruited to participate during the first full week of the semester. Upon consenting to participate, each instructor completed the Instructor Goal Inventory described in Study 1 within the first week of the semester. Instructors were contacted during the 13th week of the semester to schedule the in-class session. Data collection took place in the 14th week of the semester, from November 28-30, 2012. Research assistants entered the classroom at either the very beginning or very end of class (depending on the instructor’s preference and the availability of research assistants) to recruit participants. Classes sizes ranged from 58-108 students (M = 75.21) and 30-70% of enrolled students (M = 60.1%) completed the evaluation.

All students present in class at the time of data collection were eligible to participate. Research assistants first read the informed consent script, then passed out the student questionnaire (see Appendix B) and a sheet to record their responses. The vast majority of students who were present consented to participate and answered all of the questions.

Measures

Instructors’ goals. Instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching were measured with the Instructor Goal Inventory created in Study 1. Instructors responded to 66 questions with the stem “In general, with regard to your teaching, how much do you WANT or TRY to”. Instructors’ responses were computed into 4 subscales according to the results of Study 1 (see Table 6). As expected, instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and students’ emotions were significantly correlated. Instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable
and to appear competent were also significantly correlated. Instructors’ averaged compassionate and self-image goals were not significantly correlated ($r = .09, \ ns$). Instructors’ self-image goals to appear competent were moderately negatively correlated with their comfort teaching, whereas instructors’ compassionate goals to support student learning were moderately positively correlated with their comfort teaching. Males and females did not differ in reports of their interpersonal goals for teaching ($ps > .16$).

**Student evaluations.** Students completed a 19-item questionnaire assessing their Psych 1100 instructor (see Appendix B). Six items were drawn from the Ohio State University’s Standard Evaluation of Instruction measure. Students rated their agreement with the statements “My instructor is organized,” “My instructor is intellectually stimulating,” “My instructor is interested in teaching,” “My instructor is well prepared,” “My instructor is interested in helping students,” and “My instructor communicates the subject matter clearly.” Students also responded to the items “My instructor motivates me to do my best work,” “My instructor displays a positive attitude toward me,” “My instructor wants me to succeed,” “I like my instructor,” and “I would recommend my instructor to a friend who wants to take Psych 1100.” Students were also asked to give an overall rating of their instructor. The instructor-student relationship was measured with 6 items modified from Canevello & Crocker (2010) to describe the instructor-student relationship. Students also responded to the following questions: “In general, to what extent:” “Do you feel that you instructor really care about you,” “Does your instructor behave warmly toward you,” “Do you feel you instructor really listens to you,” “Is your instructor sensitive to your feelings,” “Does your instructor seem sincere during interactions,” and “Does your instructor make you feel valued as a person.”
Results

Analysis Strategy

In this data, student evaluations are nested within instructors. To account for this interdependence, I used hierarchical linear modeling (HLM) with the maximum likelihood method. To indicate effect sizes, I report partial correlations for all analyses, as suggested by Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991).

First, I investigated the individual effects of instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning, compassionate goals to support students’ emotions, self-image goals to appear likable, and self-image goals to appear competent. I hypothesized that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning would positively predict students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills and responsiveness. I hypothesized that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would positively predict students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness, but would be unrelated to students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills. I hypothesized that instructors’ self-image goals would undermine instructors’ responsiveness but would be unrelated to instructors’ teaching skills. To test these hypotheses, I created four HLM equations to predict students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills and four HLM equations to predict students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness. In each equation, a measure of instructors’ goals for teaching was entered individually as a fixed effect with a random intercept predicting the student evaluation measure.

Next, I tested whether the effects of instructors’ compassionate goals on student evaluations were the result of shared variance between instructors’ goals. I predicted that, when entered simultaneously with compassionate goals to support students’ learning, instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would no longer predict students’ evaluations
of instructors’ responsiveness. I also predicted that, when entered simultaneously with instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning, instructors’ self-image goals to support students’ emotions would be unrelated to students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills. To test these hypotheses, I created two equations, one predicting students’ evaluations of instructors’ competence and one predicting students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness. In both equations, instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and to support students’ emotions were entered as simultaneous fixed predictors of the student evaluation measure.

Creating Subscales

An exploratory factor analysis on all 19 student evaluation items revealed a two-factor solution representing instructors’ teaching skills and responsiveness (see Table 7). Items were included in the final subscale if they had a loading of .60 or higher on their primary factor and did not cross-load more than .20. The final scale measure instructors’ teaching skills included 8 items ($\alpha = .93$) and the final scale measuring responsiveness included 8 items ($\alpha = .95$).

Total effect of each goal

My first research question concerned the individual effects of each type of instructor goal on student evaluations of instructors. I created eight separate HLM equations to investigate this question. Each of the four instructor goals was entered as a fixed predictor with a random intercept of students’ evaluations of instructors’ professional competency and responsiveness. Instructor gender did not moderate any of the effects of instructor goals on student reports of competency ($pr$’s < .13, $p$’s > .54) or responsiveness ($pr$’s < .21, $p$’s > .33).
Compassionate Goals to Support Students’ Learning. I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support learning would predict positive student evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and competence. These predictions were supported. Instructors’ compassionate goals to support student learning significantly predicted increases in students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and competence ($pr = .59, t(21.65) = 3.40, p < .01; pr = .56, t(21.92) = 3.18, p < .01$, respectively).

Compassionate Goals to Support Students’ Emotions. I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would predict positive student evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness. This prediction was not supported. Instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions did not significantly predict students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness ($pr = .29, t(22.53) = 1.45, ns$). My prediction that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would be unrelated to students’ evaluations of instructors’ competence was also unsupported. In fact, instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions predicted marginally positive evaluations of instructors’ teaching skill ($pr = .39, t(22.68) = 2.00, p = .06$).

Self-Image Goals to Appear Likable. I predicted that instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable would negatively predict students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and competence. These predictions were not supported. Instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable were unrelated to students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and competence ($pr = -.15, t(22.94) = -.73, ns; pr = -.07, t(22.89) = .33, ns$, respectively).

Self-Image Goals to Appear Competent. I predicted that instructors’ self-image goals to appear competent would negatively predict students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and competence. These predictions were not supported. Instructors’ self-image goals to appear
competence were unrelated to students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and competence ($pr = -.12, t(22.39) = -.56, ns; pr = -.06, t(22.59) = -.27, ns$, respectively)

**Within Compassionate Goals**

Next, I tested whether the previously observed effects of instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and emotions stemmed from shared variance. I created two HLM equations – one predicting students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and one predicting students’ evaluations of instructors’ competence. In both equations, instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and to support students’ emotions were entered as simultaneous fixed predictors with a random intercept. This allowed me to test for the unique influence of each type of compassionate goal.

