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The study proposes an alternative approach to studying interpersonal trust. The researcher uses the Rasch analysis to design a quantitative instrument that can be used to measure trust when exploring the effects that various aspects of educational environment have on students‘ experiences. Prior empirical studies examined trust from a qualitative perspective: through the description of participants‘ beliefs, experiences and behaviors (Blomqvist, 1997). As a result, there is no definition of trust agreed upon by different academic disciplines because most existing theories identify trust by describing its attributes rather than measuring it directly (Blomqvist). Earlier attempts to use the Rasch model in educational research demonstrated that the Rasch analysis enables a creation of a rigorous measure useful for focused exploration of complex phenomena common in educational environment (Fisher, 1991; Irwin & Irwin, 2005; Johnson et al., 1995). The proposed measure relies on two theories of trust: first, the study of Bryk and Schneider (2002), who describe trust as the mutual positive evaluation of the relations participants according to four components: respect, competence, regard for others, and integrity. The second theory is Lewis and Weigert‘s (1985) interpretation of trust as a tri-
level phenomenon, which consists of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components. After a series of instrument calibrations, the researcher added one more level to Lewis and Weigert's theory, loyalty, thus, creating a 4X4 matrix-type measure of trust. The alternative measure was tested in a pilot study, which demonstrated that the measure captures the overall structure of trust and can help detect the differences in trust due to participants' demographic and/or socio-cultural characteristics. The instrument requires further calibrations; but it has a potential to contribute to theory and practice of education. The study is set in a context of a university-based ESL program as the power asymmetry and lack of sense of belonging makes trust more prominently placed as a part of the educational process.
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Preface

It has been a long-term goal of researchers in the field of Education to determine the factors that might have an effect on students’ educational experiences and achievements. None of the sub-disciplines including those in related fields (for example, Language Teaching and Learning) is immune to this search as the goal of education as a process is to equip a student with the skills, including intellectual skills, that will help this student succeed as a professional as well as a human being and as a member of his/her social group (Valadez et al., 2011/2012). The field of Education is collaborating with the fields of Psychology, Sociology, and others to look at various aspects of education as well as various members of the educational process (Tozer, Senese & Violas, 2006). It is all but impossible to list all the factors, whose impact on students’ achievement is either proven or assumed; that is why this discussion focuses only on one aspect of education. The study looks at a specific quality of relations between students and instructors: trust or trustworthiness as defined by prominent researchers in the fields of Education, Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and Management and Business Leadership (Blomqvist, 1997).

The attention to the human relations in education is not new. In his famous work Democracy and Education, Dewey (1916) makes a strong argument claiming that the entire process of education boils down to establishing mutually trusting relations between a teacher and a student, who are open to co-creating educational experiences together. In Pedagogy of the Oppressed, Freire (1993) argues that the roles, which two people assume in relations, might either enable or suppress the development of all parties involved in these relations. Similar arguments can be found in other works on education, including
theoretical discussions and empirical research (Raider-Roth, 2005; Rice, 2006; Rotenberg, Boulton & Fox, 2005). In most discussions, trust and openness as its derivative are cited as the key elements of successful/productive/beneficial relations; however, the empirical research on trust in education remains at its infancy (Rice, 2006). Part of the reason for relative scarcity of empirical research on trust in educational relations might be the fact that none of the scientific fields has come up with a strong quantitative measure of trust, which is a rather vague and philosophical phenomenon; such a measure could help tie together the findings of qualitative research on trust and establish the base-line for further investigative work. Therefore, this particular study investigates the possibility of developing a quantitative measure of trust and uses the framework of the Rasch analysis to do that.

The Rasch analysis is particularly adept at clarifying elusive phenomena and complex processes common in education (Irwin & Irwin, 2005; Johnson et al., 1995). Fisher (1991) and Johnson et al. (1995) argue that as a measurement model the Rasch analysis enables the researcher to design, create, and refine a unidimensional framework that is descriptive enough to absorb the unique aspects of the phenomenon but also rigorous enough to be used in quantitative research. Overall, the Rasch analysis appeared a good fit for the research on trust in educational relations as it provided the researcher with both tools and techniques not only for the initial thinking on how to address the objectives of the study but also how to move the investigation to a higher level in a follow-up research.

The fact that trust is an elusive and complex phenomenon, as characterized above, made the choice of a research setting one of the most important elements of this study. A
university-based English as a Second Language (ESL) program was chosen as a site for collecting preliminary data and conducting a pilot study for two main reasons. First, the researcher's personal experience as an ESL-student suggests that ESL students are in a more vulnerable position at a foreign educational institution because, unlike with domestic students, their social support system is weak while the social rejection (or fear of it) and the pressure to succeed are much higher. The researcher's personal observations are supported by the findings of empirical research (Bartram & Bailey, 2009; Borg, 2009; Borjas, 2002). In addition to being a vulnerable population, ESL students are a group also difficult to reach and to study because of the variable levels of the proficiency in English as their second language; interviewing them in their native language, although possible, might introduce undesirable bias to the study due to the semiotic differences reflected in the structure and content of their first and second languages (Ajayi, 2011; Nikolajeva, 2010). Overall due to their socio-demographic characteristics and unique position at a foreign institution, ESL students will greatly benefit from the introduction of a more comprehensive measure of trustworthy relations.

The second reason for choosing an ESL setting is more practical: due to the described vulnerability, ESL students tend to have somewhat exaggerated expectations towards and are more involved in their relations with their teachers/instructors (B. Sayers, personal communication, December 4, 2007). Therefore, the subtle details of trust in teacher-student relations are more pronounced and easier to detect and investigate than in the relations between teachers and students coming from the same socio-cultural and linguistic background. Overall, the study uses a university-based ESL program as a setting for this research because the qualities of this setting enhance the quality of the
research and enable the researcher to use the study outcomes to enhance educational experiences of a vulnerable student population.

The structure of the dissertation reflects the logic of the development of the theoretical thought and practical work in the study; the narrative consists of seven chapters. Chapter One provides the context for the study by introducing the Midwestern Language Institute (MLI) through the objectives this institution fulfilled and the challenges it faced at different periods in its history. The first chapter also discusses the problems this study aims to address as well as the questions the researcher attempts to answer.

Chapter Two follows with the literature review on two key topics in this study. First, the history and current trends in linguistics and Second Language Acquisition (SLA) as the satellite discipline of linguistics. Following is the review of the research on trust: the original discussion initiated by the fields of management and business leadership, as well as the recent attempt to study trust and trustworthy relationships in an educational context.

Chapter Three describes the general methodological framework; it also includes the discussion on the Rasch analysis and the way the model was applied in this study. Chapter Four provides a detailed account of the process of the instrument development and calibration, including the review of the theory-driven approach and the revisions of the instrument after a series of calibrations. Chapter Five concludes the discussion of instrument development by presenting the outcomes of expert review of the instrument followed by the piloting of the final draft of the questionnaire in a true MLI setting.
The last two chapters of the dissertation talk about the outcomes of the study from a somewhat distant perspective. Chapter Six discusses the utility of the study result as a theoretical contribution and practical application. This chapter explores the possibility of using the instrument as a stand-alone measure as well as part of a larger construct in structural equation modeling. The last chapter, Chapter Seven, takes a look at the value of the study and the discussion of educational trust in view of recent trends in education as well as SLA. Overall, the dissertation is organized to help the reader understand what issues in the SLA educational context make the discussion of trust important and how this study contributes to resolving some of those issues.
Chapter One

Introduction

Background Information

In the last 25 years, the United States has gradually become the leading destination for international students who want to earn a degree from an educational, globally recognized institution (Council of Graduate Schools, 2008). Commenting on the increase in global educational exchanges and tightening competition for talented international students between universities in the UK, Australia, Canada, and the U.S., the president and CEO of the Institute for International Education, Allan E. Goodman (2007) highlighted the importance of supporting the initiatives of the American academic community to attract and retain the best international students:

Given increased global competition for talent, as well as expanded higher education options in many of the leading sending countries, America needs to continue its proactive steps to insure that our academic doors remain wide open, and that students around the world understand that they will be warmly welcomed.

In lieu of such initiatives and to help international students better accommodate in a foreign English-speaking educational environment, American universities established a series of on-campus English as a Second Language (ESL) educational institutions. Their goals have been to provide intensive language training, prepare these students for Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) exam, and introduce them to American social and academic cultures (Wedell, 2003). The format and curriculum at each specific institution varies. However, in general, students are limited to one academic year—three semesters or six quarters—of intensive training. Graduates are expected to be able to
enroll in their respective American universities and succeed as both students and U.S. temporary residents (Transition Policy at the MLI, 2011).

**Midwestern Language Institute as a Sample ESL Educational Institution**

The Midwestern Language Institute (MLI) at a Midwestern university is used in this study as an example of a currently active on-campus ESL institution and to set the context for the research. This specific MLI was founded in the late 1970s as a series of intense English programs for short-term visitors from abroad (B. Sayers, personal communication, December 4, 2007). During the subsequent 30 years, the MLI established itself as an independent academic institution with its own curriculum, faculty and enrollment (D. Pierce, personal communication, October 10, 1994).

Currently, the role of the MLI is to provide educational services to international students who attempt to enroll in the University for undergraduate or graduate studies (B. Sayers, personal communication, December 4, 2007). Over the years, the number and qualifications of MLI personnel has varied; but the most recent composition includes up to 10 full- and part-time instructors, and the program director who supervises faculty and oversees the daily functions of the institute; several undergraduate students perform secretarial and courier duties (B. Sayers). In addition, graduate teaching assistants (TAs) from the university’s English Department teach at the MLI to fulfill requirements of their TA-ships (MA in ESL: Financial Aid).

The MLI is mainly focused on teaching English as a second language (ESL) to new undergraduate students, whose TOEFL scores do not meet the university requirements—below 450 points. TOEFL preparation for undergraduate international students lasts for one year or six academic quarters. At the end of each quarter, students
are offered an opportunity to take the test (MLI’s Transition Policy, 2011). Those who succeed with TOEFL immediately enroll at the university while those who do not pass the test continue with the MLI ESL program (MLI’s Transition Policy, 2011).

At the end of an academic year, the MLI students who do not pass but manage to score 400-450 points on the TOEFL are allowed to conditionally enroll at the university (MLI’s Transition Policy, 2011). Under the requirements for such enrollment, international students continue as part-time attendants at the MLI as well as part-time students at the university in their specific academic departments. These “conditional” students must pass all their classes (obtain a “C” or higher) to be allowed to continue as full-time university students (MLI’s Transition Policy, 2011). Those who fail at one or more classes, as well as students who do not score 400 or above on the TOEFL, have three options: transfer to another university, enroll nowhere and violate their visa status, or go home (S. Perry, personal communication, August 7, 1984 & October 25, 1984).

In addition to preparing international undergraduate students for the TOEFL, the MLI faculty test incoming graduate international students’ language skills—mainly clarity and accuracy of speech (MLI’s ITA SPEAK Screening and Training Policy). Since the university frequently employs graduate international students as Teaching Assistants, their language proficiency is crucial for their respective academic programs. Those graduate students who do not pass the language proficiency test are required to enroll in two academic quarters of remedial programs at the MLI in addition to their major-specific courses (English Language Proficiency Policy for the University International Graduate Students). There is no exit test for graduate students; upon
completion of the two quarters, they proceed with their regular academic and student teaching workloads.

**Preliminary Observations**

Over the years, the MLI has experienced frequent and significant fluctuations in the number of enrolled students (B. Sayers, personal communication, December 4, 2007). Those fluctuations were partially due to the changes in global politics as well as to historically unconsidered university policies (Cooper, 1999; MacKillop, 1983; Maull & Pick, 1989). For example, between September 1983 and August 1984, the Office of International Students Services of the MLI’s host university prepared transfer paperwork for more than 50 percent of the total 190 students enrolled in the MLI because they were not able to pass the TOEFL; this incident stimulated the establishment of conditional enrollment regulations later in 1985 (S. Perry, personal communication, August 7 and October 25, 1984). At the same time, the MLI experienced a number of spikes in enrollment; the most recent started in the early 2000s and was related to the education-abroad decrees adopted by a number of Middle Eastern states (B. Sayers, personal communication, December 4, 2007).

In the last two years, enrollment among undergraduate students has been gradually increasing, putting even more pressure on the MLI faculty to prepare ESL students for the TOEFL while helping them to overcome challenges of adjusting to different educational and social-cultural environments (B. Sayers, personal communication, December 4, 2007). For many undergraduate international students arriving at the MLI, it is their first trip abroad, the first experience of separation from their families, and the first attempt at independent living; all added to the new
responsibility of being a college student (Sayers). To minimize the effects of social and cultural —shocks,” new international students subconsciously seek support from and put a lot of faith in their instructors as adult representatives of the unfamiliar society (Sayers). This makes the relations between instructors and these students crucial, especially in the ESL programs.

The MLI instructors, as well as the director of the institute, recognize the importance of successful relations between ESL students and their instructors; they understand that MLI students expect the MLI staff to serve as a “safety net” similar to that of a family (B. Sayers, personal communication, December 4, 2007). However, there are no formal practices that measure and/or enhance student-instructor relations (Sayers).

The MLI carries on regular summative teaching effectiveness evaluations designed to assess students’ satisfaction with the program. The current teacher evaluation relies on a typical SET (student evaluation of teaching) questionnaire, which asks for students’ opinion about an instructor’s behaviors and course organization (Yao & Grady, 2005). Because of its strong reliance on the SET questionnaire, the current MLI summative evaluation exhibits the same positive and negative characteristics as the methodology on which it relies: on one hand, the MLI teacher effectiveness evaluation provides a generally reliable but biased review of the instructor’s classroom performance (Anikeeff, 1953; Badri et al., 2006; Moses, 1988). On the other hand, this questionnaire does not allow evaluation of the instructors’ role in the students’ educational success or their support to the student during the period of educational and social transition (Badri et al.). Thus, the evaluation’s contribution to the improvement of services provided by the institute is somewhat limited because it does not measure student-staff relations: the
component of the education process MLI personnel and administration recognize as important to the students’ success. (B. Sayers, personal communication, December 4, 2007)

**Study Context**

The challenge faced by this MLI is merging the mechanical elements of teaching ESL, formally recognized as ‘important,’ with complex student-staff relations, the importance of which has been proven through practice but has not yet been formalized within the institutional framework (Lightbown, 2000). This challenge is not unique to this MLI. According to Lightbown, until today, there has been a disconnect between the field of the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) that provides the theoretical foundation for teaching ESL, and the practices of Language Pedagogy (LP), including those used in teaching ESL. The reason for this disconnect lies in the historical development of SLA and ESL as disciplines.

Since its emergence in the late 19th century, SLA developed mainly as a part of linguistics and linguistic structuralism and, consequently, focused predominantly on the structure of the language rather than on the characteristics of the learner or on the relations among the individuals engaged in the SLA process (Bredella & Righter, 2006). The field of TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages), which addressed the ‘human’ aspect of the LP, appeared almost a century later as a practice-oriented discipline; TESOL developed independently from SLA according to its own goals set by government agencies rather than educational researchers, theorists or philosophers (Wedell, 2003). While SLA and TESOL enjoy some inter-disciplinary dialogue, the transferability of SLA and TESOL knowledge is limited; cross-discipline
knowledge borrowing is scarce and selective (Gee, 1990; Lightbown, 2000). While MLI is leaning towards TESOL practices, it also strives to stay abreast of the new developments in linguistics. As a result, the misalignment of SLA theory and TESOL practices is an historical issue that contributes to the challenges faced by the MLI as discussed above.

The second problematic issue with historical roots lies in the deficiencies of the TESOL intra-disciplinary dialogue; more specifically, in the original framework and objectives of the TESOL and the role it plays in the contemporary system of education. Wedell (2003) noted that a substantial part of the knowledge body for TESOL was generated by the practical experiences of the “employed change agents” engaged in British/American/Canadian/Australian government-funded programs to improve the educational systems throughout non-English speaking world (p. 440). Wedell further argued that due to its origins and initial objectives, many TESOL processes continue[d] to be expressed in language strongly influenced by what Holiday (1994) calls the BANA (British, Australian, North American) thinking” and did not always match the educational cultures of the non-English-speaking population of learners (p. 440). ESL, the section of TESOL focused on teaching English to the speakers of other languages in an English-speaking environment, suffered more than other TESOL sub-disciplines from such a lack of cultural sensitivity (Wakabayashi, 2003). The key characteristic of ESL is that prior to initiating their studies, learners must relocate from their native-language environment to either natural or artificial English-speaking environments; relocation leads to changes in physical, social, cultural, traditional and other contexts comprising an individual’s everyday environment (Hinkel, 2006; Walker, 2001). A combination of these changes
contributes to the uniqueness of ESL educational context, in which some culture-specific characteristics and behaviors of students augment and turn into natural defense-mechanisms that hinder their adaptation and learning (Hinkel, 2006; Walker, 2001).

Knowledge of the educational cultures of non-English speaking societies would enable ESL practitioners to be more aware of the fact that the some cultural characteristics might negatively affect the success of ESL students and help them minimize the influence of such characteristics.

Hinkel (2006) argues that TESOL has the capacity and is better positioned than SLA to resolve the two problematic issues discussed above. Because of its comparatively short history as a discipline, TESOL has been and continues to be a dynamic field, one in which new venues and perspectives are still unfolding” (p. 109).

Walker (2001) believes that in contemporary English-language teaching-learning practices, TESOL’s role is to merge theoretical knowledge accumulated by SLA and the knowledge and practices gained by other disciplines dealing with the creation and provision of intangible goods and services. Walker further argues that “while inherently educational, [TESOL] exhibits a number of classical service characteristics” and is a hybrid discipline that combines educational purposes with some business-originated structural elements (p. 187). Therefore, TESOL might benefit from the tools accumulated by the field of management; more specifically, the tools designed to study and refine the relationships between the provider (for example, a TESOL teacher) and the client (that is, student)” (Walker, p. 187). The nature of these relationships determines the quality of the product (the quality of ESOL training the student receives), the level of student satisfaction, and his or her success in employing TESOL skills in the future (Walker).
Problem Statement

Currently, the field of SLA does not have a reliable theoretical framework to explain how people with different ethnic/cultural backgrounds build classroom relations conducive to fruitful educative interactions and encourage informational exchange. However, the flexibility of TESOL as a hybrid discipline allows it to benefit from extracting and combining relevant knowledge accumulated by educational and non-educational fields (Walker, 2001). Two such fields are education and management. Prominent theories in social foundations of education all highlight the importance of open and frequent interpersonal interactions for a successful educational process (Dewey, 1916; Piaget, 1963; Rotenberg, Boulton & Fox 2005). The core of these theories is trust—the mechanism that helps control the fear of, and invites openness to, investigating the unknown (Freire, 1993; Raider-Roth, 2005; Rice, 2006). While the discussion of trust in the field of education is relatively new and scarce, the field of management has accumulated substantial knowledge of trustworthy relationships as those in which partners (or service providers and clients) do not withhold pertinent information, respect each other's expertise, do not compete for exclusive control, and practice cooperative behavior and a pursuit of mutual rather than selfish goals (Das & Teng, 1998; Zand, 1979).

The combination of theoretical knowledge and practical expertise in both education and management allows for the logical assumption that trustworthiness is one of the key characteristics of an effective relationship between the TESOL service provider and the client (Walker, 2001). Similarly, trusting relationships with their teachers allows ESL students to switch off their culturally specific guard and explore the
unknown as a part of an educational process and as part of their surroundings outside the classroom. According to Borjas (2002), the human ability to learn from the unknown is rooted in the perception of it as positive rather than unfriendly and hostile; such a perception is not possible in a context lacking trust. Thus, research exploring the effect of trust in teacher-student relationships in the ESL environment on students’ success in learning English (or passing the TOEFL) would contribute to the resolution of the challenge faced by the MLI and similar institutions. Such research would also fit the contemporary role of TESOL as the discipline that attempts to merge the knowledge accumulated by educational and non-educational fields and create a language-teaching framework flexible enough to address the expectations of clients with different cultural backgrounds (Hinkel, 2006; Walker, 2001).

Despite the ongoing discussion on the importance of trust in building successful relationships in business as well as in educational environments, neither has offered a comprehensive quantitative measure of trust as a phenomenon with identifiable stages of development/progress. Existing theories of trust rely on qualitative descriptions of the phenomenon; such descriptions strongly depend on culture-specific and research-specific contexts and, as a rule, are not generalizable to groups beyond the participants of the study (Fukuyama, 1995; Putnam, 1993; Putnam, 1995; Weber & Carter, 2003). In other words, due to their nature, qualitative descriptions of trust do not provide a basis for the investigation of its role in an educational environment and makes it difficult, at best, to establish cause-outcome relations between trusting classroom relations and the students’ success. Therefore, the logical first step in exploring the role of trust in the ESL environment and in ESL students’ success would be to develop a reliable quantitative
measure which can be further used as an instrument in studies exploring the relationships between trust and the ESL students‘ satisfaction with and success in acquiring English and adjusting to the ESL context.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine if the existing theories of trust can be used to develop an empirical measure of trust -- the Educational Trust Matrix (ETM) – as a new approach to evaluating of the student-staff relationships at university-based English-language programs similar to the MLI. The ETM was expected to address the unique features of the ESL educational environment characterized by high asymmetry of power and low levels of familiarity between students and their instructors, the variability of students‘ English-language proficiency, and the diversity of their cultural and educational background. As a part of the instrument calibration and validation, the ETM was employed in a pilot study to assess the measure‘s stability across the sub-groups of students assembled by demographic characteristics and cultural background.

**Research Questions**

The research questions for this study were as follows:

1. How many theories would the researcher need to use to develop an initial framework for the ETM as the measure of various levels of trustworthy staff-student relationships from a student perspective?

2. How many levels should the ETM have and how should those levels be aligned to express the dynamic nature of trust in staff-student relationships?