**Responsiveness.** Previous analyses revealed that instructors’ compassionate goals to support learning strongly predicted students’ evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness. Instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions did not predict students’ reports of instructors’ responsiveness. In this analysis, I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support learning would significantly predict students’ evaluations of responsiveness and that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would be unrelated to instructors’ responsiveness. This prediction was supported. Instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning positively predicted reports of responsiveness ($pr = .53, t(21.91) = 2.93, p < .01$), but again instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions did not predict responsiveness ($pr = -.01, t(22.74) = -.06, ns$).

**Competence.** Previous analyses revealed that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning strongly predicted students’ evaluations of instructors’ competence, but instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions only marginally predicted evaluations of
instructors’ teaching skills. In this analysis, I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning would predict positive evaluations of teaching skills, but instructors’ goals to support students’ learning would not predict evaluations of teaching skills. This prediction was supported. Instructors’ goals to support students’ learning positively predicted students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills ($pr = .45$, $t(22.11) = 2.39, p < .05$), but instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions did not ($pr = .14$, $t(22.67) = .67, ns$).

**Discussion**

This purpose of this study was to investigate the effects of instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals on students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills and responsiveness.

**Compassionate Goals**

In this first investigation into the effects of instructors’ compassionate goals on students’ evaluations, I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and emotions would have similar associations with student reports of responsiveness, but that instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions would not predict teaching skills. Further, I predicted that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning would show unique benefits for student evaluations when controlling for instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions. These predictions were partially supported.

Instructors’ compassionate goals to support student learning did indeed predict positive student evaluations of responsiveness and teaching skills. However, contrary to my predictions, instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions were unrelated to responsiveness but moderately related to positive evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills. When instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and to support students’ emotions simultaneously predicted responsiveness and teaching skills, the goal to support students’
learning emerged as the sole predictor of both measures. Apart from the association with goals to support learning, instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions were unrelated to student evaluations. This indicates that the observed effects of instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions stemmed from a shared variance with goals to support students’ learning. Instructors’ goals to support students’ learning have a more powerful impact on student evaluations of instructors and, presumably, instructors’ teaching behaviors.

**Self-Image Goals**

I hypothesized that instructors’ self-image goals would undermine students’ evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills and responsiveness. This hypothesis was not supported. In fact, instructors’ self-image goals to appear competent and to appear likable were unrelated to students’ evaluations of teaching skills and responsiveness. However, it’s important to note that instructors’ self-image goals did not produce their desired effect. Instructors who wanted to appear competent weren’t evaluated as more competent and instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable did not lead to higher student evaluations.
CHAPTER 4: STUDY 3

Overview

Study 2 revealed the effects of Introduction to Psychology instructors’ goals on end-of-semester student evaluations. However, it is unclear whether students are consciously aware of their instructors’ goals for teaching. Instructors’ compassionate goals predict generally positive student evaluations, but this association does not require students to consciously recognize their instructors’ goals. Students could respond positively to behaviors associated with instructors’ compassionate goals for teaching without consciously recognizing or appreciating instructors’ goals. Further, in Study 2, instructors’ self-image goals were unrelated to students’ end-of-semester evaluations, contrary to predictions. This may either indicate that instructors are skilled at hiding their self-image goals from students or that students do not care about their instructors’ self-image goals. Study 3 addressed these questions by investigating Introduction to Psychology students’ sensitivity to their instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching.

In this study, students reported their perceptions of their Introduction to Psychology instructor’s goals for teaching. Students’ reports of their instructors’ goals were then compared to their instructors’ self-reported goals, as measured in Study 2. Research on “thin slice” judgments of college instructors reveals that students can quickly evaluate instructors’ personality characteristics. These quick evaluations are highly correlated with end-of-course evaluations, indicating that students are skilled at recognizing instructors’ personality traits that influence student evaluations (Ambady & Rosenthal, 1993). However, it may be more difficult to understand an instructor’s goals for teaching than to identify the instructor’s personality traits.
I hypothesized that students would demonstrate sensitivity to instructors’ compassionate goals for teaching because instructors’ compassionate goals likely produce observable behaviors that indicate instructors’ intentions. For instance, instructors who want to support students’ learning may provide obvious learning support and structure, whereas instructors who want to support students’ emotions may spend a great deal of time getting to know students and encouraging them to feel comfortable in the classroom. For both types of compassionate goals, students can observe behavior and infer instructors’ likely intention. However, I expected that instructors’ self-image goals may not produce overt behaviors that students can easily recognize and assign meaning to. Therefore, I hypothesized that students would not demonstrate sensitivity to their instructors’ self-image goals for teaching. I also tested instructor gender as a moderator of students’ sensitivity to instructors’ goals because female instructors are typically expected to be warmer and to give more interpersonal support to students than male instructors (Bennet, 1992). I predicted that instructor gender would moderate students’ sensitivity to instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions, such that students would more readily perceive goals to support emotions in female, rather than male, instructors. I did not have predictions for gender moderation of the remaining instructor goals.

A second aim of Study 3 was to investigate the effect of students’ beliefs about their instructors’ goals. Regardless of students’ sensitivity to their instructors’ goals, how do students’ perceptions of their instructors’ goals influence students’ attitudes and experiences in the classroom? In addition to reporting their perceptions of their instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching, students also reported on their attitudes and behaviors in their Introduction to Psychology class. Students’ reports of their instructors’ goals were then used to predict students’ experiences in the course.
I hypothesized that students would most appreciate instructors’ goals to support learning. Students are expected to infer a positive attitude from instructors whom they believe want to support their learning. Specifically, I hypothesized that students’ perceptions of instructors’ compassionate goals to support learning would predict beliefs that the instructor likes students, positive attitudes toward the course and instructor, and beliefs that the instructor is prepared for class. I predicted that students’ perceptions of instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions would positively correlate with liking of the instructor, beliefs that the instructor likes students, and communication with the instructor.