3. What key aspect(s) of the ESL staff-student relationship could be measured with the ETM?
Research Hypotheses

Following is the list of the study hypotheses numbered according to the research questions to which they correspond:

1. In this study, a theoretical basis for the ESL staff-student trust was developed based on the two key theoretical models of trust: the theories by Lewis and Weigert’s (1985) and Bryk and Schneider (2002). Lewis and Weigert described the general psychological phenomenon of trust, which consisted of cognitive, emotional and behavioral components. Bryk and Schneider focused more specifically on trustworthy relationships in the context of power asymmetry, high levels of uncertainty, and the scarcity of the feeling of belonging. Bryk and Schneider argued that the three characteristics listed above were typical for any educational environment; thus, students evaluated the trustworthiness of their instructor according to four aspects: respect, competence, regard for others and integrity.

2. The ETM was expected to be a three- by four-level matrix, where each of the trust components identified by Lewis and Weigert (1985) was aligned against each of the four aspects defined by Bryk and Schneider (2002). These two theories described trust from two different but complimentary perspectives: Lewis and Weigert highlighted the dynamic nature of trust, which progressed from cognitive to emotional and then behavioral levels. Bryk and Schneider outlined trust as a collection of four non-sequential and symmetrical aspects. The researcher hypothesized that the true measure of trust should encompass both symmetrical and non-symmetrical aspects of this phenomenon.
3. The ETM was expected to measure the degree to which the instructor, identified as the favorite by ELS students, was also perceived as trustworthy.

**Practical Value of the Study**

According to Matute-Bianchi (1991), a successful ESL program requires a team effort among teachers [to create] climate, structure, and practices … broadly sensitive, responsive, and challenging to diverse student clientele” (p. 205) Taken in a broader sense, teamwork as outlined by Simmons and Connelly (2000) should not be limited to the relations among the MLI faculty but should include ESL students as well. In fact, as discussed by Samuelowicz and Bain (1992), the relationships between faculty and students evolve as the teaching itself develops through five stages outlined by Biggs (as cited in 1992): (1) teaching as imparting information, (2) teaching as transmission of knowledge and attitudes toward knowledge within the framework of an academic discipline, (3) teaching as facilitating understanding, (4) teaching as an activity aimed at changing students’ conceptions or understanding of the world, and (5) teaching as supporting student learning. Samuelowicz and Bain claim that as teaching practices progress from Stage 1 to Stage 5, the role of the instructor changes from that of transmitter of information to mentor and, later, to partner in students’ educational experiences. The role of a student also evolves; a passive knowledge receiver becomes an active seeker and then a self-determined knowledge creator.

Both of the above theories (Samuelowicz & Bain, 1992; Simmons & Connelly, 2000) can be directly linked to Dewey’s (1916) understanding of education as a series of cooperative activities performed by a teacher and students together; those activities -- and co-lived experiences as a part of them -- stimulate personal growth of students as well as
the teacher. Thus, it appears that educational philosophers share an understanding of
education as teamwork of educators and students during which the roles of and relations
between educators and students change (Dewey; Samuelowicz & Bain; Simmons &
Connelly). Yet to engage in such mutually beneficial relations, both educators and
students should be free from the fears often natural in educational environments,
characterized by high asymmetry of power and low levels of familiarity (Bryk &
Schneider, 2002). Both of these characteristics of the educational environment force
students to engage their genuine defense mechanism and evoke passive or active
withdrawal (aggression, compliance, or withdrawal), which make it extremely difficult
for even an experienced instructor to move beyond imparting or, at best, transmitting
knowledge (Horney, 1945; Samuelowicz & Bain). If trust was found effective in limiting
the impediments naturally present in the educational environment, the study findings
could enhance SLA and TESOL practices as well as some elements of ESL institutions‘
culture (for example, mission, organizational values, and the relationships with their
respective higher education institutions). Moreover, the established value/importance of
educational trust might help ESL faculty become more conscious of the effect their
behaviors may have on educational experiences of international students in the U.S.

**Terms and Definitions**

Several definitions are essential to understanding the framework of the study. The
first is the concept of SLA, which is the key to setting the overall context of the study.
Kramsch (2000) argues that the recent interest in SLA revealed certain confusion about
the nature of the field, which might be due to the fact that SLA is a composition
discipline, which, in addition to its linguistics core, is co-influenced by sociology,
psychology and education. This makes it even more pressing to have a clear definition of the discipline and its aspects as referred to in the study.

Wakabayashi (2003) argues that SLA can be subdivided into two interrelated disciplines: the "core SLA," which deals with the mechanisms underlying learners’ L2 proficiency and its development as a combination of performance and competence systems, and the "broad SLA," which focuses on external and internal factors affecting L2 teaching-learning environment (p. 76).

VanPatten (1999) defines core SLA as a discipline that is...

…concerned with how people learn the language other than their first. This can be any language in any context… SLA focuses on both processes and products of this learning and draws on the disciplines of linguistics (including syntactic theory, pragmatic theory, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis), cognitive psychology and psycholinguistics (including first language acquisition), educational psychology (especially, reading research and methodologies used to investigate comprehension), and others… SLA is not language specific… many of the questions [it studies] ignore any classroom-versus-non-classroom distinction in that the internally driven development of a second language does not change with context… SLA research is largely concerned with the psycholinguistic, cognitive, and sociolinguistic aspects of acquisition that shape a learner’s developing linguistic system. (pp. 49-50)

VanPatten’s (1999) definition highlights the lead feature of core SLA, which is a strong focus on the individual and the internal processes of the second language acquisition that take place regardless of the specific external context of those processes.

Contrary to that, the unknown author cited by Kramsch (2000) pinpoints the externally oriented interests of broad, or applied, SLA in the following definition:

The field of SLA encompasses research on basic and applied aspects… applied SLA research addresses issues related to the learning and teaching of second languages in both the classroom and naturalistic settings with a focus on both cognitive and social issues. Of central interests are the identification of learner, teacher, and curricular variables that contribute to successful second language learning outcomes. SLA researchers also examine the role of second language knowledge and use in social identity, success in schooling, and integration into the culture. (p. 314)
The goal of the current study is to explore in more detail one aspect of teacher-student relations, trust in particular, in a SLA classroom setting. The study is focused on external factors of SLA and, therefore, it is more appropriate to refer to SLA as the broad, or applied, discipline throughout the study. Therefore, this research relies on the second definition by the unknown author cited in Kramsch (2000).

The next term to be defined is trust. In his article “The Many Faces of Trust,” Blomqvist (1997) argues that even though trust has long been acknowledged by a number of fields, including business, economics, psychology and sociology, “there is still a good deal of conceptual confusion” (p. 271; Lewis & Weigert, 1985; Young & Wilkinson, 1989). Following, Young (1993) points out that a great deal of confusion is because most definitions of trust merely list the factors that signal the presence/absence of trust rather than describe the nature of the phenomenon. Blomqvist concludes that “the various authors used the concept [of trust] very differently… and its conceptual clarification is still too incomplete for scientific progress to be made” (p. 272).

Since the universal definition of trust does not exist, the best approach to defining it in this specific study is to review its definitions offered by the scientific fields relevant to this study. As mentioned above, SLA as a discipline is co-influenced by sociology, psychology and education (Kramsch, 2000). And each of the three disciplines has set definitions of trust; analyzing those definitions would require a separate study. Therefore, the researcher chose three working definitions named below, which (1) overlap, and (2) are interdisciplinary in nature and can be applied to the unique context of the MLI classroom.
Schlenker et al. (1973) defines trust as “Reliance upon information received from another person about uncertain environmental states and their outcomes in a risky situation” (p. 420). Baier (1986) continues, claiming that trust is also “reliance on the other’s competence, and willingness to look after rather than harm, things one’s cares about, which are entrusted to the other’s care” (p. 232). Blau (1964) concludes that “Parties can gradually build trust in each other through social exchange demonstrating a capacity to keep promises and showing commitment to the relationships” (p. 12).

To summarize the common elements of the three definitions, trust appears to be a social exchange, or social relations, in which the parties expect each other to have competence and good will to contribute to the relations rather than pursue self-serving objectives (Barber, 1983). This summary fits well with Putnam’s (1993, 1994/1995) observation that trust, as a type of relationship, facilitates coordinated actions in a pursuit of shared objectives and enhances the effectiveness of a social group. The goal of this study is to contribute to the exploration of trust as a facilitator of ESL students’ education success; in this light, the summary definition presented above appears a suitable working definition for the purposes of this study.
Chapter Two

Literature Review

Introduction

According to Ortega (2005), there is no disciplinary research that can be
legitimately perceived as value-free. In fact, every research fits within effective
epistemological diversity and the ultimate value of research is to be judged by its social
utility (Ortega). The research in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) is not immune to
such judgment. And within its own field, SLA research opens —a space for disciplinary
dialogue that allows [theoreticians and practitioners in the field] to engage in the
articulation of valued research goals and professional and social responsibilities for the
field of instructed SLA” (Ortega, p. 427).

However, because of the complex nature of the field and its close relationships
with other disciplines, social utility of SLA research is defined through its contribution
not only to the field of SLA but rather to a number of disciplines. More specifically, in
addition to enabling intra-disciplinary dialogue SLA research establishes inter-
disciplinary connections with Language Pedagogy (LP), sociology, psychology, and other
fields dealing with human learning processes as well as human relations, including some
branches of management: for example, service operations and partnership agreements
(Ellis, 1997; Pica, 1997; Spada, 2005). In fact, Wakabayashi (2003) argues that the
content of SLA research can be subdivided into two interdependent categories: core SLA
research and broad SLA research. While core research studies the mechanics of the
second language acquisition, broad SLA research explores a diversity of factors that
influence the process of SLA, including, the unique characteristics of students and their instructors and the relationships that evolve as a part of SLA practices.

When talking about SLA and psychology, MacWinney (1997) notes that the last two decades saw the relationships between the two fields becoming stronger and more balanced. One of the themes bringing research in SLA and psychology closer together is the study of the role of an instructor in the SLA environment and the effect that the instructors’ personality has on the choice of teaching-learning practices made by both SLA teacher and SLA learner (MacWinney). Through the connections to psychology, the human element also emerges as an important factor in SLA; the factor that contributes to and helps explain the inconsistency of outcomes that result from the efforts to translate SLA theories into LP practices.

When discussing the relationships between SLA and sociology, Canagarajah (2006) argues that the main outcome of this relationship for SLA research is the recent shift from studying second language acquisition as a mechanical process to exploring language acquisition as identity construction and social participation. When learning second language, students view their instructor as an agent of a different socio-cultural construct and the role model; thus, students mimic instructor’s behaviors and attitudes as a part of acquiring the second language and constructing their own identity in the socio-cultural environment of the second language and the instructor represent. Thus, the relations between SLA research and studies in sociology once again underscore the importance of the human factor in SLA because, from a sociological standpoint, SLA instructor is not just a knowledge-importer but rather a mediator between students’ native and L2 identities. Canagarajah claims that the SLA success depends on (a) how
successful is the instructor in projecting and explaining the socio-cultural norms and behaviors accepted in the L2 environment, and (b) how successful are all the SLA participants in establishing and sustaining open and trusting relationships, during which L2 beliefs, norms, and behaviors can be added to L1 beliefs, norms, and behaviors without replacing or distorting the latter.

Lightbown (2000) and Gee (1990) look more specifically at the relations between SLA research and LP practices. While not denying the importance of SLA research as an intra- and inter-disciplinary dialogue, both authors express a concern that only some of SLA research results in positive changes in LP practices. According to Gee, somewhat limited transferability of SLA research to the field of Language Pedagogy is related to the fact that SLA and LP as two independent fields adhere to particular discipline-bound discourses. Unable to translate SLA discourse as a whole, LP uses a selective-trial approach and applies only those theoretical models (or even parts of models) from SLA research that can be easily translated into pedagogical practices. Lightbown (2000) continues this discussion to note that SLA research frequently invites the teachers to "engage in pedagogical behavior which is not compatible with their understanding of their role as a teacher" (p. 431). According to the author, current pedagogical practices are only partially grounded in the teachers' formal training; a much larger proportion of those practices stems from practical experiences of individual teachers in unique educational environments. While ascertaining potential differences in the differences among student population, organization of schools and classrooms, and other factors affecting the structure of teaching-learning processes and relationships, SLA research is often perceived as general and sketchy because it focuses on theoretical frameworks and
does not effectively communicate how the mentioned contextual difference might affect practical application of theoretical models. Overall, both Lightbown and Gee underscore the importance of, once again, factoring in the human component in SLA research and, moreover, building a dialogue with practicing Second Language (L2) instructors to ensure that SLA research considers the diversity of classroom realities and enhances the teacher‘s capability to control those realities.

One of the newest trends in TESOL, discussed in Chapter I, is the emerging relations between TESOL and the field of management; the relationships that have a strong focus on the nature and success indicators of the interactions among the participants of L2 process: instructor and students (Walker, 2001). The importance of these new connections between TESOL (and SLA through TESOL) and management is in the different approach to viewing L2 practices as a service with an intangible and heterogeneous product for which there is no universally accepted evaluation that is also free from bias (Fitzsimmons & Fitzsimmons, 1994; Walker). In this light, student satisfaction with the service/products becomes the only reliable form of evaluation; and customer satisfaction is commonly conceptualized as a outcome of the comparison customers make between expectations and perceptions of the service performance (Walker, p. 188). While expectations are formed by students based on their individual characteristics and previous experiences, the perceptions are formed in the process of SLA and are largely affected by the personality of the instructor and the nature of classroom relationships (Lovelock, 1995). The connection between TESOL, SLA, and management reinforce the fact that the human component, more specifically, the
relationships between instructors and students are a critical element of any teaching-learning practices but even more so in L2 teaching and learning.

Overall, as mentioned earlier the value of SLA research is judged by its social utility and the ability to enhance the effectiveness of LP practices and increase the success of both teachers and students engaged in SLA (Ellis, 1997; Ortega, 2005; Pica, 1997; Spada, 2005). Based on the themes that emerge through interdisciplinary dialogues between SLA and other disciplines, the human component of SLA environment appears to be the key to successful language practices and, thus, one of the most important research topics. More specifically, to ensure higher social utility SLA research needs to pay special attention to the role of instructors and their relationships with L2 students as these themes can serve as the link that can enhance the translation of SLA theory into L2 practice. Moreover, such focus could potentially contribute to the body of knowledge in the disciplines that SLA borrows from: psychology, social and cultural sciences, and education.

This literature review provides a more in-depth overview of the field of linguistics to illustrate the evolvement of the interest to the role of instructor and instructor-student relationships throughout the history of the field and as particularly related to SLA. The second part of the review focuses more in-depth on trust as the necessary characteristic of successful relationships; the author discusses the theories of trust as used in psychology and sociology as well as the new trends of exploring trust as an element of educational relationships. The overall discussion is aimed to reinforce the idea that (a) human relationships are the critical component of successful educational practices, including
those of SLA, and (b) to be able to learn from and with their instructor, SLA students have to establish a very specific type of open relationships based on trust.

**Theoretical Background in Second Language Acquisition**

**Introduction.** During more than a century of its existence, the fields of linguistics and SLA made a complete cycle in their development. At the wake of the linguistic thought, Paul and Whiney (Koerner, 2006) strongly promoted the idea of sociological approach to language acquisition; however, quite soon under the auspices of Saussure, the research shifted to denial of social origins of language in favor of the “imprint” schemata (Bredella & Righter, 2006). Chomsky and Vygotsky sustained Saussure’s traditions through the first half of the 20th century because both authors focused on studying language as a biological product, which resulted from individual/independent mental activity (Beliavsky, 2006; Chomsky, cited in Putnam, 1994/1995). However, the new generation of linguistic and SLA theories replaced the Saussurian framework with the revival of the discussion on the importance of social interaction and interpersonal relationships in the context of language acquisition (Bernstein, 1996; Gibbons, 2006).

Current theoretical thought on language acquisition offers a wide range of perspectives on the role of instructor ranging from mere interpretation and imparting of knowledge to active and mutually beneficial educative interactions between teacher and students. The importance of the socio-cultural trend in SLA and linguistic research is difficult to overestimate; the value assigned to pedagogical expertise of teachers empowers teachers to take a more active position in defining what and, especially, how is taught in SLA classroom. Moreover, as advocated by Lightbown (2000), this trend
encourages teachers to be proactive rather than reactive in defining the pedagogical context and relationships to enhance students’ achievement.

This part of the Chapter offers more details on the historical development of the field of linguistic. In addition to describing the theories prominent during a certain historical period, the discussion explores the role of teacher and its reflection in LP practices characteristic of that historical period.

**Pre-Saussurian Period.** Although, Ferdinand de Saussure is universally referred to as the founding father of linguistics as an independent discipline, language studies were a part of theological and natural science discussions almost a century prior to him. In fact, Saussure’s linguistic inspirations were affected by such 19th century linguists as Paul and Whitney (Koerner, 2006).

The "apostle of historicism," Paul had been frequently discussed in opposition to Saussure because Paul’s research focused on finding the relations between different languages and on explaining the seemingly arbitrary links between words, meanings, and objects through historical evolution of languages, which originated from the same root (Koerner). Paul’s work promoted the comparative analysis of different languages at a singular point of time as opposed to the exclusive focus on the comparative analysis of the same language over a series/sequence of time-periods (Koerner). Through the comparative analysis of different languages, Paul attempted to deduce external and internal forces, which affect language over time, and explain the arbitrary nature of linguistic structures (Koerner).

Another Saussure’s predecessor, Whitney explored language as a "social product" and referred to linguistics as a science affected by both society and religion (Alter, 2005).
In Whitney’s society dominated by the emerging natural sciences, language was treated as a natural object (Alter). Whitney introduced a revolutionary idea of language as a social product and of the science of language – linguistics – as a combination of theories in anthropology, ethnology, Darwin’s theory of evolution, and Scottish Common Sense philosophy (Alter). Thus, Whitney called for scientific studies of language through classification, induction, and quantification of critically analyzed empirical data (Alter). Overall, Whitney’s legacy consists of the systematization of linguistics as a field of study characterized by unique intellectual and professional challenges (Alter).

Overall, when emerging as an independent scientific discipline, linguistics – and its founders – treated language as a social product, whose historical development was closely connected to the evolution of the respective language-community. In fact, changes in the language were perceived as a reflection of historical changes in the language community stimulated by external and internal influences. By tracing the commonalities among different languages and among historical developments of different language-communities, respectively, Paul and Whitney advocated the idea that the structure of the language is secondary to the structure of social relations that the language supports; thus, learning of the language essentially consisted of learning or mimicking social relations within the language community. In this light, L2 teacher was perceived as the key figure of the L2 acquisition: teacher was the agent of the L2 community, who could help L2 learners transfer their experience in L1 community into the L2 context and acquire new social experiences common in L2 community but not in L1 community.
Saussure’s era, that followed the period of Paul and Whitney’s linguistics, did not expand on the social ideas in the field but rather introduced structural approach to studying language, the approach that defined linguistics for the first half of the 20th century. The great following of Saussurian approach could be somewhat comprehensively explained by the fact that the robust mechanics of language functioning, advocated for by de Saussure, appealed to many as rooted in a simple and coherent logics when compared to the view of language as a means and the product of social relations.

**De Saussure and Linguistic Structuralism.** The field of linguistic is generally believed to be born with the publication of Ferdinand de Saussure’s main work — *General Linguistics*” (Bredella & Righter, 2006). The arrival of the book announced the initiation of the first in Europe School of Linguistics founded by de Saussure in Geneva. In addition, it defined the framework the linguistic structuralism: one of the most powerful and influential trends in the field, the influences of which can be traced in many linguistics and SLA theories until today (Bredella & Righter).

Bredella and Righter (2006) argue that Saussure’s most influential ideas came from his works on diachronic and synchronic linguistics. Diachronic linguistics focused on language evolution or the gradual and unrelated to each other changes in the language which were not collectively recognized by the language-speaking community. Synchronic linguistics studied language characteristics shared by the collective intelligence of the community; these characteristics were believed to be arbitrary and accepted as a community-shared convention (for example, meaning, word function, and grammar) (Bredella & Righter). The process of L2 acquisition, by Saussure, was the process of adopting the shared language characteristics and acquiring the arbitrary links
between words, meanings and parts of reality words/meanings represented. While an individual born into a language-community was born with innate brain-links necessary for inter-community communication, an L2 learner had to create each individual link and build a new mental structure similar to that of an L2 native speaker (Saussure, 1916). The arbitrary nature of the links in each language made references to L1 useless; thus, SLA existed within a framework of synchronic linguistics and relevant LP heavily relied on mechanical memorization. In this light, the role of the teacher, while important, was narrowed to that of a knowledge importer; the teacher was introducing linguistic links and evaluating the students’ effectiveness in memorizing in reproducing the links in appropriate contexts. Saussure’s activities largely coincided in time with that of Foucault and the strong focus on discipline and punishment as the key characteristics of a successful educational process.

**Modern Theories in Linguistics and SLA.** In the second part of the 20th century, the field of linguistics was defined by the works of two leading researchers: Noam Chomsky and Lev Vygotsky. Even though the two authors had different perspectives on the content, process, and purposes of language acquisition, their theories made a significant contribution to the dismissal of structuralism as an inadequate theoretical approach. Chomsky’s theory was highly influenced by structuralism; the main difference was in the nature of the structure of the brain links—innate versus developed. Vygotsky emphasized the importance of socio-cultural factors in language acquisition and use. Although advocating for different perspectives, both authors stimulated the change in the perceived role of teacher in SLA and L2 practices.
Chomsky’s generative transformational theory claimed that — that knowledge of language [involved] system of rules and representations, of mental computation, linked to the motor and perceptual apparatus; and that much of this system is fixed and invariant… determined by our biological endowment” (Chomsky, cited in Putnam, 1994/1995). According to Chomsky, to know the language meant to master a system of rules and principles, the system that was innate or pre-determined by the person’s biological endowment (Chomsky). The application of the language was a rule-governed social behavior, which was also innate and naturally expected by and from all members of the society (Chomsky).