Despite predictions that students are not sensitive to their instructors’ self-image goals, I expected that beliefs that instructors want to appear likable or competent would predict generally negative attitudes and experiences. Specifically, I hypothesized that students’ perceptions of instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable would be negatively associated with liking of the instructor, beliefs that the instructor likes students, and communication with the instructor. I hypothesized that students’ perceptions of instructors’ goals to appear competent would be negatively associated with liking of the instructor, enjoyment of the course, and evaluations of the instructors’ preparedness.

Method

Participants

Instructors. Twenty-five Introduction to Psychology instructors (10 male, 15 female) participated in this study. The sample included each instructor who participated in Study 2, plus one honors instructor and one instructor of the online Introduction to Psychology course.
**Students.** Student participants were enrolled in either the general Introduction to Psychology course or the honors version of the course. Introduction to Psychology students are required to participate in a research experience program in exchange for partial course credit and chose this study from an array of options. Seven hundred sixty seven students (272 male, 486 female, 9 unknown) participated. The majority (550; 71.7%) were freshmen, with 125 (16.1%) sophomores, 61 (8.0%) juniors, 16 (2.1%) seniors, and 7 (0.9%) students who were beyond their 4th year in college.

**Procedure**

Instructors completed the Instructor Goal Inventory at the beginning of the semester (see Study 2 Method). Students completed this study online throughout the semester. Upon registering for the study, students received an email with a link to the survey and instructions to complete the survey within the next 48 hours. After providing informed consent, students first identified their instructor and then completed the Instructor Goal Inventory (Student Version) (see Appendix 3). The Instructor Goal Inventory (Student Version) mirrored the Instructor Goal Inventory that instructors completed at the beginning of the semester, except students were directed to reflect on the goals of their Introduction to Psychology instructor. Next, students reported on their attitudes and experience in the class.

**Measures**

**Instructor Goal Inventory (Student Version).** Students were asked to “reflect on what you think your instructor’s goals for teaching are” and responded to the stem “In general, how much does your Psych 1100 instructor WANT or TRY to”. Example items include “create a
positive relationship with students”, “demonstrate his/her competence to students”, “focus on specific desired earning outcomes”, and “avoid appearing unlikeable”.

**Student Evaluations.** Students also reported their enjoyment of the course, communication with the instructor outside of class, and attendance. Students in the final data collection phase (N = 253) also completed 4 additional items: “I like my instructor”, “My instructor likes me”, “My instructor is funny”, and “My instructor is well prepared for class.”

**Results**

**Analysis Strategy**

Data analysis proceeded in two stages. I report partial correlations for all analyses to indicate effect sizes, as suggested by Rosenthal and Rosnow (1991). I used HLM with the maximum likelihood method to test for students’ sensitivity to their instructors’ goals because students’ data are nested within instructors. In each equation, instructors’ self-reported goals were entered as a fixed factor with a random intercept predicting students’ perceptions of the instructor-reported corresponding goal. This strategy yielded four separate HLM equations, each with a single instructor goal predicting the corresponding student perception measure. This equation indications students’ sensitivity to instructors’ goals when instructor goals significantly predict students’ perceptions of instructors’ goals. Because I expected instructor students to over-perceive compassionate goals to support students’ emotions for female instructors, I tested instructor gender as a moderator of students’ sensitivity to instructors’ goals. I created four HLM equations, each with instructors’ goals, instructor gender, and the interaction of instructor goals and gender entered as fixed factors with a random intercept predicting the corresponding student perception measure.
Next, I tested the effect of students’ perceptions of their instructors’ goals on student attitudes and experiences in the class. Zero-order correlations revealed that students’ perceptions of all four instructor goals were highly correlated with each other (see Table 7). To eliminate the effect of shared variance among student perceptions of each instructor goal, I computed partial correlations. I computed the partial correlation of students’ perceptions of each instructor goal with each dependent variable, controlling for students’ perceptions of the remaining three goals.

**Creating Subscales**

Student responses to the Instructor Goal Inventory (Student Version) were translated into subscales according to the Instructor Goal Inventory (see Table 7).

**Sensitivity to Instructors’ Goals**

I predicted that students would demonstrate sensitivity to their instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and to support students’ emotions. This prediction was tested with two HLM equations predicting students’ perceptions of instructors’ compassionate goals from instructors’ self-reported compassionate goals. Instructors’ compassionate goals to support learning significantly predicted students’ perceptions of instructors’ compassionate goals to support learning ($pr = .44, t(21.92) = 2.27, p < .05$). Instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions also significantly predicted students’ perceptions of instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions ($pr = .36, t(28.92) = 2.05, p = .05$). These results are consistent with my prediction that students are sensitive to their instructors’ compassionate goals.

I predicted that students would not demonstrate sensitivity to instructors’ self-image goals to appear competent and to appear likable. This prediction was tested with two HLM
equations predicting students’ perceptions of their instructors’ self-image goals from instructors’ self-reported self-image goals. Results supported my predictions. Instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable did not predict students’ reports of instructors’ goals to appear likable ($pr = -.21, t(24.99) = -1.07, ns$). Likewise, instructors’ self-image goals to appear competent did not predict students’ reports of instructors’ goals to appear competent ($pr = -.33, t(23.54) = -1.67, ns$).

Students did not demonstrate sensitivity to instructors’ self-image goals.

Next, I tested whether students are differentially sensitive to male and female instructor’ goals. I predicted that students’ gender stereotypes would lead them to over-perceive compassionate goals to support students’ emotions in female instructors. I did not expect students’ sensitivity to instructors’ self-image goals or compassionate goals to support students’ learning to differ by instructor gender. As predicted, students’ sensitivity to their instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions differed for male and female instructors ($pr = .35, t(29.82) = 2.07, p < .05$, see Figure 1). Students perceived high levels of compassionate goals to support emotions in female instructors regardless of female instructors’ self-reported goals to support emotions. This could indicate that students are not sensitive to female instructors’ compassionate goals to support emotions because they perceive intentions to support students’ emotions even when female instructors do not have them. However, students are sensitive to male instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions. As predicted, instructor gender did not moderate students’ perceptions of instructors’ self-image goals to appear competent ($pr = -.15, t(19.09) = -0.68, ns$), self-image goals to appear likable ($pr = .12, t(25.45) = 0.62, ns$), or compassionate goals to support students’ learning ($pr = .27, t(21.02) = 1.27, ns$).
Students’ Experiences in the Classroom

The second aim of this study was to determine the effect of students’ perceptions of their instructors’ goals on students’ attitudes in the class. I computed the partial correlation of students’ perceptions of each instructor goal with each dependent variable, controlling for students’ perceptions of the remaining three goals (see Table 9).