Chomsky argued that differences between different languages were superficial while the basic biological endowment was universal; therefore, language learning was not more than discovering that language within once brain (Chomsky, cited in Putnam, 1994/1995). Thus, Chomsky reaffirms the existence of the "language convention” brought up to light by Ferdinand de Saussure (Bredella & Righter, 2006). However, in contrast with Saussure’s idea of dual nature of the language (which consists of structured/shared and evolutionary elements), Chomsky advocated almost exclusively for innate biological origins of human linguistic skills.

In the light of Chomsky’s theory, the role of a language teacher was concentrated on building an educational environment, in which person’s curiosity and interest in truth and development would mature and develop” at a natural path (Chomsky, cited in Putnam, 1994/1995). In other words, the teacher acted as enabler; a professional who would direct the students into discovering and mastering their innate linguistic skills according to the principles customary to the respective language-community. To some
extent, this role might be considered more powerful than that offered by de Saussure because in Chomsky’s context language teachers were the key to the students’ effectiveness in discovering their innate capabilities.

As to Vygotsky, the general claim of the researcher’s theory was that human mental activity arose as a consequence of the functional system formed by individual’s specified mental capacities and culturally constructed symbolic artifacts (Lantolf, 2006). Vygotsky argued that, similar to other higher mental functions, language had dual origins as an innate as well as socially-bonded construct; the basic linguistic ability was grounded in the individual’s innate mental capabilities but those capabilities were activated only at the social request and develop only under close social influence (Beliavsky, 2006). Consistent with his high respect to higher mental functions as the key to language acquisition, Vygotsky advocated for the systematic instruction in the “formal disciplines” such as ancient languages, composition, and “hard sciences” as the means to personal intellectual development and the advancement of personal language skills (Beliavsky).

Vygotsky’s main contribution to the field of general linguistics and SLA is the concept of ZPD (Zone of Proximate Development), in which the author argued that cognitive development unfolds stage by stage along a predetermined path. In language acquisition, learner would proceed from using “external” then “egocentric” and then “inner” speech; in SLA, language acquisition would unfold from L1 to “interlanguage” and L2 (Jones, 2008). Although a transitional stage between L1 and L2, interlanguage was thought of as the equivalent of the “egocentric” speech, which had an independent
structure and functions, which do not belong to either of the languages but depended exclusively on the cognitive abilities of an individual learner (Vygotsky, 1986).

Since Vygotsky argued that the process of teaching-learning was a social activity, the role of teacher in his theory was more of a mentor, who worked closely with the student to enhance the students’ cognitive development (Beliavsky, 2006). In contrast to Dewey’s educational partnership between teacher and student, Vygodsky‘s idea of student-teacher interaction reinforced the inequality between the two and underscored the role of teacher as a superior and knowledgeable agent of the language-community, who guided students towards the language-acquisition target predefined by the language-community (Beliavsky).

Stetsenko (2005) argues that Vygotsky’s language-acquisition theory was rigid and somewhat inconsistent: Vygotsky continuously highlighted the value of social milieu for a person‘s cognitive advancement yet his concept of ―interlanguage‖ claimed that the L1-L2 transition was rooted in absolute individual identity. In fact, according to Vygotsky, the advanced stage of linguistic proficiency – the inner speech – took place outside of the social context; private ―inner speech‖ was positioned as superior to external social communication and thus, at the advanced stages, the process of language acquisition was not truly connected to the processes in language-community, in which this language was expected to be used (Jones, 2008).

Both Chomsky and Vygotsky developed their linguistic concepts under significant influence of Saussure’s theory of language. In Chomsky’s case, language was presented as an innate biological mechanism while Vygotsky interpreted it as an external-egocentric-internal-speech progression. Both scholars criticized the early theories in
general linguistics for the lack of interest in language as a means and a product of social activity; yet, both retained the rigidity of Saussure’s framework, which described language as a predefined structure, whether social or biological. Therefore, while advancing the role of teacher from that of a mere knowledge importer to that of a mentor and enabler, none of these two theorists advocated for a language teacher to become a knowledgeable partner and a co-creator of educational opportunities, in which language develops naturally through meaningful social interactions.

Recent Trends in SLA. As discussed above, at the early stages of its history, SLA focused on the analysis of oral and written speech to define the mental processes that non-native speakers go through while developing L2 competency and, later, proficiency (Hawkins, 2001). The majority of the theories agreed on the concept of biological origins of language, which required structural approach to curriculum and instructional design and which limited the role of teacher in L2 educational process (Hawkins). However, as the new perspectives on the language acquisition emerge, the role of L2 teacher is also evolving and teacher ascertain a more prominent classroom position. There are several theories that have appeared in the last two decades and that are of particular relevance to this study: computational linguistics, socio-cultural theory, psycholinguistics, and Bernstein’s concept of code.

Computational linguistics has emerged and is developing in response to the recent advancement in informational technology; it is one of the newest perspectives in the field of linguistics and SLA and one of the most interesting because it attempts to revive the fundamental concept in linguistics, de Saussure’s general linguistics, by using most recent discoveries in informational technologies (Jones, 2007). Computational linguistics
employs IT to interpret the algorithm behind the process of humans choosing a word and a linguistic structure and combining the two into a comprehensive and unambiguous speech construct (Jones). While very similar to Saussurian linguistics in its search for abstract linguistic models, computational linguistics does not completely ignore the social aspect of language acquisition and use; the theory highlights the importance of an expert knowledgeable in both IT and L2 being present in a classroom (Jones). The expert is expected to interpret analytical algorithms to L2 learners and to teach them how to create their own algorithms, depending on the purposes and context of the language use (Jones). Computational linguistics is one of the most rigid among the new perspectives on SLA; yet, it recognizes that language is a social product and that it needs a representative of the society to teach L2 speakers on how to use the language in the respective society.

The next concept, socio-cultural theory of language acquisition claims that language serves as a cultural mediator and the channel for transmitting socio-cultural norms, habits, and behaviors; and language evolves from private/egocentric to a social speech, which enable important social interactions and transmission of the pertinent information (Gibbons, 2006). Thus, contrary to Vygotsky's concept, socio-cultural theory believes that external language is the highest stage of linguistic proficiency and language, in fact, advances in the inner-to-external-speech direction not the other way around. In this theory, socio-cultural and functional concepts of language overlap to ascertain that language develops within the language-community as a mechanism that ensures the socio-cultural sustainability of this community. Thus, language has a definite function and specific socio-cultural roots, which, to some extent, pre-determine its development. An important idea that socio-cultural theory continuously highlights is the need for a
socio-cultural moderator who guides the language acquisition by the new members of the society on behalf of that entire society (Gibbons). Thus, socio-cultural theory once again reinforces the perspective on language as a social product and promotes the role of teacher as the agent of the language-community, the agent who helps students understand how language functions in the society by making them use the language in true-to-life interpersonal interactions (Gibbons).

One more theoretical perspective, psycholinguistics, has originated in Chomsky's general linguistics theory and is a blend of psychology and linguistics (Hatch, 1983). The discipline is often referred to as “the experimental study of the psychological processes through which a human subject acquires and implements the system of a natural language” (Caron, 1992, p.3). As a blend of the two disciplines, psycholinguistics researches the phenomenon of language in both of them as well as studies the cross-discipline interaction related to language (Caron). Psycholinguistics recognizes the dual nature of language a blend of an external object and internal mental activity; on the one hand, language is a pure mental process produced by the speech activity; and, on the other hand, language structures exist outside an individual and are learned by the individual from other members of the community (Caron). In this light, Hatch, among other psycholinguists, argues that language acquisition relies on three major components: input, interaction, and inference. In SLA, the first two components are the immediate responsibility of the instructor; inference is guided by the instructor indirectly but is, nevertheless, strongly influence by him or her. Thus, psycholinguistics pushes the role of L2 teacher even further by claiming that L2 acquisition strongly depends on the teacher's ability to create an environment, in which students are exposed to the "foreign talk," have
an opportunity to practice it, and are guided in the acquisition of cognitive capabilities when making inferences about L2 (Hatch). In psycholinguistics, teacher is promoted to the role of a partner in education, who has to study each student’s existing cognitive processes before advising students on how to modify and adjust those cognitive processes to the natural L2 context.

The last theory discussed here, Bernstein’s (2006) concept of code is the one most concerned with social aspect of language learning and the first one to specifically discuss the importance of interpersonal relationships to successful language acquisition. In his theory, Bernstein argues that a language learner (L1 or L2) acquires a system of codes through a series of pedagogical interactions; each code describes a mode of communication (formal or informal) and a specific context. Bernstein claims that human beings develop different forms consciousness, which are realized through language; the system of linguistic codes accounts for the socio-cultural origins and functioning of language-specific forms of consciousness (Hasan, 2002). Therefore, a complete collection of linguistic codes help an individual to define the setting of an interpersonal communicative act and interpret the meaning of the exchanged information accordingly; thus, the knowledge and recognition of codes are the keys to successful social interactions (Bernstein).

In his book, Bernstein (1996) argues that codes cannot be learned outside social relations; the only way to acquire a code correctly is to learn it through an educational interaction, which is a part of pedagogical relationships; while not always intentional, such relationships built on learner’s openness to internalizing the principles presented by teacher. In other words, Bernstein treats language as a social function, which can only be
learned a true social interaction between learner and teacher, who trust each other and are open to cooperative educational experiences.

The four contemporary theories in linguistics and SLA while different, agree on one important aspect: they all underscore the social nature of language and argue that language cannot be acquired outside the social realm or social interactions in this language. Moreover, all four theories recognize the importance of language teacher, although, in different roles: knowledge expert, social agent, or a partner in education. Thus, the contemporary linguistic thought revives the ideas by Whitney and Paul but at a more advanced level: they do not dispute the major role that teacher plays in the process of language acquisition but rather they focus on describing different types of educational relations in order to find the characteristics that make such relationships successful. And the characteristic that reappears in several of the theories discussed in this chapter is openness defined as partnership (Hatch, 1983), trust and cooperation (Bernstein, 1996), and so on. In fact, most contemporary theories specifically argue that language acquisition is impossible without student and teacher openness to exploring each other’s socio-cultural background and making necessary adjustments in order for teacher to effectively explain and learner to understand and adopt the social functions of L2.

In this light, the environment of an intensive SLA program gains a new socio-cultural meaning. SLA students have strong socio-cultural identity realized through their native language; to acquire another language, they will have to modify their identity in accordance with socio-cultural origins and functions of a different language. Thus, L2 student need to be open to new social experiences before proceeding with teaching-learning goals and processes, SLA instructors have to negotiate with international
students the framework for establishing educational relations based on openness and trust. In particular, both students and their instructors need to explore the socio-cultural customs/traditions of their partners and find such a combination of all the traditions/customs, which will help establish and sustain educational trust and will help students immerse in the American-language environment and American-language culture while remaining open to its characteristics that are different from their own culture. Overall, SLA classroom relationships and educational trust in particular deserve an individual discussion that follows in the next part of this chapter.

**Trust as a Social Construct and Its Role in Educational Processes**

**Trust in Education: Practical Importance of the Issue.** According to Paulo Freire (1973), “to be human is to engage in relationship with others and with the world… [and unlike animals] men relate to the world [and others] in a critical way… through reflection – not by reflex” (p. 3). Through these acts of “critical perception” men integrate with their context; they adapt to the reality and develop “the critical capacity to make choices and to transform that reality” (Freire, p. 4). Following Dewey (1916), the same capacity to make choices helps men select experiences, which sustain the continuum of their development by educating them and by enhancing their consciousness.

At an early age of high immaturity, men are not capable of consistently making beneficial choices because their consciousness is not sufficiently developed and they do not possess enough knowledge to legitimately compare the alternatives (Dewey, 1916). Thus, the society instituted the system of education as a mechanism of guiding its new members through the initial stage of socialization under the mentorship of established,
conscious and experienced members. Unfortunately, this system is run by people, with whom children are not initially familiar. And, according to Bryk and Schneider (2002), lack of familiarity with the surrounding might cause children to feel apprehensive towards this environment. In addition, since children are required to enter this unfamiliar environment, their fear of unfamiliar is coupled with the social/family pressure to comply and succeed. Bryk and Schneider argue that frightening relations are not conducive for acquiring knowledge or developing consciousness because all emotional, intellectual, and physical capabilities of an individual are focused on self-preservation through escape (withdrawal), compliance (adaptation), and/or resistance (aggression). If not balanced by trusting relationships with teacher and peers, fear augmented by social pressure might lead a child to grow into an oppressor or an oppressed; in both cases, a child might *de jure* succeed as a student but *de facto* will most likely fail as a lifetime learner and a human (Freire, 1993).

As the goal of the educational system, from a Deweyan and Freireian perspective, is to promote humanization as a part of the individual’s growth, the system needs to create an educational environment, which would be different from a family circle, yet would provide the same levels of order and security to allow a child to focus exclusively on knowledge acquisition and enhancement of consciousness. Barber (1983) claims that trust forms the foundation for positive perception of the relations and their context/environment because trustworthy relations are almost always regarded as organized, secure, and beneficial to both parties.

As discussed in Chapter I, Bryk and Schneider (2002) identify two types of trust: absolute faith-like organic trust and contractual trust, which relies on superior to
relationship forces such as law enforcement agencies and/or governmental entities. Educational relations rely on trust that exhibits some characteristics of both organic and contractual trust yet is different from both. In fact, educational trust is a transitional condition between the two established types of trust. The transitional and complex nature of educational trust explains the fact that its structure has some elements that are similar to either organic or contractual trust but their combination is more intricate than that of either established type of trust. More specifically, Bryk and Schneider argue that children develop educational trust toward their teachers by evaluating such teachers' characteristics as respect, regard for others, competence, and integrity. Among the four characteristics, respect and regard for others refer to the teachers' personal traits and organic trust while competence and integrity address professional (contractual) requirements. Overall, while creating and sustaining trusting educational relations a teacher and students, as a minimum, have to establish quasi-organic and quasi-contractual trusts in the context, which has no genuine conditions for either original type.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) go even further to claim that the four elements of educational trust are shaped by a number of various social groups to which a child (and his/her family) belongs. Therefore in addition to an immediate school and family environments, educational trust is partially rooted in the customs and traditions of the social group at large; thus, educational trust is a subject to various effects of the socio-cultural background of all members of the educational environment and relationships.

According to Mellinger (1956), “it is axiomatic that the way two people feel about each other has an important bearing on what they communicate to each other and how they respond to what is communicated” (p. 304). Tsfati and Cappella (2005) continue,
trust plays an important role in many [if not all] human interactions” (p. 251). In the light of these statements, education is a human interaction, which heavily relies on open communication between a teacher and a student so that together they can share and create knowledge and succeed in supporting each other’s development as a human and as a part of their respective social group(s). If trust is a key for open communication then it has to be an essential part of education as a process and a context.

Further on, Weber and Carter (2003) argue that trust —does not exist prior to its enactment, it is a state of the relationship that is emergent, and it structures the relationships” (p. 3). Trust is not present outside a social network; it is —acted” at the beginning of relationships, it affects the relationships and is affected by it. In fact, according to Taylor and Brown (1984), mistrust is not a considered to be a primary construct but rather a derivative or a deviation of trust; it is the result and the catalyst of a defective relationship. By making the above claim, Taylor and Brown suggest that any relationships can be initiated and sustained as trusting; and only the deviation of the relations and a critical flaw in the development of the relations’ parties trigger the transformation of trust into mistrust.

To summarize the above, educational trust is enacted at and by the initiation of the relations between a teacher and a student; as the relations develop, so does trust and, depending on the characteristics and actions of the involved parties, both their relations and trust can progress in either positive/beneficial or negative/destructive direction. Thus, it is essential for an educator to monitor the relationships and be able to recognize and reconstruct deviations in trust. However, to be able to do so, an educator needs to know the nature, typologies, and characteristics of trust and its impacts on human interactions.
and behaviors. Therefore, the following part of the chapter is devoted to a more detailed discussion of trust as explored in social sciences.

**Levels of Trust.** Lewis and Weigert (1985) distinguish three levels of trust: cognitive (all the members of the group characterized by trust are aware of the norms and expectations), emotional (all the members of the group characterized by trust feel secure about those norms and expectations), and behavioral (all the members of the group characterized by trust willingly act upon them). Barber (1983) defines similar levels: expectations for order, partners’ competence in role performance, and partners’ fulfillment of fiduciary obligations. The mentioned theorists agree that only when the three levels of trust well-balanced, trust can and does facilitate cooperative behaviors.

Further on, Rotenberg, Boulton and Fox (2005) claim that absence or inadequate development of any of the three levels might result in very high or very low levels of trusting both of which in turn cause psychological and social maladjustment in children and then persist in grown-ups. To confirm this assumption, the researchers conducted a study of 5th and 6th graders in the United Kingdom. The results of the study showed that children at both positive and negative extremes of trusting are at risk of social exclusion and self-destruction: the children with high levels of trusting lack the ability to critically review the norms and rely solely on the group in determining their behaviors while the children with lower levels resist the group’s norms and miss out on the advantages of cooperative behaviors (Rotenberg, Boulton & Fox). The behavioral patterns of the children in this study can be projected to adults; thus, the negative results of deviations of trust in educational environment might have longitudinal effect on individuals as well as their social groups at large.
In an environment similar to MLA, deviations in educational trust might have critical effect on students’ success in acquiring English. In case of low level of trust, a student misses out on acquiring knowledge and a set of socio-cultural norms shared by a teacher; moreover, s/he misses out of practicing the language and socio-cultural framework with other student. In case of high levels of trusting, a student might follow a majority group in their behaviors (for example, a group coming from the same socio-cultural background, who choose to interact only in their native language and within the group of same-language speakers), which might be counter-productive to his/her educational objectives (such as acquiring English and/or passing the TOEFL). Thus, it is important for a this research to know why and how trust converts into mistrust to be able to recognize and reflect such developments in the instrument, which is planned to be designed as a part of this study.

**Trust and Mistrust.** Omodei and McLennan (2000) define mistrust as the “tendency to view others as mean, selfish, malevolent, or unreliable people who are, thus, not to be dependent on to treat one well” (p. 279). Thus, mistrust is the opposite of trust or the lack of it; that is, mistrust is the cause and the product of the environment lacking organization, security, and group-to-individual benefits.

Taylor and Brown (1984) argue that mistrust is related to the structural aspects of a person’s consciousness/personality; they also believe that the connection between mistrust and consciousness/personality is reciprocal and mutually influential. Taylor and Brown highlight two dimension of personality – affiliation and distribution of control – the misbalance or lack of which in the relations cause the conversion of trust into mistrust. Taylor and Brown’s empirical research found a positive correlation between
trust and personal affiliation as well as between trust and equal power distribution. It is not surprising, then, that organic and contractual relations are defined by the highest levels of trust: the former boast high level of the feeling of belonging and personal affiliation among the members of the relations; the latter relies on the equality of power distribution as described in the contract and reinforced by various legal institutions.

Luhmann (1979) expands on the discussion of personal affiliation to state that group affiliation is closely related to familiarity and knowability with the group; and, both familiarity and knowability form the basis for trust and mistrust. As by Luhmann group means primarily the relationships among the members of a social network, the above statements are transferrable to the relations as well meaning that familiarity and knowability with the context and the participants of the relationships form the basis for trust/mistrust in such relationships. As social networks grow in size, individuals are forced to replace direct/personal familiarity with indirect symbolic representation of it, that is, shift away from familiarity with the members of the group and rely on the familiarity with the context when making a decision in favor or against trusting such relationships.

It is important to note that in the absence of personal affiliation, past experiences that an individual had in similar context/relationships, define the positive or negative outlook of both familiarity and knowability. In other words, an individual is likely to perceive relationships as lacking organization, security, and benefit (or mistrust the relationships) if this individual had similar relationships in the past and suffered severe power and affiliation deprivation in those past relationships.
Yet further, Taylor and Brown (1984) claim that even if the individual did not have past experiences that are similar to his/her current ones, s/he still enters relationships with some pre-formed expectations, which might be based on other people‘s experiences translated into word-of-mouth stories and cultural stereotypes. Taylor and Brown observed this phenomenon when studying interracial and intercultural relationships. The authors concluded that although intercultural relationships are not necessarily frequent in every part of the world, individuals are likely to enter such relationships with some pre-formed expectations and a certain level of trust/mistrust regardless whether or not they had similar experiences before. Taylor and Brown’s observation reinforces Luhmann’s (1979) conclusions that in modern society individuals rely on symbolic and context-rooted impressions rather than on direct personal experiences when deciding in favor of trust or mistrust in their current relationships. This finding is especially important in MLA context because it means that in addition to the instructor’s personality, international students‘ trust highly depends on the expectations they form based on the stereotypes about American culture and system of education, the stereotypes that exist in their specific culture.

Mistrust, however, does not necessarily lead the relationships to failure. As discussed earlier, the three basic defense reactions are withdrawal, compliance, and aggression; and, withdrawal and aggression as the two types of social exclusion are likely to lead a person to miss out on the opportunities of cooperative behavior by passively or actively rejecting existing social norms (Horney, 1945; Rotenberg, Boulton & Fox, 2005). Compliance, however, is not an exclusion but rather an adjustment mechanisms, which allows an individual to benefit from the relationships, which s/he does not trust.
(Horney). In their empirical study, Tsfati and Cappella (2005) observed a strong association among trust, compliance, and the need for cognition (NFC). They researchers found that as a motivational disposition in a pursuit of information and/or knowledge, NFC is capable of intervening with the process of transformation of trust into mistrust and can, in fact, absorb and nullify the effects of mistrust on the relationship (Tsfati & Cappella). In other words, if an individual perceives current relationships as an exclusive or rare source of important information, this individual regards the discomfort caused by the deficiencies or lack of trust in the relationship as less significant compared to the benefits of obtaining the mentioned information (Tsfati & Cappella).

Related to the above is the concept of mistrust as an educated/intelligent choice (Rice, 2006). According to Rice, the ability to intentionally develop the mistrust of people, information, and environments is a part of education rooted in critical thinking skills. Control over mistrust is important when choosing the appropriate strategic response to situations lacking comfort, security, and benefits, because most non-trustworthy situations have equal chances to become harmful (physically, emotionally, and otherwise) or highly beneficial for a student (Rice).

Overall, mistrust is a secondary construct; it is a result of the deviations in the relationships, which are initiated as trusting and trustworthy. The deviation might be caused by several factors. First, the relationships might be, indeed, lacking order, security, and benefits to the participants. And second, the participants might perceive the relationships as not trustworthy because they are not familiar with the group/other members, they had previous negative experiences in similar relationships/context, or they have pre-existing cultural stereotypes, which prevent them from evaluating the
relationships as positive. If individual members mistrust their current relationships, they have a choice of resisting these relationships (passively or actively) or adjusting to them by using various mechanisms of compliance. However, to comply, individuals have to be able to make an intelligent choice to do so because they evaluate these relationships as an important source of information critical to their success. These observations are critical for this study as they show that trusting relationships in MLA context depend not only on the personality of an instructor but also on the personal determination of students to succeed regardless of their pre-existing cultural stereotypes/expectations, unfamiliarity with an American educational context, and overall positive or negative perceptions of order, security, and fiduciary behaviors at MLA.

**Trust in Education: Classic-Theories Viewpoint.** Considering the importance of trust in human relationships and human communication as discussed above, it is surprising that the conversations about the importance of trust in education among major educational theorists and philosophers are scarce (Rice, 2006). In her literature search, Rice discovers that Paulo Freire, Miriam Raider-Roth, and Deborah Mejer as those few educational philosophers who specifically focus on trust in a classroom in their discussions.

In his work *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire (1993) discusses the duality of trust in the context of revolutionary changes. In particular, for the oppressor to liberate the oppressed, the oppressor has to —trust in the oppressed and in their ability to reason” (Freire, p. 72). However, the oppressed also have to trust themselves and the fact that they too —know things” through their interactions with the world and others (Freire, p. 74). Freire further posits that if one of the parties lacks trust, it fails to initiate and sustain
the reflective dialogue, which makes revolutionary change possible. When considering Freire’s discussion of the “banking system of education” as an example of oppressive relationships where the teacher overpowers the students, the issue of trust appears in a different light. Education is seen as a series of revolutionary changes, during which men develop their consciousness and gain freedom; therefore, in order to take place, education needs teachers to trust their students’ abilities as well as students to trust their own knowledge. Only then, according to Freire, can education reach its full potential and break through the structure controlled by monologue, instruction, and propaganda.

Raider-Roth’s work (2005) reflects on Freire’s philosophy and brings a fresh perspective on the value of trust in education, which simultaneously expands and challenges classic models of knowledge acquisition, such as Piaget’s model (Piaget, 1952; Piaget, 1963). According to the philosophical perspective on the development of the “learner’s self,” a learner accumulates knowledge by processing outside world experiences and internalizing lessons, which result from such a processing and which also prepare the learner for subsequent experiences (Dewey, 1916; Piaget). According to Raider-Roth, knowledge is processed both internally and externally; moreover, external processing is the key factor defining the information that will be appropriated into knowledge. When in a classroom, students read the relational tenor” and define how trustworthy their teachers and peers are; based on the results of such “reading,” students then share some part of what they know and suppress knowledge deemed “unfit” for their classroom (Raider-Roth, p. 588). Suppressed knowledge is treated as unimportant and/or unworthy of trust and eventually becomes lost (Raider-Roth). Thus, when processing their experiences, students continuously negotiate trust in self and trust in others -
teachers and peers (Raider-Roth). The more trusting the classroom relationships, the more lessons are internalized by students and the more confident students are in their own knowledge and learning capabilities (Raider-Roth).

Morris and Tarone (2003) made a conclusion similar to that of Raider-Roth (2005) when studying the social dynamics of the second language classroom. In his paper, Morris and Tarone describe a study conducted among the learners of Spanish as a Second language, in which the learners had to complete an assignment in pairs. The results of the study revealed that the pairs that actively interacted while performing the task were more successful than those that did not exchange feedback; moreover, the partners, who did not exchange feedback, experienced negative feelings towards each other and were not able to accept feedback from each other because they did not trust each other's benevolent goals (Morris & Tarone). Thus, Morris and Tarone's study reinforces the idea that, in an educational environment, trusting relations stimulate cooperative behaviors, which enhance learning and advance educational achievement. Vann and Fairbaim (2003) summarizes the outcomes of Raider-Roth and Morris and Tarone's studies by stating that limited cooperative behaviors, which often characterize untrusting educational relations, can result —not only in low academic achievement but also in low self-confidence and motivation, and little understanding of higher education opportunities” (p. 11).

Rice (2006) further develops Raider-Roth's ideas to claim that —of children and younger adolescents, trusting others' knowledge, values, and skills may be indistinguishable from trusting others as individuals” (p. 74). This observation closely correlates with the findings from Rotenberg, Boulton and Fox's (2005) study of 5th and
6th graders in Britain discussed earlier in the chapter. Rice goes on to argue that, in addition to information, students rely on their teachers in acquiring emotional intelligence: teachers serve as models for learning the contextual – cultural and traditional -- appropriateness of emotions and feelings. Thus, the educational environment shapes students’ ability to acquire knowledge and defines children’s relationship patterns and functioning as future members of the society; thus, children who do not trust their teachers are at disadvantage not only as students but as members of the society as well (Rice).

**Trust in Education: Contemporary Theoretical Developments.** Bryk and Schneider (2002) represent the contemporary view on educational trust; in their work, the authors develop a theoretical foundation for relational trust, a unique type of trust specific to educational environment and involving multiple overlapping networks with numerous social agents. Bryk and Schneider define educational/relational trust by comparing it to two alternative trust types: organic and contractual. The first type is based on “unquestioning beliefs of individuals in the moral authority of a particular social institution”; the second type refers to the “constrained” relations of institutions or individuals, in which the exchange between the parties is regulated by a judicial system (Bryk & Schneider, p. 16). Bryk and Schneider confirm that relational trust lies between organic and contractual trusts on the human relationship continuum. It has some qualities of each of the alternative trust types but is not anyone of them. Moreover, Bryk and Schneider argue that educational trust involves the relationships between teachers and students, teachers and parents, teachers and school administrators, and among teachers themselves. Thus, even though relational/educational trust resembles both organic and
contractual types at different stages of its development, it is more complex and more sophisticated than any one of those types.

At the early stages of life, a child is not capable of testing most of the information provided by a teacher; thus a child has to trust the teacher's knowledge. And this is when educational trust resembles organic trust the most (Bryk & Schneider 2002; Dewey 1916). The older the children, the more they understand that teaching is a job and the more they treat teachers’ professional competence as a part of their contractual duties. At that stage educational/relational trust is the closest to contractual trust (Bryk & Schneider). However, trust never remains in a fixed position: it constantly moves along the organic-contractual continuum depending on the outcomes of day-to-day personal exchanges between the teacher and the students (Bryk & Schneider).

It is interesting that in order to define trust in educational environments, Bryk and Schneider (2002) introduce four concepts that serve as qualitative criteria of trust: respect, competence, personal regard for others, and integrity. In the context of a school, respect is the “recognition of the important role each person [including children] plays in a child’s education” (Bryk & Schneider, p.23). Genuine conversations and the desire to positively influence educational process are also elements of respect. Competence is defined as an ability of an individual to execute the formal responsibilities of his/her role; since neither students nor parents are properly qualified to judge teachers’ competence, the criteria of competence tend to fluctuate but gross incompetence is apparent and is corrosive to educational/relational trust (Bryk & Schneider). Bryk and Schneider define personal regard for others as a collection of actions aimed at reducing the sense of vulnerability of all the participants of trusting relations; those actions are also interpreted
as an expression of benevolent intentions” and include creating beneficial opportunities, working extended hours, and participating in community affairs. Finally, integrity is the consistency between what [individuals] say and what they do.” Such a consistency is perceived to be guided by a strong moral-ethical perspective and, similar to regard for others, lessens vulnerability of the relations’ participants (Bryk & Schneider, p. 23).

Overall, in their discussion of educational trust Bryk and Schneider (2002) underscore several points important for this study. First, the authors highlight the fact that, unlike other types of trust, educational trust relies not on one but on several interconnected social networks each of which brings its own socio-cultural stereotypes, norms, and expectations into teacher-student relations. Next, educational relations borrow from different types of relationships represented by various networks; therefore, educational relationships and educational trust resemble both organic and contractual relationships/trust and fluctuate on the continuum between the two but remain a separate and unique type of relationships/trust. Finally, educational trust defines the relationships that by design have neither personal affiliation (except for rare cases) nor equal distribution of power; therefore, the relationships participants use a unique set of categories to evaluate these relationships as trustworthy or not trustworthy. Thus, the unique status of educational trust reflected in the set of evaluation categories needs to be addressed in the instrument design later in the study.

**Summary and Conclusions**

Before proceeding with the study methodology, it is important to recapture the most important arguments of the above discussion. In her paper on teaching English in Hong Kong, Pennycook (1994) notes that the instructions in English as a Second
Language should not overlook “the role English plays as a medium… in social, cultural, and political relationships” (p. 13). The list of the types of relationships can be expanded by the addition of family relationships, educational and economic relationships, and so on; but, the important idea is that English, as any other language, is the medium in interaction among people and, thus, can be acquired only in the process and as a part of such interactions, real or simulated. As an independent field, SLA started its development with a strong focus on social origins of language and a human component of language acquisition. Although, this focus was perceived as somewhat secondary during the period of de Saussure, Vygotsky and Chomsky, the human component of language acquisition was never completely denied importance: all dominant theories in the field ascertained the necessity of a language instructor, whose role in the SLA process changed and evolved but was never completely eliminated. Recent developments in SLA and LP promote the social aspect of second language acquisition to an even higher level of importance when looking at the process of the second language learning as an identity construction, in which a teacher is simultaneously an agent of a different social-cultural environment and a partner/co-creator of learning experiences. Overall, the role of a teacher in a language classroom in SLA has been developing together with the developments in the perceived origins and role of language in the language-speaking community; and, both are the subjects of a heightened interest for both philosophical/theoretical thought in SLA and practical research and application in LP.

Once the importance of the social aspect as well as a prominent role of a teacher for language acquisition are established, relationships between a teacher and a student become an vital component of a language classroom; the component that, depending on
its qualities, can either positively stimulate or hamper language acquisition. Empirical research (Morris & Tarone, 2003; Raider-Ross, 2005) confirms that cooperative behaviors enhance learning outcomes as they allow the participants to benefit from each other’s feedback on the progress and product of learning activities. The acquisition of such relationships’ medium as language undeniably benefits from cooperative learning experiences even more than the acquisition of any mechanical skill. According to theories in a variety of disciplines, including but not limited to psychology and sociology, the participants engage in cooperative behaviors led by specific expectations: mainly, the expectations of benevolent behaviors of their counterparts and the expectations of beneficial outcomes of such behaviors. In other words, cooperative behaviors are initiated under the condition of trust among all the participants of such behaviors. Further, cooperative behaviors can only be sustained if the participants’ expectations receive positive reinforcement; otherwise, trust deviates into mistrust and the participants cease benefitting from cooperation. Thus, trust in a language classroom appears a critical condition of cooperative behaviors, which in their turn are crucial for successful language acquisition.

Bryk and Schneider (2002) identify two polar types of trust: organic and contractual. The former is grounded in an absolute familiarity/personal affiliation of all the participants of the relations and knowability of the relationships context; the latter relies of the third party to reinforce the benevolent behaviors through a system of legal procedures. Educational relationships belong to a grey area on the continuum between the two poles: they enjoy neither familiarity nor complete legal reinforcement. Moreover, the nature of educational relationships is more complicated because of the extended network
of primary and secondary participants and stakeholders, each entering these relationships with different expectations based on their socio-cultural background. Subsequently, the nature of and the type of reinforcement for the trust in such environment is also quite complex.

In a context of MLA, a discussion of trusting educational relations gains a different perspective and an even higher importance. On average, international students have low personal affiliation and/or knowability in the context of a foreign country and a different from their home country’s system of education; and, similar to the members of any other education relations, international student do not necessarily rely on any type of contractual agreements. Yet, the benefits of open and cooperative behaviors for such students can hardly be overestimated, especially in the context of a limited time that they are allowed to stay at the programs similar to MLA. Thus, additional insights on the specific demographic or socio-cultural characteristics that enable or hinder trust in the relationships between international students and other participants of the educational process, including American instructors, would help Institutions similar to MLA be more flexible when addressing international students’ needs and, thus, would be beneficial for international students as well.
Chapter Three

Methodology

Study Design Overview

This study was a sequential three-stage methodological exploration. The first stage of the study was devoted to an in-depth overview of the existing theories on trust and existing research methods. The goal of this stage was to draft an instrument development strategy that would allow for addressing the research questions in the most effective and efficient manner. In this stage of the study, the researcher created a general structure of the ETM as a measure that was theory-driven but also adaptable to the requirements of various practical contexts.

In the second stage of the study, the researcher attempted to realize the strategy by designing the instrument that would serve as a core of the ETM. In other words, the researcher devoted the second stage to developing a questionnaire that could be used to collect the data necessary to measure trust. Aside from the design, this stage of the study consisted of three rounds of instrument calibrations: each round included an instrument trial followed by a round of revisions informed by the trial outcomes. The trials were set in either ESL or EFL (English as a Foreign Language) environments chosen based on the researcher’s interest and level of access to the members of ESL and EFL groups.

At the third stage of the study, the researcher conducted a pilot study using the draft of the instrument created after the three rounds of calibrations. The pilot study took place at MLI, the setting that the researcher initially chose as the sample research setting. International students in two Advanced English ESL courses answered the questions in the instrument.
Each stage of the study was expected to last for two months. However in reality, only the first stage took two months; stage two lasted for slightly longer than six months, and the final stage including preliminary discussions with the MLI instructors took four months. After all three stages of the study were completed, it took the researcher another three months to summarize the study process and outcomes in writing.

**Research Site and Population under Study**

The Midwestern University and more specifically, Midwestern University’s Language Institute (MLI), served as the research site for this study. The choice of the research site was based on the researcher’s familiarity with the institution due to personal experience as an international student and, later on, as an ESL instructor. In addition, due to the mentioned familiarity the access to the population was also easier than at similar programs elsewhere. International students at MLI were considered the population under study.

Two groups of ESL students at MLI were excluded from the population: international students enrolled in graduate programs at the University and international visitors attending short-term language programs, who did not intend to enroll at the University after completing the requirements of their language programs. These two groups constituted only a small proportion of MLI students, and their characteristics differed somewhat from those of typical MLI attendants. The members of the excluded groups did not have to take TOEFL to obtain a university-student status. As discussed in Chapter One, graduate students would arrive to MLI only after they enrolled in their respective programs and met the requirement for the minimum TOEFL score, which varied by department but was usually higher than 450 (MLI’s ITA Screening and
Training Policy). Short-term programs participants could choose whether or not they would like to take TOEFL; however because of the nature of their studies at the MLI, their decisions were informed by the goals that were outside the scope of this study.

There were two additional differences that separated those groups from the average MLI students. First, graduate students, usually, enjoyed a more extensive local supportive network than typical MLI students. Their additional support came from the faculty, administration and students at the respective departments: international graduate students had extensive pre-arrival interactions with the department and after their arrival they were engaged in the coursework as students and, in most cases, as teaching assistants. Additional supportive networks, higher importance of graduate program relations as opposed to the relations at the MLI, and active academic engagement led graduate students to focusing on establishing relations with the members of their department rather than with the members of the MLI (for example, MA in ESL: Financial Aid). The second difference lay with short-term language-program students. For those students MLI training served the goals other than enrolling at the Midwestern university and, similar to graduate students, short-term MLI students focused on the aspects of their stay that were outside the realm of the MLI: their life in the country of origin, sightseeing in the area of the USA they resided during the short-term study, and so on (Hazen & Alberts, 2006).

Overall due to the different nature of their MLI engagement, graduate students and short-term language program students at MLI had different expectations towards their relations with MLI faculty. In fact, the importance of those relations for graduate students and short-term language program students was lower than for undergraduate
hopefuls. The researcher excluded graduate and short-term program students from the research population and subsequently from the sample in an attempt to avoid selection bias as a possible threat to the study’s internal validity (Onwuegbuzie, 2000).

**Note on the ESL Students in the USA**

As discussed in Chapter One with the reference to the researcher’s personal communication to Sayers (December 4, 2007), the groups of international students arriving to study at the MLI might vary significantly year after year. Based on the literature review, the researcher concluded that the undergraduate student population, the population chosen for this study, was generally subject to fluctuations due to the changes in the geopolitical environment (Cooper, 1999; MacKillop, 1983; Maull & Pick, 1989). Such fluctuations would make it difficult to describe the study population with high level of precision. Therefore, the researcher compiled a brief overview of the studies on international students in the USA, including the studies on the students’ statistics and information on their motivation factors and academic goals. The researcher believed that this overview provided readers with the details necessary to better understand the methodological approach to the study.

According to Hazen and Alberts (2006), among three English-speaking countries (Australia, the UK, and the USA), the United States had been “a major recipient of international students since 1960s” (p. 201). Moreover, for the last forty years the number of international students grew almost ten times: from 65,000 in 1970s to more than 550,000 in 2003 (Open Doors, 2004). Recently, the proportion of international students had been 4.6 percent of all the students enrolled in American universities (Hazen & Alberts, 2006). This portion was higher at a graduate level (10 percent); the proportion of
international students was the highest in graduate engineering programs: up to 49 percent of enrolled students (Borjas, 2002; Open Doors, 2004).

According to Hazen and Alberts’ (2006) survey of 950 international students at the University of Minnesota (random sample), the factors that motivated international students to enroll in American universities represented a complex interaction of personal characteristics, cultural and educational background, academic aspirations, and professional perspectives and expectations after graduation. Among these, „better educational opportunities in the US‘ [were] by far the strongest motivator for 72 percent of international students who participated in the study (Hazen & Alberts). The motivators that international students ranked as second and third highly depended on the students‘ socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. For example, students from affluent parts of the world – Asia and North America – desired „to experience a new culture“ while students from impoverished parts of the world – Africa and Latin America – were more concerned with better job opportunities upon graduation and return to their home countries (Hazen & Alberts). Interestingly, funding opportunities and academic freedom were almost equally valued by students from different parts of the world (Hazen & Alberts).

Aside from discovering the dominance of education and career-related factors as the motivator for international students to choose American universities, Hazen and Alberts (2006) discovered that „many international students [had] little to no first-hand experience of the US before arriving to start a course of study” (p. 208). The majority of international students in the study relied on secondary sources (for example, printed media and TV) when familiarizing themselves with the future host country, and for the
most the preliminary knowledge of the country was limited to economic factors and descriptive statistics of the system of education (Hazen & Alberts). While the mentioned information might be plentiful, it did not prepare students for the academic and personal challenges they experience as international students in the USA.

To summarize, according to Hazen and Alberts (2006), most international students agree that the key motivator for those students to enroll to American higher education institutions is that the US offers better educational opportunities. However in many cases, this perception of the US education is based on rumors and secondary informational sources. These perceptions might include all aspects of the US educational environment and might lead to misguided expectations towards educational relations and American instructors. Once at an American university, international students might face a challenge of reconciling their pre-formed expectations with the reality; and that is when American instructors play an important role in helping the students adjust to and succeed in the foreign educational environment.

**ESL Students at MLI and Issues with Reaching the Study Population**

The objective of this section is to explain why the researcher chose to conduct a measurement study instead of using the same strategy as the existing studies on educational trust and conducting a qualitative study. As described here, the researcher encountered several barriers when attempting to collect qualitative data from the MLI students. Although the mentioned issues did not force the researcher to abandon the idea of conducting a study with the MLI students, the researcher doubted that, if collected, qualitative data would be useful as a basis for any recommendations or even further research.
Initially, the data collection was planned as a series of focus group discussions with current MLI students. The groups were defined by the cultural background of the students: Asian, West-European, East-European (included all Former Soviet Union republics), Hispanic or Latino, and African. The researcher contacted MLI and made a brief presentation to MLI students describing the general purposes of the study and the research procedures. Twenty-seven students signed up for the study. However, multiple attempts to gather those students for the actual discussion did not bring positive results.

There are several possible explanations of the researcher’s failure to recruit focus group participants. First, MLI students were worried that the results of study would be shared with MLI faculty and administration and the students might suffer negative consequences of unflattering outcomes. Second, MLI students felt that they would not be able to contribute to the study because of their limited English-language proficiency. Third, because of the limited English-language proficiency, the students did not understand the procedures of the study and considered signing up to be the only action they were expected to take. There might be other explanations to the students’ behaviors related to individual opinions, beliefs, and expectations.

Upon further analysis, focus groups with MLI students or international students from similar programs appeared to be a time-consuming data-collection method with the outcomes uncertain due to the students’ culturally colored opinions and expectations and their limited command of English. Therefore, focus groups were replaced with individual in-depth interviews with current or former ESL students at MLI programs. However, this strategy did not prove successful either.
While attempting a series of interviews with ESL students, the researcher encountered two issues that made data collection problematic. First, the recruitment of the participants appeared difficult. As most ESL students, especially those that were younger, were not familiar with educational research and did not understand why their experiences would be valuable and, thus, recommended the researcher to choose someone "more experienced." It is likely that the students did not want to be singled out as "research participants" for the reasons similar to those that made them decline participation in the focus groups earlier: fear that their opinions would be shared with the faculty, fear that they would fail to provide the "right" answers to the researcher's questions, and so on. Interestingly, even the students, who initially agreed to participate in a focus group discussion, did not want to be interviewed. Thus, after several rounds of recruitment efforts, the researcher managed to find two ESL students interested in being a part of the study.