**Compassionate Goals to Support Students’ Emotions.** I predicted that students’ perceptions of their instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would positively correlate with liking of the instructor, beliefs that the instructor likes students, and communication with the instructor. These predictions were partially supported. As predicted, students’ perceptions of instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions were positively correlated with student beliefs that their instructor likes them and communication with the instructor. Contrary to predictions, beliefs that instructors want to support students’ emotions were unrelated to liking of the instructor. Surprisingly, students’ perceptions of instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions were negatively correlated with beliefs that the instructor was well prepared for class. Students’ perceptions of instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions were unrelated to attendance or enjoyment of the class, or reports of instructor funniness.

**Compassionate Goals to Support Students’ Learning.** I predicted that students’ perceptions of their instructors’ compassionate goals to support student learning would positively correlate with enjoyment of the course, liking of the instructor, beliefs that the instructor likes students, and evaluations of instructors’ preparedness. These predictions were supported. Students’ perceptions of instructors compassionate learning goals were positively correlated with enjoyment of the course, liking of the instructor, beliefs that the instructor likes students, and
reports of instructor preparedness. Additionally, perceptions of instructors’ compassionate learning goals were positively correlated with attendance and reports of instructor funniness. Students’ perceptions of instructors’ compassionate learning goals were unrelated to communication with the instructor.

**Self-Image Goals to Appear Likable.** Student ratings of instructor goals to appear likable were positively associated with ratings of instructor funniness. Student perceptions of instructor goals to appear likable were not significantly correlated with attendance, enjoyment of the course, attitude toward the instructor, perception of positive attitudes from the instructor, and perceptions of instructor preparedness. Students communicate with instructors they perceive as wanting to appear likable, although this effect is only marginally significant.

**Self-Image Goals to Appear Competent.** Students enjoy class less and like their instructor less when they believe their instructor wants to appear competent. Attendance, communication, perceptions of instructor positive attitudes, and reports of instructor funniness and preparedness are not associated with perceptions of instructor goals to appear competent.

**Discussion**

This study investigated the association between students’ perceptions of their instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals and students’ experiences in the classroom. I first tested students’ sensitivity to their instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals for teaching. Then I measured the effect of students’ perceptions of instructors’ goals on student attitudes and evaluations.
Sensitivity to Instructors’ Goals

I predicted that students would demonstrate sensitivity to their instructors’ compassionate goals but would not be sensitive to their instructors’ self-image goals. These predictions were supported. Students demonstrated sensitivity to their instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and emotions as evidenced by a significant correlation between students’ and instructors’ reports of these goals. Further, students demonstrated the strongest sensitivity to instructors’ compassionate goals to support learning. Students did not demonstrate sensitivity to instructors’ self image goals to appear competent and to appear likable, as evidenced by a nonsignificant correlation between students’ and instructors’ reports of these goals.

Why are students most sensitive to instructors’ goals to support student learning? I suggest that this goal, compared to other goals for teaching, is most associated with observable instructor behaviors that affect students. For instance, instructors who have goals to support learning may challenge their students, may clearly explain their goals for each assignment, or may make themselves available to students for questions or clarifications. These behaviors (and likely many more) can directly affect students’ experiences in the classroom and are clear indications that the instructor cares about and wants to support learning. Thus, students are better able to identify when their instructor has this type of goal.

Instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions also likely have obvious behavioral markers that students can identify. When instructors want to support students’ emotions, they likely make an obvious effort to help students feel comfortable in the classroom. Despite the possibility that students rely on observable instructor behaviors to identify their goals, there’s evidence that students’ perceptions of instructors’ goals can be influenced by students’ expectations of their instructors. I found that instructor gender moderates students’ sensitivity to instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions, presumably because of a prevailing stereotype
that female instructors are warm and sensitive to students’ feelings (Anderson, 2010; Bennet, 1982). Students report that female instructors want to support students’ emotions regardless of female instructors’ self-reported goals to support students’ emotions. As a result, students are sensitive to male, but not female, instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions.

Although research on “thin slice” evaluations of teachers suggests that students are highly skilled at identifying their instructors’ personality traits, students in this study were not sensitive to their instructors’ self-image goals for teaching. There could be several reasons for this. Students are likely more experienced with evaluating instructors’ learning and emotional support. They also may not find instructors’ goals to appear competent or likable relevant to their attitudes toward the course. Instructors may also be skilled at hiding their self-image goals so that students don’t have observable behaviors to reflect on.

Perceptions of Instructors’ Goals

Study 2 measured the effect of instructors’ self-reported goals on student evaluations of instructors’ responsiveness and teaching skills, but it was unclear if students consciously recognize instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals. A second aim of Study 3 was to investigate the effect of students’ perceptions of their instructors’ goals on student attitudes toward the course and instructor.

I predicted that students would respond very positively when they believed that their instructor wanted to support students’ learning. As predicted, when students believe that their instructor wants to support their learning, students like the instructor more, enjoy the class more, and attend class more. Students also report that these instructors like students, are funny, and are prepared for class. These results support my hypothesis that students infer positive attitudes from instructors who want to support their learning. They also suggest that instructors with
compassionate goals to support students’ learning create a generally positive classroom environment for students.

I predicted that students’ perceptions of their instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions would predict positive attitudes toward the instructor and beliefs that the instructor likes students. This prediction was partially supported. When students believe their instructor wants to support students’ emotions, they report that the instructor likes students more and they communicate with the instructor more often. Interestingly, beliefs that the instructor wants to support students’ emotions were unrelated to students’ liking of the instructor. Perhaps some students appreciate instructors who want a positive relationship, whereas other students do not. Or perhaps emotional support is not what they want from their instructors, so it does not predict liking of the instructor. Another interesting result was the relationship between student beliefs that instructors want to support emotions and evaluations of instructors’ preparedness. Students evaluations of instructors’ preparedness were negatively correlated with beliefs that instructors want to support students’ emotions. This finding reflects the tension between the benefits of warmth and competence in instructors (Cuddy, Glick, & Beninger, 2011).