The second issue turned up during the very first interview with one of the two recruits: trust as a phenomenon appeared difficult for ESL students to describe in English. The second trial interview confirmed the fact that ESL students had significant difficulties analyzing their experiences with such an elusive phenomenon as trust while simultaneously trying to express those experiences in their second language.

To summarize, the researcher tried two different qualitative methods while attempting to extract information from ESL students and both methods brought unsuccessful results. In both trials, the participants had various English-language proficiency levels, different age, sex, and different cultural backgrounds. Thus, the researcher came to a conclusion that the difficulties exhibited by ESL participants during
the two rounds of trials were not necessarily related to the interference of the students‘ personal characteristics but rather had to do with a complex nature of trust as a concept and as a phenomenon.

The unsuccessful trials attempted by the researcher coincided in some aspects with the conclusions that Blomqvist (1997) made in his overview of the definitions of trust. Blomqvist discovered that there was no agreement among various disciplines on the phenomenon of trust because most of the definitions described qualitative characteristics of trust but do not, in fact, define the phenomenon. For his review, Blomqvist selected the works of theoreticians, who were well-known and well-established in their respective academic fields; nevertheless, Blomqvist was unable to find a definition that was simple, comprehensive, and applicable across various disciplines. Blomqvist’s review demonstrated the fact that trust was a complex phenomenon, and its understanding was often colored by the specific perspective adopted by a field of study that studied it.

While individual students that the researcher attempted to recruit for this study were not established academicians, the researcher faced a problem similar to that of Blomqvist (1997): potential participants had different, although unclear, understanding of trust. In addition, they were unable to comprehensively formulate their understanding in English as their second language. Therefore after a thorough consideration of the initial attempts to collect the data, the researcher made a decision to change methodological approach and first, develop an instrument to measure trust with relative precision. Second, the researcher sought to use the new instrument in a Pilot study to collect the data necessary for the initial understanding of trust in ESL classroom environment.
Study Samples

As discussed at the beginning of this chapter, the study progressed according to the stages set by the researcher. The use of participant samples was necessary only at the second and third stages: for instrument calibrations and for the pilot study. The researcher conducted three rounds of instrument calibrations, which involved four samples (two samples were used for the second round). The researcher used one more sample for the pilot study; altogether, there were five different samples. Chapter Four and Chapter Five provide detail descriptions of each sample while this section discusses the sampling approach as well as the effects of this approach on the study reliability.

All five samples in this study were non-random samples: intact groups recruited via convenience sampling; participants had existed in a form of a group prior to the study and volunteered to take part in the study (Lohr, 2010). The first sample consisted of 32 volunteers, who were EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners, in Yerevan, Armenia. These participants were recruited for a different study supervised by the researcher. After the study was completed, the participants were asked to take part in another study, and all of them agreed to fill in the questionnaire before leaving the research site of the study they had been originally recruited for. For the second round of instrument calibrations, the researcher used two groups of students at a Community College in Nebraska: 22 students in one group and 19 students in the other. The recruited students were enrolled in two sessions of the same course taught by the same instructor; all students in the course were invited to participate in the study and 41 of them volunteered and filled in the questionnaire after the class. The 24 high school students in Washington, who took part in the third round of the instrument calibrations were also the
students of one instructor, attended different sessions of the same course and volunteered their opinion by filling in the questionnaire after the class. Finally, the participants on the pilot study – 31 ESL students at MLI – were the students in two Advanced English-language groups taking classes with the same instructor who took part in this research as an expert consultant and volunteered the students for the study.

For all five samples, the researcher's choice of the sample was primarily driven by the familiarity with the sample's gatekeeper: a recruiter or a course instructor. Even in the case with the participants of the pilot study set at the MLI, the researcher accessed the sample via the instructor, who was already engaged with the study and who was also the gatekeeper for the sample sought by the researcher. Although ease and speed of access were important factors in the sampling approach, the researcher pursued one more goal by using the help of the recruiters and instructors. As discussed earlier, potential participants were shying away from providing their opinions when the researcher approached them directly because, among other reasons, they were not sure about the value of their opinions or they feared their opinion would be used against them. It was the researcher's assumption that the speakers of English as a Second or as a Foreign Language would be more open to taking part in the study if they were approached via the people with whom they were familiar. The researcher was proven correct in this assumption and the sampling approach resulted in five usable groups of participants.
Data Collection Procedures

In all five cases when the data were collected from the study participants, there was at least one intermediary assisting the researcher. During the instrument calibrations, the participant recruiter and the course instructors performed the data collection; for the pilot study, the course instructor introduced a third person, who then collected the data.

The procedure was the same for each of the five cases. First, the intermediary introduced the study by describing the overall goal as “an attempt to improve the quality of international students’ experiences at American universities.” Following, the intermediary listed the rules of the study: the participants did not need to write down their names and had to fill in the questionnaires honestly and accurately. Finally, the intermediate disseminated the questionnaires to all students present in the room at that time. After receiving the questionnaire, the potential participants had a choice: they could fill in the questionnaire and return it to the intermediate or they could return the questionnaire without filling it in. The intermediate was instructed to collect the questionnaires empty-side-up, so that no one except for the participant him/herself knew whether s/he was returning an empty or a completed questionnaire.

After the questionnaires were collected, the researcher checked each of them for completeness. During the second stage of the study, for the instrument calibrations, the researcher was checking only if more than 75 percent of the questions had an answer. At the third stage, the pilot study, the researcher was also checking whether the participants answered the questions inquiring on their demographic information. Since the main objective of the pilot study was to see if the ETM captured the difference in ESL students’ expectations by their socio-cultural background, the researcher had to discard
the questionnaires that did not have necessary demographic information as those were not usable.

**The Rasch Model**

All the data collected in this study were analyzed using the Rasch analysis. Since the time it was originally developed by Georg Rasch (Rasch, 1960), the Rasch theory of measurement has been successfully applied to explore elusive phenomena in a variety of fields. In the recent years, the field of education has been regularly turning to the Rasch analysis when seeking understanding of the complex processes that constitute education. For example, Irwin and Irwin (2005) used the Rasch analysis to measure the numeracy of students while Johnson et al. (1995) employed the Rasch model in the study of school climate.

Fisher (1991) defines the Rasch model as “a rigorous measurement technique [which] tests the hypothesis that empirical person-item interactions are, in fact, dominated by the variable of interest” (p. 139). According to Irwin and Irwin (2005), three features of the Rasch analysis are especially desirable for the researchers. In particular, in the Rasch model the difficulty of test items can be estimated independently of the sample of persons taking the test; similarly, the ability of those taking the test can be estimated independently of a particular set of items; and the dimensions of both difficulty and ability are measured in the same units (logits) (Irwin & Irwin, p. 284). In addition, Johnson et al. (1995) argue, “the Rasch analysis alone could be used to test unidimensionality” of the structural representation of the phenomenon and suggest the directions for the structure revisions in cases when unidimensionality is not confirmed (p. 458).
Based on the researchers’ observations as described above, the Rasch analysis appeared to be the research methodology that fit the best the purposes of this study for two main reasons. First, it allowed the researcher to evaluate the unidimensionality of the construct of trust created based on trust theories and realized in the questionnaire. Second, the analysis of the unidimensionality was needed to test the researcher’s assumptions of the structure of trust independently from testing the students’ expectations towards trust. These two factors contributed to the researcher’s decision to choose the Rasch analysis for testing the study hypotheses.

Data Analysis

The data for this study were analyzed with Winsteps version 3.59 using the Rasch model to evaluate the ETM on the following characteristics: unidimensionality of the items’ fit, the distribution of items’ difficulty, and the reliability of the ETM in explaining the variance in students’ evaluations of trust in their relations with the favorite instructors (Kim & Park, 2011). In addition and as a part of the instrument calibration, the researcher compared the appropriateness for the ETM design of the 4-point Likert-type agreement rating scale and the 3-point importance rating scale.

Each of the abovementioned characteristics of the ETM was assessed through one or more indexes produced by the Winsteps software. The unidimensionality of the ETM was evaluated via examining the item fit table. Following, the researcher used item separation index, the map of items and the measure order of the items to evaluate the distribution of items’ difficulty. Finally, ETM reliability in explaining the differences between students’ evaluation of their relations with instructors was assessed via a
combination of the principle contrasts (in particular, variance explained rate) and person separation index.

By using person separation index for evaluation in multiple instrument trials, the researcher attempted to introduce one more instrument-realibility index in addition to the standard error of measurement. According to Allen (2007), person separation was similar to Cronbach’s alpha (cited in Hardigan, 2010, p. 10). More specifically, “high person separation [meant] that apparent differences between people on the measure [were] less likely a result of errors in measurement… Low values… [indicated] larger measurement errors and thus less confidence that comparisons can reveal true differences” (Allen, cited in Hardigan, p. 10).

The difference between male and female subjects was explored only in the pilot study. First, the subsets were evaluated independently for potentials trends as well as for stability of the ETM as a unidimensional measure of trust. Following, the researcher investigated male and female data subsets by using Differential Item Functioning (DIF) to determine whether the differences between the subsets of the sample could be treated as significant.

**Study Limitations**

This study was subject to a number of limitations due to the exploratory nature of the research. First as discussed earlier in this Chapter, it involved several participant samples, none of which was either randomly selected (Onwuegbuzie, 2009). Moreover, the accessibility of each individual sample was made possible only through the sympathetic attitude of individual (for each sample) gatekeepers, who were either personally familiar with the researcher or received a favorable recommendation from a
friend/business acquaintance personally familiar with the researcher (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). Overall, the study's sampling approach signaled low external validity in a traditional sense, yet, the repetitive instrument calibrations served as an attempt to establish stability of the ETM's structure and validate the instrument (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2010).

Second, the internal validity of the findings might have been subject to the Hawthorne effect. In several cases the chosen sample was only somewhat accessible not only due to the presence of a gatekeeper but also because of the physical distance between the participants and the researcher. In those cases, the instrument was administered by the instructor. As a result, for their evaluation the students might have picked the instructor, who administered the questionnaire (although, they were given the option of choosing any instructor). Therefore, the outcome data might be overly positive because the students might have perceived the current study as a part of the instructor's evaluation and wanted to please him/her (Onwuegbuzie, 2000).

In addition, one part of the instrument validation was conducted in a foreign country that had only recently started benefitting from closer and richer social, cultural, and economic relations with English-speaking developed countries such as the USA. In the light of such positive experience, the participants in the study might have positively skewed their responses to the questionnaire because the study was done for the US-based University, thus, also causing Hawthorne effect, although of a different origin (Onwuegbuzie, 2000).

Finally, there was a possibility of the participants' behavior bias (Onwuegbuzie, 2000). Based on the researcher's observations while an ESL instructor, some of the
students at the MLI arrived to the MLI following the steps of their siblings or relatives; this was especially common among students from Middle East. Such students might had arrived to the MLI equipped with positive or negative predisposition towards the Institute. Since the researcher did not have an opportunity to meet with the students prior to the study and explore the students attitudes towards the MLI, the effect of the participants‘ behavior bias in this study was unknown (Gersten et al., 2005; Onwuegaguzie).

Overall, the findings of the study are presented as suggestive recommendations that should be treated with caution. Nevertheless, these findings are based on extensive and positive exploratory efforts and can be used in future research to further benefit the fields of TESOL, ESL, and, possibly, SLA.

**Study Timeline**

This study started in the Fall of 2007 with a research on the history of MLI performed as a part of requirements for the History of Higher education graduate course. That part lasted for four months and included an interview with the Director of MLI as well as the study of the materials archived at the Canaday Center at the University’s library. Elements of this research were, included in Chapter I, and provided the initial direction and the background for the study. The next stage of the research, the literature review, took one year. Following, the development and calibration of the instrument took one year. Finally, the pre-pilot discussion with the MLI instructors and piloting of the instrument took two months. Overall, starting from the initial research on the history of MLI and rounding up with the piloting of the ETM the research discussed in this study took approximately four years.
Chapter Four

Study Stage I and II: Literature Review and Instrument Development

Initial Matrix

The design of the instrument was informed by two theories on trust, discussed in the literature review. The first one was the theory of Bryk and Schneider (2002) describing relational trust as the mutual positive evaluation of the relationships participants according to four components of trust: respect, competence, regard for others, and integrity. Aside from defining trust as a collection of characteristics rather than one integral phenomenon, the usefulness of this theory for the study lied in the fact that the theory focused on exploring trust in the context of high power asymmetry, high level of uncertainty, and the scarcity of the feeling of belonging. Those characteristics were even more pronounced in the relationships between international students and their American instructors because those relationships were placed in the environment intensified by external factors as in the case with MLI-type environment.

The second theory that informed the instrument design was Lewis and Weigert's (1985) interpretation of trust as a tri-level phenomenon, which consisted of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components. As Lewis and Weigert described it, trust among the members of the group was possible only if and when the members of this group were aware of the relationship norms and expectations, felt secure about those norms and expectations, and willingly acted in accordance with those norms and expectations. When looking at [relational] trust from different perspectives, together the two theories created a relatively comprehensive and complete description of trust as a phenomenon, which
consisted of four components and which developed at three different, yet interconnected, levels.

Continuing the logic of the discussion, if trust as an integral phenomenon had cognitive, emotional, and behavioral levels, then each of recognized components of trust -- respect, competence, regard for others, and integrity -- had to have the same three levels. Vice versa, if a tri-level phenomenon of trust consisted of four components, then, cognitive trust as well as trust emotional or behavioral could have been broken down into respect, competence, regard for others, and integrity. That observation led to the development of the basic trust matrix, in which cross-references between the levels and components of trust helped form the basic framework for the design of the instrument measuring trust as a three-level and four-component phenomenon (see Table 1).

Keeping in mind unidimensionality as the main premise of the Rasch analysis, it is important to note that the matrix discussed in this section is used for visualization of the thought process involved in the instrument design rather than as a base structure for the phenomenon of trust. The instrument is expected to describe trust as a unidimensional phenomenon, which progresses from cognitive to emotional and then to behavioral levels. The progress at each level is defined by the development of the four components: respect, competence, regard for others, and integrity. In other words, the relations do not progress from cognitive to emotional level of trust unless cognitive respect develops into emotional respect, cognitive competence becomes emotional competence, and so on. Overall, the four components of trust define each level of the phenomenon as a collection of smaller sub-levels; together, the three levels and four sub-levels are expected to align.
into a complex but unidimensional structure that forms the basis for the phenomenon of trust.

Table 1.

*The Basic Concept of the Structure of Trust as a Tri-Level Phenomenon and a Combination of Four Components*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items Development</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect (for the user)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard for others (benevolent behavior)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items Development*

As the basic matrix was in place, the goal of the next step of the instrument development was to describe each trust component to reflect the components' cognitive, emotional, and behavioral levels. Further literature review was conducted to fulfill this goal. More specifically, the researcher investigated theoretical concepts of each
component of trust to single out the aspects that could help differentiate cognitive, emotional, or behavioral levels of that component.

For example, Dickert (2009) argued that while there were many ways to define interpersonal trust, “the core elements of respect…are appreciating what is valuable or important about a person, recognizing the constraints or demands that such a valuation places on one‘s own conduct, and acting in a way that expresses that recognition” (p. 311). Dickert went on to claim that, “respect demands attention to important subjective experiences, persons‘ existence as part of communities, and considerations of comportment” (p. 311). In the context of the ESL environment, Dickert’s elements of trust were interpreted as: recognition of ESL students autonomous agency and unique background (cognitive), appreciation of ESL students‘ uniqueness as a part of a diverse ESL classroom community (emotional), employing behavior patterns that reflect both recognition and appreciation of ESL students‘ uniqueness.

Next, according to Honneth (1999) human integrity was the essence of and the key to the behavioral norm in a given environment; as such, integrity “can take on three different shapes – love, law, and solidarity – which are paralleled by three dimensions…: self-confidence, self-respect, and self-esteem” (p. 11). Bryk and Schneider (2002) viewed integrity as a strong moral-ethical perspective and a ground for the relationship norm in any specific environment. In other words, integrity was the consistency between the norm established through love, law, and/or solidarity, the norm that a person knew and believed in and what this person said and did (Bryk & Schneider). As related to ESL environment, the theoretical views on integrity could be translated as a combination of good knowledge of regulations/laws that shaped the norms in ESL environment (cognitive), strong belief
in and active promotion of these norms (emotional), consistency in acting according to the norms even in morally difficult situations (behavioral).

Following, Bryk and Schneider (2002) defined regard for others — an expression of benevolent intentions” (p. 23). However, most of Bryk and Schneider’s examples were concentrated in the behavioral level of this component (for example, the authors named creating beneficial opportunities and working extended hours as the elements of such benevolent behaviors). Bond et al. (2000) looked further into defining regard for others or other-esteem to claim that — regard for others seems to be a guarantor of social integration, knitting persons together” (p. 549). As such, other-esteem was closely associated with high frequency of engagement in —finity maintenance strategies” or in the actions taken to reduce the sense of vulnerability in trusting relationships (Honeycutt & Patterson, 1997, p. 35). Bond et al. continued to list three components of regard for others: verbal impact or — the use of a direct… open, and precise style of speaking; internal focus or — the use of inference about another’s feelings coupled with sensitivity to the other’s situation”; and limited tendency to self-enhance at the expense of others (low sense of self-superiority) (pp. 549, 537). To apply the discussion of other-esteem to the context of this study, in ESL classroom regard for others (for ESL students) should be reflected in the instructor‘s knowledge-based inference of the students’ feelings and emotions (cognitive), empathy for students’ needs educational and otherwise (emotional), and open and direct communication aimed at creating beneficial educational opportunities for all ESL students (behavioral).

Finally, when talking about competence Bryk and Schneider (2002) agreed that in any educational environment, but especially in ESL environment, students were not
always in a position to evaluate the professional performance of the instructor. However, based on their observations of the instructors’ work in their own country and on their expectations of the teaching-learning outcomes in the USA, ESL students, nevertheless, possessed a certain set of criteria according to which they evaluated their American instructors. Overall, ESL students expected their instructor to know the subject they teach (cognitive), like education-related interpersonal communication related to the subject and otherwise (emotional), and acted to the benefit of their students rather than out of their self-interest (behavioral). Based on the findings from the additional literature review, the researcher expanded the initial framework by adding the description for each of the trust components as presented in Table 2.
Table 2.

*A Description of Trust as a Tri-Level Phenomenon and a Combination of Four Components with Instrument Items Added*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
<th>Regard for others (benevolent behavior)</th>
<th>Competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognitive</strong></td>
<td>Instructors recognize ESL students' autonomous agency and a unique background</td>
<td>Instructors possess good knowledge of regulations/laws that shape the norms of ESL environment</td>
<td>Instructors possess knowledge-based inference of the students' feelings and emotions</td>
<td>Instructors know the subject they teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotional</strong></td>
<td>Instructors appreciate of ESL students' uniqueness as a part of a diverse ESL classroom community</td>
<td>Instructors strongly believe in and actively promote these norms</td>
<td>Instructors demonstrate empathy for students' needs educational and otherwise</td>
<td>Instructors like education-related interpersonal communication related to the subject and otherwise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavioral</strong></td>
<td>Instructors use of behavior patterns that reflect both recognition and appreciation of each ESL student's uniqueness</td>
<td>Instructors consistently act according to the norms even in morally difficult situations</td>
<td>Instructors are open and direct in communication aimed at creating beneficial educational opportunities for all ESL students</td>
<td>Instructors act to the benefit of their students rather than out of their self-interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Following, each of them was transformed into a one-sentence statement, which could be included in the study instrument. The goal of the transformation process was to create statements that were simple enough to be clear for ESL students regardless of their English-language proficiency level. However, the statements were expected to address each trust component with the best possible precision.

Next, the statements were rearranged according to the levels of trust rather than trust components. As described earlier in this chapter as well as in the literature review, Lewis and Weigert (1985) argued that trust develops along three sequential steps: cognitive, emotional, and behavioral. In other words, unless students know and understand ESL environment norms and processes they won’t feel secure about those norms and processes. Logically, unless the students feel secure about ESL context norms and processes they won’t willingly act upon those norms themselves and they will not expect their American instructors to act upon those norms and processes (Lewis & Weigert). Therefore, after being defined, the statements representing the tri-level components of trust were arranged according to their logical progression from cognitive to behavioral (see Table 3).
Table 3.

*Description of Trust as a Dynamic Phenomenon with Three Stages of Progress from Cognitive to Emotional and To Behavioral Trust*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Emotional</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>Instructor understand students' unique background</td>
<td>Instructor enjoys the fact that all students in ESL classroom are different and encourage them to share their unique experiences</td>
<td>During the class, the instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture or heir personal experience and compare those examples to ESL context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Instructor has a good knowledge of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and educational context</td>
<td>Instructor inform students of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and educational context and encourages the students to follow the set rules</td>
<td>Instructor makes clear what is not appropriate in ESL classroom and never acts inappropriately even if the student encounters a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regard for others</td>
<td>Instructor knows how it feels to be an international student in a foreign country</td>
<td>Instructor shows understanding and support for the students' experiences in the foreign country and in a foreign educational institution</td>
<td>Instructor is open and approachable and always looking for the ways the students can expand their experiences at the university and in the USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>Instructor knows the subject they teach (ESL) well</td>
<td>Instructor enjoy talking to students about the subject and about the students' experiences</td>
<td>Instructor provides extra information and is willing to stay after the class to help students with their learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choice of Scale and Draft Instrument

The choice of the rating scale was the second most important step in the process of questionnaire development because the structure of the rating scale had strong influence on the quality of the data and had the ability to minimize as well as inflate data ambiguity (Clark and Schober, 1992; Fox, 2001). The fact that the English-language proficiency of the respondents varies already introduced some uncertainty to the quality of the data. Therefore, it was important to limit the mentioned uncertainty by choosing the rating scale with the minimum level of response ambiguity.