Despite my prediction that students would not demonstrate sensitivity to instructors’ self-image goals, I predicted that students’ perceptions of instructors’ goals to appear likable and to appear competent would predict negative attitudes toward the course and instructor. This prediction was partially supported. Beliefs that instructors want to appear competent did indeed predict negative student evaluations. When students believed their instructor wanted to appear competent, they enjoyed the class less and liked the instructor less. Beliefs that instructors want to appear likable, however, were unrelated to students’ liking of instructors of beliefs that the instructor likes students and were positively correlated with beliefs that the instructor is funny. The only indication of a negative effect of student perceptions of instructors’ self-image goals to
appear likable was a moderately negative correlation with communication between instructors and students.
CHAPTER 5: GENERAL DISCUSSION

Research on teaching suggests that students want instructors who are both skilled at teaching and care for them (Buskist et al., 2002; Schaeffer, et al., 2003). A great deal of theory and research suggests that instructors should make students feel comfortable in the classroom and connect personally with their students because it encourages positive student attitudes and motivation (Mehrabian, 1969; Wilson & Taylor, 2001). Indeed, students are more motivated and learn more when they believe their instructor cares for them (Benson et al., 2005; Buskist & Saville, 2004). In sum, students benefit when they believe their instructors care for them and instructor characteristics that predict instructor caring will likely benefit students.

I’ve suggested a new perspective from which to understand the instructor-student relationship. Across three studies, I investigated the role of instructors’ interpersonal goals in the classroom. I predicted that instructors would have two types of compassionate goals that depend on the type of support they want to provide their students. Instructors can have compassionate goals to support students’ learning or to support students’ emotions. This distinction is important because research to date has muddied the distinction between the benefits of supporting students’ learning and supporting students’ emotions. Measures of rapport include indices of both emotional and learning support, which I expected to have differential effects on students. I suggested that instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning are the most beneficial to students because this goal is associated with obvious support behaviors that students can recognize. I suggested that students infer that their instructor cares for them when their instructor supports their learning. I suggested that instructors’ compassionate goals to support
students’ emotions would predict some positive outcomes for students, but that this goal would not be as beneficial to students because their emotional needs are not the most salient needs in the classroom. I also predicted that instructors would have two types of self-image goals that correspond with the ways in which instructors are evaluated. Instructors can have self-image goals to appear likable or to appear competent. I suggested that instructors’ self-image goals would generally undermine the instructor-student relationship and student evaluations.

Study 1 demonstrated that instructors indeed report the proposed goals and that they are related but independent. Study 2 demonstrated the effect of instructors’ goals on student evaluations and disentangled the unique effects of instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning and compassionate goals to support students’ emotions. Instructors’ self-image goals to appear likable and to appear competent were unrelated to student evaluations. Instructors’ compassionate goals to support student learning, however, were powerful predictors of both teaching skills and responsiveness. Instructors who want to support their students’ learning were rated as more responsive and as more competent by their students. Instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions were unrelated to student evaluations independent of instructors’ goals to support students’ learning.

Study 3 demonstrated that students are sensitive to their instructors’ compassionate goals, but not instructors’ self-image goals. Not surprisingly, students’ perceptions of their instructors’ goals to support learning were associated with positive evaluations of the course and instructor. Students’ perceptions of goals to support students’ emotions did not have the same general positive effect on students’ attitudes. Despite students’ inability to recognize instructors’ self-image goals, beliefs that instructors want to appear competent predicted negative attitudes toward the course and instructor. Beliefs that instructors want to appear likable were unrelated to
students’ attitudes toward the instructor, but were moderately negatively correlated with instructor-student communication.

**Compassionate Goals for Teaching**

**Compassionate Goals to Support Learning**

This research suggests that instructors’ goals to support students’ learning initiate a myriad of benefits for both the instructor and student. In Study 2, instructors’ goals to support students learning were strongly associated with evaluations of instructors’ teaching skills and responsiveness. These evaluations are very important for tenure and promotion decisions. In Study 3, students demonstrated that they can recognize their instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning. This is likely because instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning produce observable support behaviors from instructors, which students can easily recognize. Students’ beliefs that instructors want to support their learning predict students’ increased attendance, enjoyment of the course, liking of the instructor, and beliefs that the instructor likes students. These beliefs also predict positive evaluations of instructors’ funniness and preparedness. These results support my hypothesis that students infer a positive attitude from instructors who want to support students’ learning.

**Compassionate Goals to Support Emotions**

This research suggests that instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions are not as effective as they may appear. In Study 2, instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions were unrelated to student reports of instructors’ responsiveness and teaching skills, when instructors’ goals to support students’ learning were taken into account. In Study 3, although students demonstrated sensitivity to their instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions, student beliefs that instructors want to support their emotions are unrelated to students’ liking of the instructor.
Even more, student beliefs that instructors want to support students learning predict negative evaluations of instructors’ competence. This isn’t necessarily bad, but suggests that instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions are not universally beneficial for the student and instructor.

The most surprising finding with regard to instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions is their relationship with instructors’ responsiveness. Contrary to predictions, instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions do not predict student evaluations of responsiveness. Perhaps instructors who want to support their students’ emotions are responsive in ways that students can’t recognize. Or, perhaps students do not value instructors’ emotional support and therefore don’t consider it to be responsive to their needs. Either way, instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions do not appear to have their intended effect.

**Self-Image Goals for Teaching**

In Study 2, instructors’ self-image goals were unrelated to student evaluations of instructor competency and responsiveness. In Study 3, it was revealed that students do not accurately perceive instructors’ self-image goals. Student reports of instructors’ goals to appear likeable and competent were unrelated to instructors’ self-reported goals to appear likable and competent. These findings were contrary to my hypotheses, which suggested that students would pick up on instructors’ self-image goals and would respond negatively to them. It is important to note, however, that although self-image goals did not predict negative evaluations, they also did not predict positive evaluations. Instructor goals to be likable were not associated with students’ liking of instructors. Instructor goals to appear competent were not associated with student evaluations of instructor competence. So, even though instructor self-image goals don’t undermine student evaluations, they are not profitable goals, at least as measured in these studies. It is possible that even though students don’t pick up on their instructors’ self-image goals,
instructors with self-image goals experience greater anxiety while teaching and miss out on the joy of teaching. They may miss out on the opportunity to grow and become better teachers.

Perhaps instructors’ self-image goals are not relevant in the classroom. However, I suggest that instructors’ self-image goals keep them from experiencing joy in the classroom and may even make it harder for instructors to support students in the way students need to be supported.