Several factors might elicit the ambiguity due to the quality of the rating scale. First, Chang (1994) claimed that rating scales that provided some alternative responses rather than only mutually exclusive categories failed to help a group of respondents remain within one frame of reference and collected imprecise or even corrupt data. Second, vague labeling that left space for the respondents to guess the meaning of each category could also be the reasons for poor data quality (Dunham & Davison, 1990). Finally, there had been numerous discussions about the inclusion of various neutral categories or “don’t know/refuse” categories all of which allowed the respondent to avoid answering the question (Dunham & Davison). Despite claims for the necessity of such categories in order not to restrict the respondents, the researcher’s previous experience showed that the absence of such categories stimulated respondents thinking processes. In addition, when respondents were truly unable to pick one response category, they skipped responding to the question altogether: they would choose the non-existing neutral/don’t know/refuse category even when it was not explicitly provided in the questionnaire.
In the light of the discussion above, the researcher selected a four-point agreement scale for this instrument. This was a traditional scale that was clear, straightforward, and concise enough to limit the divergence of the respondents from the general frame of reference. Yet, this scale provided enough response-variability because both agreement and disagreement were presented by two categories: one for a stronger and one for a weaker position on a specific statement. Neither “neutral answer” nor “no answer” categories were included in the scale. The researcher’s rational for excluding these categories lied in the fact that due to their status ESL students felt more vulnerable than, for example, domestic students would feel and, thus, were more likely to employ self-censorship while responding to the questionnaire. Such self-censorship would have resulted in ESL students choosing the neutral/no response category more often than truly necessary. By forcing the students to respond within the given framework, the researcher did not prevent them from skipping some of the questions; however, the absence of explicit neutral answer-option might have limited ESL students’ indecisiveness. The pre-calibration draft of the instrument is presented in Table 4.
Table 4.

*Instrument Draft 1 for the First Round of Calibrations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q: Please, think about one American instructor, whom you like the best. Do you agree that the following characteristics of this instructor are important for your good relations with this instructor?</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Instructor understand students’ unique background</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Instructor has a good knowledge of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and educational context</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Instructor knows how it feels to be an international student in a foreign country</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Instructor knows the subject they teach (ESL) well</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Instructor enjoys the fact that all students in ESL classroom are different and encourage them to share their unique experiences</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Instructor inform students of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and educational context and encourages the students to follow the set rules</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Instructor shows understanding and support for the students’ experiences in the foreign country and in a foreign educational institution</td>
<td>☐ 4</td>
<td>☐ 3</td>
<td>☐ 2</td>
<td>☐ 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instrument Calibration: Round One</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructor enjoy talking to students about the subject and about the students’ experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>During the class, the instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture or heir personal experience and compare those examples to ESL context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Instructor makes clear what is not appropriate in ESL classroom and never acts inappropriately even if the student encounters a problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Instructor is open and approachable and always looking for the ways the students can expand their experiences at the university and in the USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instructor provides extra information and is willing to stay after the class to help students with their learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**For the purposes of empirical testing of the instrument, the draft of the instrument was administered to a group of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students in Yerevan, Armenia. The researcher used a convenience sample: 32 volunteers took part in the instrument trial conducted at the office of an Armenian NGO. All the participants were allowed to use a dictionary in case they needed to translate unknown words; verbal translations were prohibited to reduce the threat of biased or leading translations, which could have affected the participants’ answers.**
The purpose of conducting the instrument trial in EFL rather than ESL environment was twofold. First, EFL students tend to have lower overall English-language proficiency level than ESL students because the latter enjoy the benefits of linguistic immersion, which helps with the advancement of the proficiency level. Therefore, the clarity (or the lack of it) of the instrument items to the respondents with very limited language skills were apparent and, thus, informed further revisions of the items. Second, while learning English, EFL students remained in their familiar national and educational environment and, thus, felt less vulnerable and/or intimidated by the survey-taking process than ESL students. As such, EFL students were more likely to attempt and respond to all questions unlike ESL students, who might employ skips if they felt uncomfortable exposing their opinions. Considering the small sample of participants, who took part in the first trial of the instrument, it was essential for the researcher to limit the amount of missing data.

The first round of the instrument calibration provided several important findings:

1. Based on the researcher’s observation of the participants while they were taking the survey and based on the discussion of the instrument afterwards, the language of the instrument was relatively clear and straightforward. While taking the survey, only few of the participants used a dictionary. After the study, some of the participants admitted that they had some problems understanding the meaning of statements 7, 10, and 11; they were able to infer the general meaning but were not sure if their guesses were accurate.
2. The chosen rating scale was working well (see Figure 1 in Appendix B). The step between all categories was more than 1.5 units, which means that the participants were able to clearly distinguish between the four categories.

3. The items’ mean-square (MNSQ) infit statistics ranged from .70 to 1.46; the items’ MNSQ outfit statistics ranged from .69 to 1.46. As such, both items’ infit and outfit MNSQ remained within the recommended 0.5-1.5 range, which meant that all of them were productive of measurement and worked well as a part of the instrument: no item was introducing unnecessary noise and none of the items was overly predictive.

4. The assumption that trust developed from cognitive to emotional and then to behavioral levels was not confirmed in the first round of the instrument trials. As seen from Figure 2 in Appendix B, the items did not perfectly align by trust levels: cognitive, emotional, or behavioral. However, the lack of alignment affected only selected items rather than the entire collection of items. More specifically, items 8 and 4 were misplaced. Aside from those items, the items fell into four categories (item separation 4.07) that logically progressed from cognitive to emotional and then to behavioral levels of trust. The items’ reliability was relatively high (.94).

5. Interestingly, the items that appeared misplaced on the item map were not the items that caused EFL students problems with understanding. It was possible that EFL students had problems with understanding the questions additional to those discussed above.
6. The separation between the participants was very low (1.05); participants’
reliability rating was also below desirable (.52). These ratings might have been
partially attributed to the limited number of the participants (standard error at .12
with participants mean and standard deviation (both modeled) at .42 and .5,
respectively) as well as to the poor initial wording of the questions in the
questionnaire (for example, double barreled items 6, 10 and 12).
Possible solutions for the issues encountered during the first round of instrument
calibration included the following steps:

1. It was necessary to require the students to use the dictionary and check the
translation of every unknown word while they were taking the survey. Based on
the observation of the first round of calibrations and on the outcomes this round
provided, there were only few words that the participants did not understand.
With the participants checking the translation of those words, the survey was not
expected to take a lot of extra time. However, the accuracy of the data could have
improved.

2. Although the current scale was working well, it was worth exploring at least one
other type of scale to confirm that the initial choice of the scale was correct.

3. Five items in the questionnaire required revision. Items 4 and 8 were revised to
minimize the participants’ confusion. Items 7, 10, and 11 were simplified to
decrease the participants’ frustration due to the complexity of the language.

4. Finally, some of the items – for example, items 6, 10 and 12 -- appeared double-
barreled, thus, causing additional confusion and undermining quality and usability
of the data. Those items also had to be revised.
The researcher attempted to further explore and resolve those four issues before the second round of the instrument trial/calibration.

**Instrument Calibration: Round Two**

**Instrument revisions.** Before proceeding to the second round of the instrument calibration, the researcher revised the instrument based on the findings from the first round of calibrations. The researcher decided to have two different versions of the questionnaire: draft 2 and draft 3. In draft 2, the researcher kept the original 4-point scale but changed the wording of the problematic items 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12 as discussed above (see Table 5).

Table 5.

*Instrument Draft 2 for the Second Round of Calibrations: New Wording Trial with the 4-Point Agreement Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q: Please, think about one American instructor, whom you like the best. Do you agree that the following characteristics of this instructor are important for your good relations with this instructor?</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor understand students’ unique background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructor has a good knowledge of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and educational context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instructor knows how it feels to be an international student in a foreign country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instructor makes learning easy and interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instructor enjoys the fact that all students in ESL classroom are different and encourage them to share their unique experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instructor inform students of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and educational context and encourages the students to follow the set rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instructor encourages students when they feel frustrated and motivates them to face with courage the challenges of studying in a foreign country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructor likes when students share their experiences related to learning with other students in the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>During the class, the instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture or heir personal experience and use those examples when explaining the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Instructor makes sure that their own behavior serves as an example for students’ behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In draft 3 of the instrument (see Table 6), the researcher kept all the original statements intact; however, the original scale was replaced with a 3-point importance scale. As discussed in Chapter Three, it was important for the researcher to design the instrument that would adequately address the difference in ESL students' language proficiency. In other words, the instrument needed to be simple and comprehensive enough even for the students with low-to-moderate proficiency in English not only advanced learners. The rejection of the 5-point scale at the design stage was prompted by this attempt of not introducing extra categories that might turn confusing for the study subjects. The reason for trying the 3-point important scale was to try an even simpler scale, which still allowed to capture the relative value of different aspects of trust in students opinions. Although the Rasch model allowed collapsing the scale if some of its categories appeared similar to participants, the researcher decided to try a different type of a scale rather than experiment with a larger number of categories for the same type of a scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to talk to the instructor in and outside the classroom, ask for advice, or discuss a topic that is important to the student(s).</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor offers more information than available in the textbook and is willing to stay after the class to help students understand a difficult topic or assignment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Even though at first sight, the 3-point importance scale appeared positively skewed, this instrument was being developed to measure the value of trust as a collection of aspects that are present (to some extent) in the teacher-students relations and are, at least, somewhat valued by the student. The ability to define between the aspects that were valued a lot and the elements that were only somewhat valued was one of the key requirements for this instrument. As discussed earlier, it would have be of lesser value for the study to use a 3-point scale with a neutral answer.

The remaining positive and negative answers did not allow for understanding to what extent different aspects of trust were important to the students; subsequently, it became impossible to compare the relative importance of one aspect to that of another one. In addition to introducing a neutral item, another option was to offer a negatively skewed scale with a “somewhat unimportant” answer as a middle option. Meaning wise, this answer option was almost identical to the option that was chosen (“only somewhat important”). However, as mentioned above, the goal of this study was to create a collection of aspects of trust that were valued by ESL student not the aspects that were unimportant. Therefore, the researcher made a choice in favor of positively rather than negatively skewed 3-point measurement scale.

Table 6.

*Instrument Draft 2 for the Second Round of Calibrations: Trial of the 3-Point Importance Scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q: Please, think about one American instructor, whom you like the best. How important are the following characteristics of this instructor for your good relations with this instructor?</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Only somewhat important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor understand students' unique background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructor has a good knowledge of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and educational context</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instructor knows how it feels to be an international student in a foreign country</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instructor knows the subject they teach (ESL) well</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instructor enjoys the fact that all students in ESL classroom are different and encourage them to share their unique experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instructor inform students of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and educational context and encourages the students to follow the set rules</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instructor shows understanding and support for the students' experiences in the foreign country and in a foreign educational institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructor enjoy talking to students about the subject and about the students’ experiences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>During the class, the instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture or heir personal experience and</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second round of instrument calibration took place in a private community college in Nebraska, USA. The researcher used two intact samples: two groups of ESL students (22 students in the first group and 19 students in the second group), who were signed up for the General Chemistry course in the Summer’10 session. Overall, community college population of ESL students had three characteristics advantageous for this study. First, this was the population on which the researcher initially planned to focus: ESL students at an American higher education institution. Second, this group of students had a better command of English than the Armenian EFL students because the former group was immersed in the English-language environment and engaged in the studies in English rather their native language. Finally, community college ESL students had lower language proficiency than university students because the requirements for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use those examples when explaining the topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Instructor makes clear what is not appropriate in ESL classroom and never acts inappropriately even if the student encounters a problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Instructor is open and approachable and always looking for the ways the students can expand their experiences at the university and in the USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instructor provides extra information and is willing to stay after the class to help students with their learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them were lower. Therefore, the participants’ expectations of educational trust were somewhat similar to the population of interest.

During the second round of calibrations, all participants were allowed (and encouraged) to use a dictionary to translate all unfamiliar words. The instructor administering the instrument calibration noted that there were very few occasions when the students turned to a dictionary. Overall, according to the instructor administering the instrument, the students did not identify any items in the instrument as especially unclear.

Draft 2 calibration results. During the initial overview of the data collected via the second draft of the instrument, three participants were identified as misfit: all three participants had more than two extreme answers. These three participants were excluded from the analysis. There were a few more participants that had extreme answers, however, the deletion of the chose three participants helped the researcher increase item and participants separation and reliability indexes as well as the rate of variance explained by the items; the deletion of other participants with extreme answers did not have such effect or led to decrease in the mentioned indexes.

The analysis of the data for the remaining 19 students and 12 items (statements) demonstrated the following results:

1. After the changes, the item reliability and separation were slightly lower than in the first round: .93 and 3.53 compared to .94 and 4.07 respectively (see Figure 3 in Appendix C). However, the variance explained by the instrument almost doubled: 55.4 percent in the first round compared to 94.1 percent in the second round.
2. The separation of the participants and participant reliability were much higher than in the first round: 2.84 and 89 percent, respectively. Although, standard error was also higher at .66 (participants mean and standard deviation were at 2.72 and 2.79, respectively) (see Figure 3 in Appendix C). This outcome somewhat reinforced the researcher's assumption that the poor outcomes of the first round of calibrations were due to poor wording of the items; and the second draft of the instrument was stronger in terms of reliability and targeting.

3. The chosen 4-point scale worked well (see Figure 4 in Appendix C). In this round’s results, the steps between the scale points were wider than in the first round confirming the assumption that the participants were able to clearly distinguish the four categories of the scale.

4. At this stage of the instrument development, it was important that the four items in each category – cognitive (1-4), emotional (5-8), and behavioral (9-12) – were clustered together. Following, the item-clusters were expected to be placed along the easy-to-difficult scale according to Lewis and Weigert’s theory (1985). The items’s alignment supported the hypothesis that served as the basis for the instrument: there was a progression from cognitive to emotional and then to behavioral aspects of trust as the trusting relations developed with cognitive items clustered at the bottom and behavioral items closer to the middle of the easy-to-difficult scale. (see Figure 5 in Appendix C).
5. The mean of items set by the WinSteps was noticeably lower than the mean of the participants' responses (see Figure 5 in Appendix C). The responses of seven participants were outside the framework set by the instrument; this meant that the instrument did not cover the entire range of possible levels of trust and there was one or more levels outside the cognitive-emotional-behavioral progression.

6. MNSQ infit statistics as well as MNSQ outfit statistics for all items were within the recommended 0.5-1.5 range. All items were productive of measurement and worked well as a part of the instrument.

**Draft 3 calibration results.** During the data overview, several participants appeared to have more than two misfit answers. Three participants were removed from the dataset; similar to the participants in the previous round, the removal of these three participants allowed the researcher increase item and participants separation and reliability indexes as well as the rate of variance explained by the items

All of the items were kept because the purpose of the calibration was to evaluate how well the combination of items explained the variance in trusting relations between ESL students and their American instructors.

Based on the analysis of the data for the remaining 17 students and 12 items (statements), the researcher made the following observations:

1. Draft 3 of the instrument produced the lowest item separation and reliability levels: at 1.59 and 0.72 respectively (see Figure 6 in Appendix D). The variance explained by the third draft of the instrument -- 82.9 percent -- was
higher than that demonstrated by the first draft (55.4 percent) but much lower than that demonstrated by the second draft (94.1 percent).

2. The separation and reliability for the measured participants in this round were comparable to the results obtained by the first draft but, again, noticeably lower than the results gained with the second draft of the instrument.

3. The 3-point scale seemed to perform well in terms of providing the participants with three distinct answer choices but the data collected with the draft 3 of the instrument was more positively skewed than the data gathered with draft 1 and draft 2 of the instrument (see Figure 7 in Appendix D). In the first round of instrument calibration, the proportions of positive (scores 3 and 4) and negative (scores 1 and 2) results were 76 percent and 24 percent, respectively. The second instrument produced a similar breakdown: 75 percent of positive (scores 3 and 4) and 25 percent of negative (scores 1 and 2) responses. The 3-point scale was initially designed with a certain level of positive skewness; however, as a result 90 percent of all responses turned out positive (scores 2 and 3) with 55 percent in a very positive group (score 3). While the mentioned positive skewness did not necessarily undermined the reliability of the data, the researcher felt that the 4-point scale provided more opportunities than the 3-point scale for the participants to identify the relative difficulty of the items in the instrument.

4. In this round of instrument calibration, items 2 and 5 were misplaced (see Figure 8 in Appendix D). Item 2, which belonged to the cognitive cluster, appeared in the cluster of emotional aspects of trust while item 5, which
reflected an emotional aspect, appeared among the items of cognitive cluster.

This result might have been partially due to the small number of participants (item standard error of items was high at .66 (modeled)) (see Figure 6 in Appendix D). However, the second draft calibration, although based on 19 participants, did not result in any misplaced items. Thus, the change in the item-alignment was more likely to be the results of a different context introduced by the 3-point Importance scale.

5. There were 3 items with MNSQ infit statistics lower than .5 and 4 items with MNSQ outfit statistics lower than .5, which means that approximately 30 percent of the items in the instrument were overpredictive and were potentially skewing the measure.

6. The mean set by WinSteps was lower than the identified by the participants’ responses. In fact, there was only one item – item 9 – that was above the mean of the participants’ answers. Moreover, 11 out of 17 participants were above the participant-answer mean and 9 out of 17 participants scored outside (higher) the trust-level framework defined by the instrument.

Overall, the second round of calibrations produced the following results:

1. The 4-point agreement scale appeared to be more appropriate for this instrument as it allowed for more variability in the relative difficulty that the participants assigned to the items in the instrument.

2. Draft 2 had been the most successful draft of the instrument that far as it produced a combination of relatively high item reliability and item separation
and a capacity to explain more than 94 percent of the variance in participant responses.

3. In addition, the researcher was able to confirm the hypothesis that trust developed as a progression from cognitive to emotional and to behavioral levels.

4. The data gathered through all three drafts of the instrument demonstrated that there was one or more levels of trust beyond the behavioral level.

Based on the results of the two rounds of the instrument calibration, further revisions of the instrument focused on the following aspects:

1. It was essential to conduct one more round of literature review to explore the possibility that there was the fourth level in the development of trust, which could account for the expectations of the respondents, who scored higher than the top level preset by the researcher. This level should be broken down into 4 components (respect, competence, and so on) and four additional items should be added to the existing instrument.

2. The second draft of the instrument was treated as the most successful among the three drafts that undergone the process of calibration and was thus used to introduce any potential design improvements.

3. The sequence of items within clusters was defined; items were arranged and assigned numbers according to this sequence.

**Development of Additional Items**

While exploring the possibility of adding the forth component to the matrix of educational trust, the researcher decided to turn to theoretical fields that had recently
became the subject of interest among educational theorists and practitioners. Business appeared to be one of the fields that developed close ties with education in the past decade. According to Bonstingl (1996), there was a certain similarity between the ways education and business operated. Moreover, education often borrowed business and marketing research strategies to ensure it was adequately informed of and successfully addressed various societal changes through the changes and adjustments in the structure of educational institutions (de Guzman & Torres, 2004). Therefore, when conducting further literature review to find the forth potential level of trust, the researcher focused on the area of most recent cross-sector research: customer loyalty and student/alumni loyalty (de Guzman et al., 2008).

Nesset and Helgesen (2009) claimed that as the competition in educational market intensifies, the universities and colleges projected "customer perspectives on the student role" and gradually increased the importance of student loyalty as "a strategic theme" (p. 327). Further, Nesset and Helgesen's study established that a) student loyalty was grounded in the student's knowledge and perception of the university and learning experiences at this university, and b) and each of these experiences had an influence on different aspects of loyalty rather than the construct of loyalty as a whole. In other words, in their study Nesset and Helgesen suggested that there were relationships between cognitive, emotional, and behavioral experiences of a student and student loyalty to the educational institution and that loyalty was a multi-level construct.

The definition of loyalty common in business marketing presented the concept as a "fervor predisposition of a customer toward a brand store or services" (East & Sinclair 2000, cited in de Guzman et al. 2008, p. 110). De Guzman et al. defined educational
loyalty as “on e’s continuing patronage [of] and service [to educational institution], which extended voluntary work to [this institution]” (p. 110). Overall et al. (2010) claimed that loyalty was expressed through a passive emotional and behavioral response to external circumstances and involved unobservable [internal] cognitive effort and [self-restrain on] overt responses” (pp. 128-129). These authors argued that loyalty did not always result in immediate or even long-term positive outcome for loyal individuals; nevertheless, the individuals grounded their internal effort and external benevolent behavior in the faith in the good will of the subject of loyalty and in the hope for possible future return on their own investment in loyalty (Overall et al.).

To summarize, loyalty was a direct result of the individual’s cognitive, emotional, and behavioral experiences with the subject of loyalty: service, product, or another individual. If all or most of the mentioned experiences were positive, the individual was open to transferring the responsibilities of defining future relationships between him/her and this subject onto the subject: brand holder for service and/or product or another individual in interpersonal relations. Meanwhile, the individual showed an unconditional commitment to fulfilling his/her obligations in the relationships such as buying the product or coming to class and doing the homework. If the subject of loyalty made wrong decisions that did not benefit or even harmed the individual, the loyal individual continued to fulfill his/her obligation in the relationships, suppressed judgment, restrained him/herself from interfering in the decision-making process, and hoped that the subject of loyalty acted in the best interest of both sides of the relationships.