**Implications**

Beyond establishing instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals as an effective paradigm from which to study instructor effectiveness, the present work has several broad implications for the study of college teaching and interpersonal goals in general. First, these studies raise an issue regarding the importance of the qualities of a positive instructor-student relationship as it is currently defined. Lowman (1995, p. 29) described instructors who establish rapport as “knowing who they [students] are, caring about them and their learning a great deal.” Although this premise had not been empirically tested, this definition implies that instructors who establish rapport support students both personally and academically. More recent descriptions and measures of the instructor-student relationship include items that assess both emotional and learning support without differentiating between the two (Keeley et al., 2006; Wilson et al., 2010). It has been difficult to conclude whether students benefit more from instructors’ learning or emotional support and, to my knowledge, this distinction has been overlooked by other researchers. These studies provide strong evidence that instructors’ emotional support and learning support produce different outcomes for the instructor-student relationship. This implies that instructor support for students’ learning and for students’ emotions should be evaluated separately.
Although college students value emotional support from their close relationships (Canevello & Crocker, 2010; Reis et al., 2004), they appear to value learning support from their instructors and perhaps even discount emotional support from instructors. Students find instructors who want to support their learning to be responsive to their needs and give positive global evaluation of such instructors. Although instructors who want to support students’ emotions presumably truly care for students and want to support their needs, instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions are largely unrelated to indices of a positive instructor-student relationship as measured in these studies and are even negatively related to students’ assessments of instructors’ preparedness. This implies that instructor goals and/or behaviors that support students’ learning are most valued by students and are interpreted as indicators that instructors care for students. In sum, this work implies that instructors’ goals to support students’ emotions are not as beneficial as existing literature regarding the instructor-student relationship suggests. In fact, supporting students’ learning appears to be a more effective way to communicate caring to students.

This work also has important implications for the study of compassionate and self-image goals. To date, compassionate and self-image goals have been most thoroughly studied in close relationships (e.g. roommates, married couples, friendships). This work extends our knowledge of compassionate and self-image goals and demonstrates that these goals initiate similar dynamics in a different type of relationship. The instructor-student relationship is quite different from close relationships. College students presumably want different things from their instructors than they want from their close relationships, and this work demonstrates that instructors’ compassionate goals initiate positive outcomes beyond close relationship satisfaction and commitment.

This work also implies that compassionate and self-image goals are relevant in domains other than close relationships. These studies extend previously unpublished research on the role
of compassionate and self-image goals in the workplace. Crocker and Niiya (2007) provided initial evidence that employees can have compassionate and self-image goals for their jobs and that these goals predict important work-related behaviors. Employees with compassionate goals were more responsive, courteous, and constructive at work, whereas employees with self-image goals were marginally less responsive to their coworkers. The present studies expand on this work by demonstrating that college instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ learning are powerful predictors of instructors’ effectiveness.

Earlier work, even work on compassionate and self-image goals in the workplace, assumed that there is only one form of compassionate goals (Crocker & Canevello, 2012). The college classroom is the first context in which non-relationship compassionate goals have been identified, measured, and found to predict important outcomes. This initial work reveals that people can have different types of compassionate goals that depend on the type of support they want to provide. People can want to be constructive and supportive within particular contexts, and different forms of compassionate goals can produce different outcomes. This knowledge opens the door to studying other implications of compassionate and self-image goals both generally and within the instructor-student relationship.

Remaining Questions and Future Directions

The present work highlights a number of avenues for future research. While it is clear that instructors’ compassionate goals are important predictors of students’ experiences in the classroom, these studies are unable to describe the mechanism through which instructors’ goals affect students. Perhaps instructors’ goals influence students’ experiences by influencing instructors’ behaviors in the classroom, causing students to evaluate the instructor more positively because the instructor is truly better. This possibility is supported by evidence that students are not sensitive to instructors’ self-image goals for teaching, which likely produce fewer obvious
behaviors for students to notice. Or, perhaps instructors’ goals influence students’ experiences indirectly through the attitudes they evoke in students. This possibility is supported by evidence that instructors’ immediacy behaviors account for the same variance as the single item “Does your instructor like students” (Wilson & Taylor, 2001). Rather than recognizing instructors’ goals through their behaviors, students may infer instructors’ goals by the degree to which they perceive caring from their instructor.

This work also suggests the possibility of a variety of effects of instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals on student outcomes. One of the more interesting questions concerns the effect of instructors’ goals on students’ learning orientations. How do instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals influence students’ approaches to the course? An important part of an instructor’s job is to motivate students to engage in the class and to learn (Ambrose et al., 2010; Lowman, 1994). Do instructors’ goals to support student learning lead to increased learning orientations or growth goals for students? I predict that compassionate goals to support students’ learning will be the only instructor goals to encourage a learning (versus performance) motivation for students.

I would also like to investigate the effect of instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals on their own experience in the classroom. Compassionate goals are associated with numerous psychological benefits. Self-image goals, on the other hand, tend to backfire and produce the opposite of their intended effect. Self-image goals predict increased anxiety and depression over time, whereas compassionate goals predict decreased anxiety and depression over time (Crocker et al., 2010). I hypothesize that instructors with compassionate goals will enjoy teaching and experience positive emotions while teaching. I hypothesize that instructors’ self-image goals will predict negative teaching experiences for instructors.
Conclusion

Three studies were designed to investigate the role of instructors’ compassionate and self-image goals in the classroom. These studies revealed that instructors’ compassionate to support students’ learning have the most profound effect on students’ classroom experiences. Students were most sensitive to these goals and their evaluations of the instructor were most influenced by these goals. Surprisingly, instructors’ self-image goals were largely unrelated to students’ experiences in the classroom. This work has important implications for the study of both teaching effectiveness and compassionate and self-image goals.
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APPENDIX A: INSTRUCTOR GOAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please reflect on your goals for your teaching. In general, with regard to your teaching, how much do you WANT or TRY to:

1. Create a good relationship with students
2. Make a positive difference in students’ lives
3. Connect interpersonally with students
4. Pay attention to students’ emotional needs
5. Avoid doing things that may be unresponsive to students’ needs
6. Avoid neglecting your relationship with students
7. Let students know that you appreciate who they are
8. Have compassion for students’ personal weaknesses
9. Avoid making students feel personally alienated in the classroom
10. Support students’ academic growth
11. Avoid doing things that would impede learning
12. Understand how your actions affect students’ learning and motivation
13. Communicate information as clearly as possible
14. Encourage students to take responsibility for their learning
15. Pay attention to whether students understand the course content
16. Create a lasting appreciation for the course material
17. Give helpful feedback to students, even when it’s negative
18. Appreciate students’ individual learning styles
19. Avoid neglecting students’ individual academic/learning styles
20. Avoid overwhelming students with unnecessary material
21. Avoid confusing students with technical jargon
22. Focus on specific desired learning outcomes
23. Design assessments that that will appropriately test students’ learning
24. Make sure that each classroom activity has a clear learning purpose
25. Help students to apply course material to their own lives
26. Help students appreciate the importance of the material
27. Avoid confusing students
28. Avoid alienating students from the course material
29. Prevent students from becoming bored with the course material
30. Avoid talking over students’ heads
31. Give the appearance of being on top of things
32. Get students to recognize or acknowledge your expertise
33. Convince students that you are right
34. Avoid being exposed as wrong
35. Seem like you know what you're doing
36. Demonstrate your strengths
37. Avoid revealing your professional shortcomings or vulnerabilities
38. Demonstrate your abilities
39. Conceal your past failures
40. Appear knowledgeable
41. Demonstrate your competence to students
42. Avoid looking like you don’t know your material
43. Avoid being criticized by students
44. Avoid taking risks in the classroom
45. Prove that you are knowledgeable about the course subject
46. Get students to see things your way
47. Avoid exposing gaps in your knowledge
48. Project an image of yourself as a caring person
49. Prove that you’re not uncaring
50. Avoid making students think you're a bad person
51. Try not to appear insensitive
52. Get students to think that you are nice
53. Avoid showing your unlikeable side
54. Get students to think that you are kind
55. Avoid appearing egotistical
56. Be seen as a person who is easy to get along with
57. Demonstrate that you are someone students can relate to
58. Avoid appearing unlikeable
59. Get students to like you
60. Avoid getting negative teaching evaluations
61. Get students to think you’re a good teacher
62. Get students to think that you are fair
63. Avoid appearing unfair
64. Get students to think that you are authoritative
65. Demonstrate that you’re qualified to teach the class
66. Seem interesting
67. Avoid appearing boring

Demographics

1. Please indicate your gender
2. Please indicate your race
3. Please indicate your ethnicity
4. Please indicate your age
5. We’d like to know about your experience teaching. How many courses have you taught? If you’ve taught a specific course (for instance, Biology 101) more than once, please only count that course once.
6. Overall, how many individual classes have you taught? If you’ve taught a specific class more than once, please include each time you’ve taught that course. For example, if you’ve taught 6 sections of Biology 101 and 3 sections of Biology 300, you’ll indicate that you’ve taught 9 individual classes.
7. Please indicate your current school/institution (e.g., Ohio State University)
8. What general subject matter do you teach? (e.g., Psychology; English; Biology)
9. What format of class(es) do you teach? Please check all that apply [lecture; recitation; discussion; online; other]
APPENDIX B: STUDENT EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE (STUDY 2)

This survey refers to your experience in Psych 1100. Please answer the questions honestly and thoughtfully. Your responses are completely anonymous and your instructor will not see these results.

Please rate your agreement with the following statements

1. My instructor is well organized
2. My instructor is intellectually stimulating
3. My instructor is interested in teaching
4. My instructor is well prepared
5. My instructor is interested in helping students
6. I am learning a lot from my instructor
7. My instructor communicates the subject matter clearly
8. I like my instructor
9. I would recommend my instructor to a friend who wants to take Psych 1100
10. My instructor motivates me to do my best work
11. My instructor displays a positive attitude toward me
12. My instructor wants me to succeed

In general, to what extent:

1. Do you feel that your instructor really cares about you?
2. Does your instructor behave warmly toward you?
3. Do you feel your instructor really listens to you?
4. Is your instructor sensitive to your feelings?
5. Does your instructor seem sincere during your interactions?
6. Does your instructor make you feel valued as a person?
7. If I could give my instructor a grade, I would give him/her a(n) [A; B; C; D; E]
APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTOR GOAL QUESTIONNAIRE (STUDENT VERSION)

This brief survey is about your Psych 1100 instructor. Please reflect on what you think your instructor's GOALS for teaching are.

1. Get students to think he/she is a good teacher
2. Make sure that each classroom activity has a clear learning purpose
3. Prove that he/she is knowledgeable about the course subject
4. Create a good relationship with students
5. Support students' academic growth
6. Give the appearance of being on top of things
7. Project an image of him/herself as a caring person
8. Avoid talking over students' heads
9. Get students to think that he/she is fair
10. Make a positive difference in students' lives
11. Avoid doing things that would impede (interfere with) learning
12. Get students to recognize or acknowledge his/her expertise
13. Prove that he/she is not uncaring
14. Help students to apply course material to their own lives
15. Connect interpersonally with students
16. Understand how his/her actions affect students’ learning and motivation
17. Convince students that he/she is right
18. Avoid making students think he/she is a bad person
19. Help students appreciate the importance of the material
20. Get students to think that he/she is authoritative
21. Communicate information as clearly as possible
22. Avoid being exposed as wrong
23. Demonstrate his/her competence to students
24. Try not to appear insensitive
25. Get students to see things his/her way
26. Encourage students to take responsibility for their learning
27. Seem like he/she knows what he/she is doing
28. Get students to think that he/she is nice
29. Demonstrate that he/she is qualified to teach the class
30. Avoid neglecting his/her relationship with students
31. Pay attention to whether students understand the course content
32. Demonstrate his/her strengths
33. Avoid showing his/her unlikeable side
34. Avoid alienating students from the course material
35. Let students know that he/she appreciates who they are
36. Create a lasting appreciation for the course material
37. Avoid revealing his/her professional shortcomings or vulnerabilities
38. Get students to think that he/she is kind
39. Avoid appearing boring
40. Avoid exposing gaps in his/her knowledge
41. Have compassion for students' personal weaknesses
42. Give helpful feedback to students, even when it's negative
43. Demonstrate his/her abilities
44. Avoid appearing egotistical
45. Avoid confusing students
46. Prevent students from becoming bored with the course material
47. Avoid making students feel personally alienated in the classroom
48. Appreciate students' individual learning styles
49. Conceal his/her past failures
50. Be seen as a person who is easy to get along with
51. Avoid neglecting students' individual academic/learning styles
52. Appear knowledgeable
53. Demonstrate that he/she is someone students can relate to
54. Avoid overwhelming students with unnecessary material
55. Avoid appearing unfair
56. Demonstrate his/her competence to students
57. Avoid appearing unlikeable
58. Avoid confusing students with technical jargon
59. Avoid looking like he/she doesn’t know the material
60. Pay attention to students' emotional needs
61. Get students to like him/her
62. Seem interesting
63. Focus on specific desired learning outcomes
64. Avoid being criticized by students
65. Avoid doing things that may be unresponsive to students' needs
66. Avoid getting negative teaching evaluations
67. Design assessments that will appropriately test students' learning
1. Avoid taking risks in the classroom