Based on the definitions of the concept commonly used in the fields of business and education, loyalty appeared to be the ultimate expression of trust because a loyal
individual undertook certain responsibilities in the relationships while simultaneously giving up control over these relationships to their counterpart based mainly on previous positive experience in similar relationships or with the same subject/individual. Thus, adding loyalty as the forth/top aspect to the existing matrix of trust arose as a plausible experiment in filling in the void in the top-tier of trusting relationships between ESL students and their American instructors.

Looking further into the descriptions of loyalty, the concept was interpreted through various psychological processes: faith, submission, hope, commitment, and so on. Therefore, it appeared legitimate to treat loyalty as a psychological aspect of trust. As such, loyalty complemented the progression of trust from cognitive to emotional and behavioral by signifying the ultimate level of trusting engagement: engagement on a psychological level, which would be impossible unless the relations parties first got to know each other, felt emotionally connected, and were willing to act in each other’s best interests.

Following the process of trust-matrix evolution, loyalty as a psychological aspect of trust was to be specified as a four-level component of trust and captured by the four statements representing loyalty through respect, integrity, regard for others (benevolent behavior), and competence. In addition, the statements had to make clear the passive nature and the positive outlook embedded in the concept. The four statements, reflecting loyalty as a psychological level of trust that were included in the trust-matrix were as follows:

*Respect:* I let the instructor penalize me for my mistakes because s/he does it to improve my skills not to humiliate me
Integrity: I accept my grades without contest, even when they are low, because this instructor provides fair evaluation of my work every time

Regard for others: I recommend my friends and acquaintances to take courses with this instructor and I myself take the courses this instructor offers

Competence: I let the instructor decide on my class-schedule because s/he knows better than I do what skills I need to learn to succeed

Instrument Calibration: Round Three

Before the third round of instrument calibration was initiated, the instrument was revised. The following summarizes all the revisions made to the instrument:

1. The four statements of loyalty were added to the list of items

2. The numbering of items and their sequence within thematic clusters (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral trust and loyalty) was changed to reflect the observations the researcher made during the previous two rounds of instrument calibrations. One major change was as follows:

3. Regard for Others appeared to be lower on the participants’ scale than Integrity in all three thematic clusters (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral trust) during the calibrations of the first and the third drafts of the instruments. The researcher defined the new sequence of thematic clusters/levels of trust as Respect, Regard for Others, Integrity, Competence. This sequence was reflected in the items’ sequence and numbering in the fourth draft of the instrument.
Table 7.

*Instrument Draft 4 for the Third Round of Calibrations with Four Loyalty Items Added*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q: Please, think about one American instructor, whom you like the best. Do you agree that the following characteristics of this instructor are important for your good relations with this instructor?</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Instructor understand students’ unique background</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Instructor knows how it feels to be an international student in a foreign country</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Instructor has a good knowledge of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and educational context</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Instructor makes learning easy and interesting</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Instructor enjoys the fact that all students in ESL classroom are different and encourage them to share their unique experiences</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Instructor encourages students when they feel frustrated and motivates them to face with courage the challenges of studying in a foreign country</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Instructor inform students of what is acceptable and what is not in ESL and</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The educational context and encourages the students to follow the set rules.

2. Instructor likes when students share their experiences related to learning with other students in the class.

3. During the class, the instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture or their personal experience and use those examples when explaining the topic.

4. It is easy to talk to the instructor in and outside the classroom, ask for advice, or discuss a topic that is important to the student(s).

5. Instructor makes sure that their own behavior serves as an example for students’ behavior.

6. Instructor offers more information than available in the textbook and is willing to stay after the class to help students understand a difficult topic or assignment.

7. I let the instructor penalize me for my mistakes because s/he does it to improve my skills and not to humiliate me.

8. I recommend my friends and acquaintances to take courses with this instructor.
The third round of instrument calibration took place at a High School in the District of Columbia, USA. The researcher used one intact sample of 24 students enrolled in the senior-level ESL class. Similar to the previous stages of the instrument calibration, access was one of the reasons for using the mentioned sample. In addition, the 24 students, who engaged in this round of the instrument calibration, shared two characteristics with the population of interest. First, by the time of the contact all of the students had spent between six months and a year in the United States; they took more than one ESL class and were also receiving private English-language tutoring. Thus, their average English-language proficiency level was similar to that of MLI students after one semester of studying ESL and at least six month of private tutoring or group lessons in their countries of origin. Second, the senior students participating in this round of instrument calibrations were planning to enroll in a university in less than a year and were training to take TOEFL in less than six month. The second characteristic was even more important for choosing this group because TOEFL was the main motivational link...
connecting the sample in the third round of calibrations and the population of the researcher's interest.

The instructor of the course administered the test; however, she was not allowed to interact with the students while they were filling in the survey. Each student was instructed in advance to bring in their English-language dictionary; and the instructor encouraged the students to use them to check the meaning of unfamiliar words. However, the instructor was not allowed to explain the meaning of the sentences or translate worlds. The researcher was able to observe the students while their instructor administered the test.

Based on the observation, most students appeared to have no problems understanding the statements in the instrument. The researcher observed very few occasions when a student turned to the dictionary. During the post-test discussion, two students who used the dictionary explained that they were checking possible meanings of the word “relations” to ensure that they understand the instructions correctly. The third student who turned to a dictionary was looking for the words “penalize” and “encourage” because he did not remember their exact translation. Further conversation with these students showed that they managed to find the correct translation of the words in question and were able to understand the instructions and the statements in the instrument correctly.

During preliminary stages of the data analysis, one student who produced both more than 2 unexpected and more than 2 misfit answers was removed from the dataset. Among the remaining 23 students, some also produced unexpected or misfit answers or both; however, the trial removal of other students did not prove beneficial because it
negatively affected the reliability of the instrument and the percentage of variance explained. No items were removed from the dataset, because that would be counterproductive to the objectives of the calibration.

The third round of instrument calibration resulted in the following conclusions:

1. Item reliability and separation were the highest after the three rounds of calibration: 0.98 and 7.97, respectively (see Figure 9 in Appendix E). The variance explained by the instrument was also higher than demonstrated by the second draft of the instrument: 95.5 percent (modeled) compared to 94.1 percent (modeled). The standard error remained high (at .45 (modeled)) due to a small number of participants in the study.

2. Participant reliability and separation were also slightly higher than produced by the second instrument. Participant separation was 2.84 during the second round (second draft of the instrument) with participant reliability at 89 percent. During the third round of calibrations, the participant separation went up to 2.95 with reliability at 90 percent. The change in participant separation and reliability compared to the second round of calibrations (second draft of the instrument) in this case might have been explained by the improved qualities of the instrument since English-language proficiency of the participants in the second and third rounds did not significantly differ.

3. The 4-point agreement scale appeared to work well (see Figure 10 in Appendix E): the step between the categories was more than 1.5 units, which meant that the participants did not use any of the provided categories interchangeably. Moreover, the scale was only slightly positively skewed with
approximately 51 percent of positive answers compared to 75 percent in the second round (second draft of the instrument).

4. Most assumptions embedded in the new instrument design seemed to be confirmed by the outcomes of the calibration (see Figure 11 in Appendix E): the items on the map aligned according to the design order except for items 4 and 15. However, neither item was placed outside its aspect of trust: item 4 exchanged places with item 3, while remaining within the group of items describing cognitive aspect of trust. Item 15 exchanged places with item 16; however, both remain within the groups of items describing the psychological aspect of trust. Moreover, all statements describing loyalty as the psychological level of trust were at the top of the map as they were expected to be.

5. The mean introduced by WinSteps was very close to the mean set by the participants’ responses. Moreover, the participants were spread along the progression of items rather than grouped together, which might have signified the fact that the new instrument provided more opportunities for nuanced account of the participants’ perceptions of their relationships with the instructor.

6. While the average MNSQ infit statistics for all items was at .95 and MNSQ outfit statistics was at 1.31, there was one item for which the respective statistics were at 1.80 and 5.01 meaning that that item was introducing unnecessary noise to the measure (item “Instructor provides extra information and is willing to stay after the class”). Two more items had MNSQ outfit
statistics at 2.48 and 2.11 (above the recommended 1.5): items “Instructor knows how it feels to be an international student in a foreign country” and “Instructor makes learning simple and interesting.” The first and the third items appeared double-barreled; the second item might have simply appeared confusing to the ESL students. All three items above required revisions before the pilot study.

**Overall Results of Three Rounds of Instrument Calibration**

The processes of additional literature review, instrument development, and instrument calibration described in this part of the chapter were expected to address the first two research questions stated at the beginning of the chapter. More specifically, the researcher planned to select a research methodology that would allow extracting reliable and valid information from ESL students while balancing the constraints rooted in the nature of the concept of trust as well as in the specific characteristics of ESL/MLI environment. The main hypotheses set prior to the initial stages of the instrument development included the following characteristics:

1. The instrument would combine qualitative and quantitative components and would enable the researcher to extract data that could be interpreted both qualitatively and quantitatively and could be used for strategic consulting in the sphere of ESL education.

2. The instrument would present the concept of trust in an indirect manner through a series of straightforward statements or questions that would be comprehensive to international students at different levels of ESL proficiency.
3. Rooted in culture-neutral theoretical knowledge, the instrument would not depend on culture-specific perceptions of international students and would extract reliable information regardless of the students’ cultural background.

The third round of instrument calibration demonstrated that the instrument, developed at this stage of the research, could explain almost 96 percent of variance in the degree of trust in the relationships between the learners of English as a second language and their instructors with 98 percent reliability. The two percent that remained unexplained could be attributed to the differences in ESL students’ demographic characteristics, small number of subject who participated in the study or to the insufficient explanatory power of the instrument. To define, which of these reasons prevent the researcher from explaining 100 percent of variance in the degree of educational trust, the researcher proceeded with investigating the third research question stated earlier in this chapter conducting a Pilot study of the new instrument to define whether the instrument was stable across the subgroups of the ESL students population and whether it was capable of gauging differences among those subgroups of understanding/evaluating trusting relations. The procedures and outcomes of the Pilot study are discussed in Chapter V that follows.
Chapter Five

Stage II of the Study: Instrument Review and Pilot Study

Instrument Review

Prior to proceeding with the piloting of the instrument, the development of which was described in Chapter III, the researcher followed the advice of one of the academic advisors and turned to ESL instructors for an informed evaluation of the questionnaire. According to the advisor's observation, some of the items in the questionnaire might have appeared inapplicable to the MLI context or confusing to the students coming from non-American educational backgrounds. The researcher had only limited exposure to the MLI context and students; therefore, it was essential to obtain an opinion of the experts, who had longer and broader engagement with ESL students.

While selecting potential reviewers at MLI, the researcher made a decision not to contact part-time and temporary employees and summer interns and graduate students. The reason those groups were excluded from the pool of potential reviewers was that the experiences and exposure of the instructors from these four groups would be a close match to that of the researcher; and thus, it was likely that the representatives of these two groups of the instructors might not have an important insight and experience the researcher was seeking in the reviewers.

In a search for the opinion of the instructors with the best experience available at MLI, the researcher decided to contact only full-time instructors at MLI and ask for their assessment of the draft research instrument. The researcher contacted four full-time instructors and MLI; and two instructors expressed interest in being the evaluators for the questionnaire.
The main objective of the instrument review was to gain the evaluators opinions on the following:

1. Was the wording of the items in the questionnaire simple enough for MLI students with intermediate to advanced proficiency in English to understand?
2. Were the situations described by the items applicable to the MLI educational context?
3. Were there any items that could be misunderstood or even treated as offensive by MLI students?

Prior to giving the instructors the questionnaire for their evaluation, the researcher provided them with a brief overview of the objectives and procedures of the study. The main purpose of such a briefing was, first, to minimize the chance that instructors would evaluate the questionnaire based on their own assumptions about the study rather than based on the framework set for the study by the researcher. Following, the researcher aimed to avoid some of the questions related to the narrow focus of the questionnaire by explaining that the instrument had been designed to measure only trust as one aspect of the relationships between ESL students and their instructors and that the researcher was not planning to use this instrument to measure overall relationships as a latent construct. Based on the responses from the instructors, they had a good understanding of the objectives of the study prior to seeing the instrument; and once they saw the questionnaire, the structure and content confirmed that their understanding was accurate.

The choice of the two evaluators had proven very useful as the instructors reviewed the instrument from different, complementary to each other, perspectives.
Instructor 1 focused on the comprehensiveness and the merits of the logical construct of the questionnaire while instructor 2 provided detailed recommendations for specific items that required refinement.

Instructor 1 thought that the progression of the questions was adequate and addressed well the objectives of the study, as described by the researcher. The instructor (email communication, 26 June 2011) added that the statements were providing "an interesting portrait of a certain kind of empathetic and student-centered teacher." In addition, this instructor (2011) highlighted the fact that the wording in the introductory part of the questionnaire combined with the actual questions would help to see "whether ESL instructors that are liked in fact are liked for these kinds of reasons" but not whether they were liked for other more general reasons. The concern was mostly related to the part of the introductory paragraph, which asked the respondents to think about the instructor whom students liked the best. This concern, however, confirmed the fact that the researcher's work was progressing in the right direction because the overall goal of the study was to investigate a narrow aspect of the student-instructor relationships not the general qualities of a likable ESL instructor.

Instructor 2 also expressed concern about the wording of the introductory paragraph; the suggestion of this instructor was to rephrase the wording of the second sentence to focus more on the characteristics of the instructor that contributed to the good relationships between the instructor and student and to eliminate the potentially limiting meaning of the word "important" in the same sentence. Overall, based on the two instructor’s suggestions, the introductory paragraph was changed to sound as follows, 

"Please, think about the American instructor, who you like. Do you agree that the
following characteristics of this instructor contribute to positive relationships between you and this instructor?”

Also related to the overall structure of the questionnaire, instructor 2 noted that the last four items (items 13-16) did not necessarily describe the characteristics of an instructor but rather the characteristics of the relationships between a student and this instructor. This observation was valuable for two reasons: first, it confirmed that the items were addressing the purpose of the inquiry in the last part of the instrument well. To recap, the idea behind the inclusion of these four items was to measure students’ loyalty towards the instructor they liked or to measure the students’ willingness to allow the instructor to control more components of the educational process (more than customary or necessary) because the knowledge, emotional disposition, and behavior-observations that the students possessed towards the instructor were positive at least to some extent. Thus, the last four items were meant to assess the stage of the relationships at which the student actively assigns additional trust onto the instructor as opposed to passively observing the instructors efforts to earn trust. From Instructor 2’s observation, it was clear that these four items were worded a line with the aspect, which they were expected to measure. However second, those four items stood out as a bad fit to the overall structure of the questionnaire. The researcher’s solution for this issue was to restructure the instrument to have two independent parts: one consisting of items 1-12 and the other one consisting of items 13-16. This change in the instrument's structure was expected to address the evaluators’ concerns. In addition, the researcher decided to reverse-code the answer options in the second part of the instrument (items 13-16) to introduce variability and prevent respondents from mechanically marking the answers in
one column (Brown & Maydeu-Olivares, 2011). Thus, the items 13-16 were made into a separate section of the instrument with an independent introductory paragraph that says, "Think about the same American instructor that you like. Please, tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements."

Among the suggestions for the improvement, Instructor 1 had suggestions for items 13 and 16. This instructor felt that the word 'let' was confusing as it suggested that in both cases, the student had "some ability to say no to the arrangement" which was somewhat misleading (Instructor 1 evaluation). In question 13, the use of word 'let' seemed "a little odd culturally" because students cannot usually avoid a penalty by simply rejecting it once the instructor determined that their performance and/or actions deserved a penalty (Instructor 1 evaluation). In the case with Question 16, most ESL instructors did not decide on their students' schedules unless directly asked for assistance by students or management; however, even in such cases, the instructors' advice would be just that: an advice. Thus, both question 13 and question 16 described a situation that was hypothetical and/or possibly desirable by a student but that would rarely take place in reality. Therefore, Instructor 1 suggested highlighting the hypothetical nature of the two situations by replacing the word "let" with the phrase "do not mind." This replacement would not distort the situations inquired on in the two questions; however, the change in wording would demonstrate the fact that both situations are not typical in ESL environment.

Instructor 2 suggested revisions to 6 items: items 1-4, item 6 and item 8. This instructor felt that in question 1 phrasing "unique background" should be replaced with "cultural background" to prevent students from misreading the meaning of the statement.
Following, Instructor 2 misunderstood the meaning of the statement in question 2 and thought the students were inquired on whether or not their instructor had ever been a foreign student him/herself. To minimize the possibility of ESL student understanding the statement in a similar manner, the researcher reworded the question to highlight the fact that the instructor was expected to have an appreciation of ESL students’ difficulties at foreign universities based on years of experience interacting with such students but not necessarily on personal experience as a foreign student. Next, in question 3 this instructor suggested specifying “educational context” as “American educational context” to keep the participants focused on their experiences with the instructor in ESL context rather than their overall educational experiences. Further, Instructor 2 noted that the fourth question was double-barreled: it inquired if learning was both easy and interesting. Upon a serious consideration, the researcher decided to take out the word “easy” because the expectation towards a good instructor is that s/he would make learning an engaging and “fun” process even in the cases when the subject matter was challenging. Next, Instructor 2 pointed out that the phrase “with courage” in question 6 did not add anything to the statement but made it longer and more difficult for ESL students to understand; the researcher chose to delete the highlighted phrase. Finally, the instructor thought that question 8 was not really clear as the phrase “learning experiences” might have carried different meaning for different student; the instructor suggested phrasing the statement in a more specific and simpler way.

Based on the discussion above, the questionnaire was revised once again before the piloting. The researcher also added three demographic questions inquiring on the participants’ age, gender, and country of origin. The final vision of the instrument is
presented in Table 11; the full version of the questionnaire with demographic questions is available in Appendix A.

Pilot Study

**Study timing and setting.** Instructor 2, who participated in the instrument review, allowed the researcher to pilot the instrument in two of the Advanced English sections at MLI that the instructor was teaching. The data collection took place on Wednesday, September 28, 2011, between 10 am and 12 pm.

The instrument was administered to ESL students during a regular class. The pilot study was postponed several times because both the instructor and the researcher tried to choose the day on which the students would not have tests or pop-quizzes. Aside from causing additional stress to the students, tests and pop-quizzes would alter the overall classroom environment; such alterations might have introduced additional unexpected biases to the data and were, therefore, undesirable (Onwuegbuzie, 2000).

The researcher made one more attempt to avoid introducing bias to the data: during the pilot study the instrument was administered by a researcher’s assistant. As discussed by Onwuegbuzie (2000), the personality of the person, who interacted with study participants introducing the intervention or administering data-collection instrument, might be critical to the success of the study. The possibility for the introduction of a bias to the data existed regardless of who interacted with the study participants. A familiar person (a current instructor) could have caused a Hothorne effect if his/her relations with the students had some emotional coloring, positive or negative (Onwuegbuzie). A researcher, who interacted with the participants him or herself, might have produce dsimilar effects or biases as the instructor. The participants would have
known that the researcher was personally invested in the study and could have tried to either please or displease the researcher depending on their impression of the researcher as an individual; such reaction was difficult to either predict, especially when the interaction with the participants was as short as in this study (approximately 10-15 minutes) (Onwuegbuzie).

Overall, the researcher made a decision to have an assistant administer the questionnaire to the participants because the participants were not familiar with the assistant and they knew that the assistant had no personal interest in the study outcomes; the assistant was a truly neutral party. Therefore, the possibility of the assistant causing bias was lower than if the questionnaire was administered by the instructor or the researcher.

**Study participants.** As a result of the pilot study, the researcher collected the data from 31 ESL students. One student did not provide any demographic information; this questionnaire was removed from the dataset. Another student did not provide the name of the country of origin; this questionnaire was initially removed from the dataset. However after the preliminary data review, the questionnaire was included to the dataset (see next section for details). The final sample for the pilot study consisted of 30 ESL students: 13 females and 17 males. The cultural background of one student was unknown; seven students were from the Middle-Eastern cultural background and 22 students from the Asian cultural background. Among the students from the Asian background, 20 were from China, one from South Korea and one from Malaziya. Of the 7 students from the Middle-Eastern background, five were from Saudi Arabia, one from Jordan and one from Iraq (currently, a Canadian citizen).
Preliminary review of the data. The preliminary observations of the pilot study data revealed the necessity to refocus data analysis. Initially, the researcher planned to look at the patterns in students’ evaluation of their relations with the instructor first, by exploring the entire sample and then, by looking at ESL-student subgroups by cultural background (for example, Asian and Middle-Eastern). However, the demographic composition of the sample did not allow for such analysis because the group of ESL students with the Middle-Eastern background was too small to produce usable outcomes. Moreover, since the sample was dominated not just by ESL students with Asian background but rather by ESL students with Chinese background, the comparison of the relations patterns of the entire sample and the subgroup of students with Asian background was unlikely to reveal differences in the patterns between the two groups. Having considered other available demographic information (age and gender of ESL students), the researcher made a decision to look at the relations patterns in the overall sample first and then, focus of the differences in the relations patterns by gender.

At this point, the researcher brought back the initially excluded questionnaire. As discussed above, one of the questionnaires was missing the information about the participant’s cultural background; however, it had the information on the participant’s gender (male) and could be used to conduct data analysis according to the new scenario.

Data coding. The preliminary observations of the data and the experience during the three rounds of instrument calibrations gave the researcher the idea that the analysis of the data and visualization of the findings would be more comprehensive if the items were given meaningful codes as opposed to just numbers. Such codes made it easier to
identify the placement of different items relative to each other; they would also facilitate the analysis of the constellations of students relative to constellations of items.

The researcher assigned each item a five-letter code. The first two letters stood for one of the levels of trust: cognitive (CG), emotional (EM), behavioral (BH), and loyal (LT). The last three letters identified one of the components of trust: respect (RSP), benevolent behavior (BBH), integrity (INT), and competence (COM).