Student Evaluations

1. How often do you attend your Psych 1100 class?
2. How much do you enjoy your Psych 1100 class?
3. How often do you communicate with your instructor personally (that is, outside of the lecture)?
4. I like my instructor
5. My instructor likes me
6. My instructor is funny
7. My instructor is well prepared for class
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Demographics

1. Have you completed this survey before?
2. Please indicate your gender
3. Please indicate your age
4. What is your major? If you are undecided, what majors are you considering?
5. What is your year in school?
6. Please indicate your race
7. Please indicate your ethnicity
## APPENDIX D: TABLES

Table 1

*Initial factor loadings for instructors’ relationship goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Appear Likable</th>
<th>Support Students’ Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avoid appearing unlikeable</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to think that you are nice</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to think that you are kind</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid making students think you're a bad person</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid showing your unlikeable side</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to like you</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be seen as a person who is easy to get along with</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prove that you're not uncaring</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate that you are someone students can relate to</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid appearing egotistical</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try not to appear insensitive</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay attention to students' emotional needs</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let students know that you appreciate who they are</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid neglecting your relationship with students</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have compassion for students' personal weaknesses</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect interpersonally with students</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a good relationship with students</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a positive difference in students' lives</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid doing things that may be unresponsive to students' needs</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid making students feel personally alienated in the classroom</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project an image of yourself as a caring person</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Final factor loadings for instructors’ relationship goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Appear Likable</th>
<th>Support Students’ Emotions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get students to think that you are nice</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to think that you are kind</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid appearing unlikeable</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to like you</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be seen as a person who is easy to get along with</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay attention to students’ emotional needs</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let students know that you appreciate who they are</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect interpersonally with students</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have compassion for students' personal weaknesses</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid neglecting your relationship with students</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a good relationship with students</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make a positive difference in students' lives</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

*Initial factor loadings for instructors’ competence goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Appear Competent</th>
<th>Support Students’ Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seem like you know what you're doing</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate your competence to students</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear knowledgeable</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate your abilities</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate that you're qualified to teach the class</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid exposing gaps in your knowledge</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to recognize or acknowledge your expertise</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prove that you are knowledgeable about the course subject</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid looking like you don't know your material</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate your strengths</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid revealing your professional shortcomings or vulnerabilities</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid showing your unlikeable side</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convince students that you are right</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give the appearance of being on top of things</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceal your past failures</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid being exposed as wrong</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to think you're a good teacher</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid being criticized by students</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to see things your way</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to think that you are authoritative</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid getting negative teaching evaluations</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid appearing unfair</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid taking risks in the classroom</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid doing things that may be unresponsive to students' needs</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay attention to whether students understand the course content</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid making students feel personally alienated in the classroom</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on specific desired learning outcomes</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand how your actions affect students' learning and motivation</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support students' academic growth</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciate students' individual learning styles</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid doing things that would impede learning</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate information as clearly as possible</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give helpful feedback to students, even when it's negative</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid alienating students from the course material</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that each classroom activity has a clear learning purpose</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent students from becoming bored with the course material</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design assessments that will appropriately test students' learning</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a lasting appreciation for the course material</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid neglecting students' individual academic/learning styles</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid overwhelming students with unnecessary material</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students to apply course material to their own lives</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage students to take responsibility for their learning</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid talking over students' heads</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid confusing students with technical jargon</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students appreciate the importance of the material</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65
Table 4

*Final factor loadings for instructors’ competence goals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Appear Competent</th>
<th>Support Students’ Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seem like you know what you're doing</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear knowledgeable</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid looking like you don't know your material</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrate that you're qualified to teach the class</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid exposing gaps in your knowledge</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to recognize or acknowledge your expertise</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid revealing your professional shortcomings or vulnerabilities</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get students to think you're a good teacher</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid being criticized by students</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid getting negative teaching evaluations</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid making students feel personally alienated in the classroom</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay attention to whether students understand the course content</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on specific desired learning outcomes</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support students' academic growth</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid doing things that may be unresponsive to students’ needs</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand how your actions affect students' learning and motivation</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid doing things that would impede learning</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid alienating students from the course material</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent students from becoming bored with the course material</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make sure that each classroom activity has a clear learning purpose</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a lasting appreciation for the course material</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate information as clearly as possible</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students appreciate the importance of the material</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid neglecting students' individual academic/learning styles</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Descriptive statistics for instructors’ goals for teaching (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Support learning</th>
<th>Support emotions</th>
<th>Appear likable</th>
<th>Appear competent</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support learning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support emotions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear likable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear competent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, + p < .01
Table 6

Descriptive statistics for instructors’ goals for teaching (Study 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Support learning</th>
<th>Support emotions</th>
<th>Appear likable</th>
<th>Appear competent</th>
<th>Comfort</th>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support learning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.36+</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support emotions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear likable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear competent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.40+</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, + p < .01
### Table 7

**Factor loadings of student evaluation items (Study 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Teaching Skills</th>
<th>Responsiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommend</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates clearly</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn a lot</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectually stimulating</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade instructor</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in teaching</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in helping students</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates me</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive to my feelings</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values me as a person</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cares about me</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listens to me</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sincere</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wants me to succeed</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays a positive attitude</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Descriptive statistics for perceptions of instructors’ goals (Study 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Support learning</th>
<th>Support emotions</th>
<th>Appear likable</th>
<th>Appear competent</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support learning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.84***</td>
<td>.66***</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support emotions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear likable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear competent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, + p < .01
Table 9

Partial correlations of students’ perceptions of instructors’ goals with evaluations, controlling for the remaining three student perception measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Attend</th>
<th>Enjoy</th>
<th>Communicate</th>
<th>Like</th>
<th>Instructor Likes Students</th>
<th>Funny</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support learning</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support emotions</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear likable</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06+</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appear competent</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$, + $p < .01$
APPENDIX E: FIGURES

Figure 1. Students’ sensitivity to instructors’ compassionate goals to support students’ emotions moderated by instructors’ gender.