In addition to coding, the researcher edited and shortened the items. Most of the items in the measure contained more characters than WinSteps could include on the summary tables. The program was then expected to automatically reduce the number of characters by cutting off parts of the items. Rather than relying on the software to make arbitrary changes, the researcher decided to adapt the items to WinSteps capacities by revising the items in a comprehensive manner that allowed reducing the number of characters in each of them without modifying the meaning of the item. The final list of codes assigned to individual items and a list of redact items was as below:

- **CGRSP** - Instructor understands students’ cultural background
- **CGBBH** - Instructor knows the challenge of being an international student
- **CGINT** - Instructor knows what is acceptable in educational environment
- **CGCOM** - Instructor makes learning interesting
- **EMRSP** - Instructor enjoys that all students are different
- **EMBBH** - Instructor provides emotional support and motivation
- **EMINT** - Instructor informs students of what is acceptable in a classroom
- **EMCOM** - Instructor encourages students to share their unique experiences
- **BHRSP** - Instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture
BHBBH - Instructor is approachable
BHINT - Instructor's behavior serves as an example
BHCOM - Instructor offers extra information and extra time to help students
LTRSP - I do not mind if the instructor penalizes me
LTBBH - I take all courses this instructor offers
LTINT - I accept my grades without contest
LTCOM - I do not mind if my instructor decides on my class-schedule

**Data analysis: Overall pilot study sample.** The first step in data analysis was to look at the participant-answer fit and filter out the outliers. As the sample for the pilot study was initially very small, the researcher made a decision to delete only those participants who had two or more answers that did not fit the overall pattern. Based on the one-by-one elimination of participants and analyzing the outcomes, the researcher deleted six participants. The elimination allowed to increase both reliability of the measured items and the variance explained by measure by 4 percent and 6 percent respectively compared to those of the original 30-participant sample. No items were removed from the dataset because the deletion of the items would disrupt the strategy that went into the development of the ETM: The deletion of any single item would have had to be followed by the deletion of three more items so that the matrix remained balanced.

Overall, with the remaining 24 participants the reliability and separation of the items in the pilot study was lower than in the last round of calibrations at 0.94 and 3.85, respectively (see Figure 12 in Appendix F). Nevertheless, the item separation was close to 4, which was the separation initially set by the 4X4 matrix that formed the theoretical basis of the instrument. The variance explained by the measure in the pilot study was at
66.0 percent: relatively high but not as higher as the researcher managed to gain in the third round of the instrument calibrations. The standard error of item measure was at .35 (modeled).

It was important to note here that while the Rasch dimension explained 66.0 percent of variance in the data, the first and second residual contrasts explained 6.8 percent and 5.7 percent of variance, respectively. The eigenvalue of the biggest residual contrast (contrast 1) was 3.2 and the eigenvalue of the second contrast was 2.7. Those eigenvalues indicated that the strength of both secondary dimensions was about 3 items (more than 2-item strength required for an independent dimension), which meant that both of them had a potential to be independent secondary dimensions of trust or independent factors with a potential to affect ESL students' perceptions of trust.

The participant reliability in the pilot study was 0.84 and participant separation came up to 2.26: both lower than in the third round of calibrations (see Figure 12 in Appendix F). Lower rating for the participants could be the result of several factors: for example, a small number of participants and missing data due either to participants leaving some of the questions without answers or to the participants deleted by the researcher.

The four-point scale consistently proves a good fit for the ETM. In the pilot study, the step between each two of the point on the scale was more than 2.0, which confirms that the participants clearly understand the distinction between different categories on the scale (see Figure 13 in Appendix F). Figure 13 also demonstrated that the fact that the data were positively skewed.
The analysis of the Map of Items revealed several more important outcomes (see Figure 14 in Appendix F). First, the items in the three basic levels of trust (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral) did not cluster by their respective groups; however, the loyalty-level items grouped well and formed a separate and the highest level on the scale of trust.

Next, the cognitive item that was the lowest on the scale (CGINT) appeared as rarer than two items from the emotional-level group as well as two items from the behavioral-level group. This might mean that the researcher’s assumption that trusting relations progress from cognitive to emotional to behavioral and then to loyalty might not be correct. Interestingly, unlike emotional-level or behavioral-level items the cognitive-level items were more closely clustered together with only one item (EMRSP) wrongfully placed within this cluster. Overall, the Map of Items suggested that emotional-level might be setting the basic or the lowest requirement for trusting relations followed by a higher-level cognitive level then behavioral and, finally, loyalty levels.

In addition, the mean fit statistics for the collection of items was close to a perfect 1.0: the mean MNSQ infit statistics for all items was at .99 and the mean MNSQ outfit statistics for all items was at .98. There were two items, whose independent indexes were outside the .5-1.5 recommended range; however, the statistics for those items was only slightly off. For example, item “LTBBH I take all courses this instructor offers” scored 1.56 and 1.53 MNSQ infit statistics and MNSQ outfit statistics, respectively; item “CGBBH Instructor knows the challenge of being an international student” had 1.54 and 1.42 as MNSQ infit statistics and MNSQ outfit statistics, respectively. All the remaining
items scored between .66 and 1.29 in infit and between .54 and 1.28 in outfit MNSQ statistics, confirming that they worked relatively well together as a measure.

Following, the median set by Winsteps was noticeably lower than the median based on the student answers. Moreover, all 12 items that belonged to the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral levels were below the median mark as set both as a researcher and by the participants; opposite to that, loyalty-level items were above median in both cases. This observation confirmed the fact that loyalty was a part of trusting-relations matrix and that it signaled the highest level of trusting-relations development. However, the central part of the map, between loyalty and the other three levels remained empty. This meant that the researcher either failed to discover the level of trusting relations that should occupy the currently-empty median level of the scale or that the researcher failed to comprehensively format the items and that prevented the participants from marking those items correctly. The high median of the participants was the immediate reflection of the positive skewedness of the data and the Hothorne effect discussed above.

Finally, the positive skewedness of the data was also reflected in the distribution of the participants along the progression of trusting-relations development. More specifically, none of the participants was placed at the lowest level of the scale represented by items one through six from the bottom; most of the participants were clustered at the median level with three participants being at a level higher than set by the measure.

**Data analysis: Female students.** Similar to the analysis of the overall sample, the first step in the analysis of the female students was to look at the student fit and eliminate the participants who appeared as outlier. Only one student was eliminated as the deletion
of more students led to the decrease in the reliability of items and the proportion of variance explained by the items. Besides, the group of females was already small for analysis; therefore, the researcher had to keep as many students as possible to ensure the possibility of at least a suggestive overview of the data.

With the 12 females students in the group, the reliability and separation of the items were lower than the reliability and separation shown by the analysis of the overall sample: item reliability stood at 0.83 and item separation was 2.18 (see Figure 15 in Appendix G). The proportion of variance explained by the items was 52.3 percent (modeled), a relatively low proportion compared to the outcomes of the instrument calibrations and complete sample analysis. The low scores for this group were partially explained by the small size of the group, as mentioned earlier. However in addition, the fact that the items explained only slightly more than a half of variance in group members' responses made the researcher consider the possibility of females having different expectations about trustworthy relations than described by the ETM matrix.

Interestingly, the step between the scale categories for females was shorter than it was in the overall sample (see Figure 16 in Appendix G). Overall scale showed that females still clearly understood the difference among the four points of the instrument scale. In addition as seen from Figure 16, females' responses were more positively skewed: 75 percent of female students' responses fall into one of the positive categories (very or somewhat important) compared to 73 percent in the overall pilot study sample.

The investigation of the map of items demonstrated similarities as well as noticeable differences between the overall sample and the group of female students (see Figure 17 in Appendix G). Among the similarities, the median set by the instrument was
again lower than that set by the group. In addition, the four loyalty items were clustered together while the other-level items were mixed together. Finally, cognitive-level items appeared as rarer based on the student answers than behavioral or emotional-level items.

As to the differences between the Map of Items for the overall sample and that for female students only, based on their answers the female students were clustered at the top of the map; none of the females was placed below the researcher-set median. Moreover, six in 13 females were above the media set by their answers with one showing trust-related expectations higher than suggested by the instrument. This observation partially supported the suggestion made earlier that females might either have very high expectations towards the trustworthiness of their relations with the instructor or there was another factor as important as trust that defined their educational relations. One more imperative observation was that the placement of individual items, including the loyalty items, on the Map of Items for the female student group was different than that for the overall sample. This observation demonstrated that the structure of the instrument was not stable and was a subject to change due to the changes in participants’ demographic characteristics.

**Data analysis: Male students.** Based on the WinSteps participant misfit map, the researcher deleted four male students from the analysis; one of the students had as many as four (25 percent) of misfit answers and the elimination of this student noticeably boosted the reliability of the items and the proportion of variance explained by the measure. The final scores for the input from 13 male students were as follows: item reliability stood at 0.91, item separation was at 3.20, student-answer reliability was 0.90, and student-answer separation was 3.07 (see Figure 18 in Appendix H). All of the scores
were lower than those for the overall sample but slightly higher than those for the group of female students. However, the proportion of variance explained by the items for the male students was the highest among the three samples explored in the pilot study: 72.8 percent (modeled).

The Summary of Category Structure showed that male students’ responses were less positively skewed compared to the overall sample and to female students (see Figure 19 in Appendix H). While males’ answers were still not well-balanced, there were 65 percent of positive answers or two thirds compared to three quarters for the other two groups. In addition, the step between the categories for males was noticeably longer than that for females and for the entire sample, which might signal that males had more precise understanding of each category and for them shifting between category-answers was less likely than for females.

Turning to the Map of Items, male students were not as closely clustered as female students; males were spread along the scale with four participants below the median of the instrument (see Figure 20 in Appendix H). Interestingly, all male students remained within the framework of trusting relations set by the instrument: there were no males placed either above the least frequent or below the most frequent items in the instrument.

Similarly to female students, for male students cognitive-level items appeared relatively rarer than some behavioral or emotional-level items. In addition, loyalty-level items were also clustered together as they were for the overall sample and for female students.
The overall placement of items along the frequent-rare scale on the map was very different from that for the female students. Two examples appeared most striking: first, two behavioral-level items, BHRSP (behavioral/respect) and BNBBH (behavioral/benevolent behavior), were at the second and third positions from the bottom of the scale (frequent) for male student while were female students the same items were rarer and occupied positions 7 and 8 from the bottom, respectively. Second example, the EMRSP (emotional/respect) and BHINT (behavioral/integrity) items on the map for male students were close to the top of the scale as rare on positions 11 and 12, respectively. For female students the same items were in positions 5 and 4 from the bottom, respectively, signaling much lower rareness of those items for female students. The distribution of items for male students was, in general, closer to that of the overall sample than to the distribution for the group of females.

**Data analysis: Comparison of male and female students.** As discussed in Chapter Three, the potential of the ETM to capture differences in trust between different groups (sample subsets grouped by demographic or other types of characteristics) was first explored using the item bias (DIF) between male and female ESL students. For the purposes of DIF examination, the researcher created a separate output file, which included gender markers and specific commands necessary for DIF. As seen from the DIF bias analysis (see Figure 21 in Appendix I), there was an equal split in item difficulty between males and females: 8 items of 16 were more difficult for males to rate positively and 8 item were more difficult for females to rate positively. However, the outcomes of the two-tailed t-test showed that none of those differences was statistically significant at .05 level (at the given degree of freedom at 21-
22); and only one time had a potential to be statistically significant at a more liberal .10 level: item “BHCOM Instructor offers extra information and extra time to help students.” The findings of DIF analysis confirmed the researchers earlier statement that with the small sample in this study it was not possible to affirm with any certainty if the ETM did or did not have the capability to capture the differences in perceptions of trust among various subjects grouped by demographic or other types of characteristics. As such more trials with larger subjects were planned as a part of future research.

Discussion

To fully appreciate the outcomes of the pilot study, it is important at this point to see how the findings described above address the research questions and to what extent, if at all, they confirm the research hypotheses stated in Chapter One. To recapture, there were three research questions and three corresponding hypotheses. The discussion below focuses, first, on reviewing the study outcomes in relation to the research hypotheses; the final part of this section reviews the research questions and restates them for future research.

The first hypothesis in this study suggested that the measure of trust could be developed based on the two theoretical models of trust: those by Lewis and Weigert’s (1985) and Bryk and Schneider’s (2002). This hypothesis was rejected at the stage of the instrument calibrations, which clearly showed that the three levels of trust suggested by Lewis and Weigert (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral) were not enough to explain the phenomenon. Prior to the third round of the instrument calibrations, the researcher added one more level of trust to the matrix, loyalty (de Guzman et al., 2008; Nesset & Helgesen, 2009; Overall et al., 2010). While loyalty appeared to be a good overall fit to the
theoretical concept of the trust matrix, the outcomes of the pilot study suggested that there might be at least one more level of trust still not accounted for by the matrix. The map of items for the analysis of the data for female students was the best example of the mentioned suggestion: the map demonstrated that the females‘ expectations towards trustworthy relations with their instructors were higher than suggested by the top level of matrix, loyalty. The outcomes of the data from the male students in the study implied that there might be one more level at the median level, which was also accounted for by the instrument.

In the second hypothesis, the researcher suggested that the measure of trust would be best designed as a 3X4 matrix in which the three levels of trust from Lewis and Weigert‘s theory (1985) would represent the three sequential steps in the development of trust (cognitive, emotional, and behavioral) while the four aspects from the work by Bryk and Schneider (2002) would add non-sequential layers to each level. This hypothesis was confirmed by neither the instrument calibrations nor the outcomes of the pilot study. In fact, the pilot study demonstrated that the placement of the items was strongly affected by the characteristics of a group under study (for example, males versus females), which means that the structure of the instrument was not stable. There are several possible explanations to the instrument vulnerability: first, the wording of the items might be not coherent and open to interpretation, which might affect the evaluation and placement of the item. Second, the items might be subject to interpretation not because of unclear wording but due to ESL students‘ incorrect translation. Finally, it is possible that the researcher‘s assumption that the three levels suggested by Lewis and Weigert were asymmetrical and sequential was incorrect and the levels were, on the contrary,
symmetrical and non-sequential. Due to the small size of the sample, which introduced high levels of measurement error, and limited number of the instrument calibrations, it is impossible to highlight any of the three explanations above as the most possible explanation of the outcomes; more instrument trials are necessary to determine and correct the flaws in the theoretical concept of the ETM.

According to the third hypothesis, the ETM was expected to help identify to what extent the instructors that ELS students identified as favorite were also perceived as trustworthy. Although the deficiencies of the instrument structure and small sample size allowed for suggestive analysis only, the outcomes of the pilot study demonstrate some differences in trust related expectations towards favorite instructors between the groups of male and female participants. While larger samples would be necessary to confirm those differences, the current findings showed that the instrument had a potential to capture the differences related to educational trust among groups different by various demographic characteristics.

The Rasch analysis has proven to be the best fit for the current study. Although limited by the small sample size, the application of the technique led the researcher to making two important decisions: to choosing a 4-point scale over a 3-point scale and to adding one extra level to the matrix. And after the pilot study data was analyzed, the use of the Rasch model helped to suggest the directions for further improvements of the instrument as discussed earlier in this section.

**Conclusion**

The overall goal of the pilot study was not to compare the groups of female and male students but rather to confirm that the development of the theoretical concept for the
ETM is progressing in the right direction by answering the research questions stated in Chapter One. The outcomes of the study address those questions by suggesting the directions for further instrument development based on the outcomes of the instrument calibrations and the pilot study. More specifically, the first research question inquired on which theories could form the theoretical framework for the instrument. In the process of this study, the researcher used five different theories, including three theories on loyalty, to design the instrument. It appears that to design a comprehensive instrument with a stable structure, it might be necessary to use additional theories on trust, possibly borrowed from other fields and/or disciplines such as for example, management and organizational leadership.

The second question asked how many levels the ETM should have to adequately present the dynamic nature of trust in staff-students relations. While this question did not receive a concrete answer, the outcomes of the study suggest that the ETM matrix might be more complex than either the 3X3 or the 4X4 designs explored in this study. The outcomes of the pilot study suggest a possibility that levels of trust described by Lewis and Weigert (1985) might not be sequential, as assumed by the researcher. If this is the case, than the placement and the role of the four aspects of trust by Bryk and Schneider (2002) would also be different. In fact, one of the theories might even be replaced if further literature review helps the research discover another theoretical concept that will fit the purposes of the ETM better.

In the third question, the researcher asked about the key aspects of the staff-student relations that could be measured with the help of the ETM. Based on the outcomes of the pilot study, the researcher believes that it might be possible to use the
ETM to define if the students’ expectations differ depending on the students’ demographic characteristics. However, there might be additional ways to apply the ETM, which are discussed in detail in Chapter Six that follows.

Overall, while the researcher failed to corroborate two out of three hypotheses, the pilot study nevertheless confirmed that the idea of presenting the phenomenon of trust with a help of a numerical measure has a certain merit. Based on the reactions of the two ESL instructors, who served as instrument reviewers for the pilot study, the theoretical concept reflected in the instrument was comprehensive; it was also well-received. The instrument tested in the pilot study is only the first draft of the ETM; and it will require extensive literature review and numerous further trials before it is ready. However, the study reinforced the researcher’s belief that it is possible to design the ETM; and once ready the measure could be applied in a variety of ways to help institutions like the MLI improve ESL students’ experiences.
Chapter Six

Research Utility and Future Research

Views on Research Utility

When talking about the utility of research, Cousins and Shulha (2006) argue, "Possibly the most significant development of the past decade in both research and evaluation communities has been a more general acceptance that how we work with clients and practitioners can be as meaningful and consequential as what we learn from our methods" (p. 277, emphasis in the original). In other words, the utility of educational research is not limited to the dissemination of the findings within the research community and outlining further research opportunities; it also includes making sure that at least some elements of research findings and/or routines is translated into concrete and actionable educational practices that lead to the improvement of student and teacher educational experiences and outcomes.

Patton (2007) expands the discussion of the dual nature of the research utility to argue that utility consists of a practical side, or process use, and theoretical part, or findings use. According to Patton, process use includes "changes in attitudes, thinking, and behaviors" that result, directly or indirectly, from the respondent's participation in the study (p. 99). Patton claims there is no agreed-on operational definition of findings use because theoretical utility of research is "inherently situational and context-dependent" (p. 104). Nevertheless, Patton identifies three nominal types of findings use: instrumental, enlighten, and persuasive. Findings use can adhere to only one type or be a combination of two or more types depending on the "intended use by the intended users" (Patton, p. 104). The character of process use can be describes in a similar manner: the specific
changes in people and environments stimulated by the research highly depend on the characteristics and objectives of those people and environments (Patton).

Baird and Gordon (2009) continue a discussion on research utility by setting it within the educational context. According to the authors, in educational research findings use takes a form of internal discussions within education research community while process use stimulate internal discussions within educational institutions aimed at achieving a "better balance [of] their efforts to improve the student experience" (Baird & Gordon, p. 193). The nature of the internal community discussions is such that their progress and outcomes are "vague and more general" (Patton, 2007). Opposite to that, internal discussion within educational institutions are expected to result in a series of actions aimed to enhance student experiences as one of or a combination of educational, interpersonal, and consumer experiences while at an educational institution (Baird & Gordon). Baird and Gordon further suggest that a productive findings use relies on clear understanding of student experience and the ways to improve it. Newton (2000) and Westerheijden, Hulpiau, and Wayetens (2007), however, claim that despite good intentions research recommendations in the system of education frequently translate into additional regulations that are burdensome for both educators and students while the impact of the implementation of such regulations remains untraced.

Overall, the modern research community agrees that in addition to contributing to the knowledge base of its respective field of a social or natural science, research findings also need to benefit the practitioners and the institutions in this field. Findings use of the research is a process characterized by a natural flow of the discussion with the progress and outcomes determined by those involved in the discussion and somewhat affected by
the circumstances/context in which the discussion takes place. Process use, or the practical application, of the research is more demanding and requires the researcher to identify the aspect of the practice that can be modified by the research. Further, research outcomes should be translated into the language and actions that the practitioners in the field can understand, use, measure and evaluate. When applied to the field of education, the framework of process use involves identifying a specific educational context first, following with the identification of students‘ experiences within that context. In addition, the researcher has to identify the challenges unique to the selected educational context and the barriers that might arise due to educators' or students' background and characteristics (Baird & Gordon, 2007). In this chapter, the researcher discusses the potential directions for the findings use and process use of this study‘s outcomes, including the environments and people, which can be positively stimulated through the engagement with the study.

**Findings Use: As an Independent Instrument**

As an exploratory study aimed at developing and piloting a new instrument, this research offers a potential for the findings use to apply to the questionnaire, designed in this study, as to an independent instrument and as a part of a larger construct, for example, a Structural Equation Model (SEM). As an independent instrument, the questionnaire can be used to improve the understanding of the relations between various socio-demographic characteristics and ethnic/cultural background of ESL students and those students‘ ability to develop trustworthy relationships with their instructors.

To borrow from the sphere of organizational and customer relations, although a subject to severe criticism for the reinforcement of culture-related stereotypes Hofstede's
cultural typology (1994) provides an insight important for this research. Hofstede argues that human relations are to a certain extent defined by the national —value system,— which consists of five main components: power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism, masculinity, and, in Asian culture, Confucian dynamism (pp. 5-15). Nowadays, this typology is not frequently applied even in the sector it was originally developed for because of the inflexible and inadequate conceptualization of the notions of culture and cultural influence (Edwards & Kuruvilla, 2005). Nevertheless, the value of Hofstede’s typology cannot be overestimated, because it brings the attention of the research community across various fields of knowledge to the fact that cultural environment has an impact on human relations. Moreover, the imperfections of Hofstede’s theory stimulate further discussions and research on the characteristics and the impact of national culture” in various fields of knowledge.

Among the discussions rooted in Hofstede’s typology, three are especially important for this study. First is the critical analysis of Hofstede’s typology by Edwards and Kuruvilla (2005). The authors argue that the main weakness of Hofstede’s theory lies in the fact that the author treats culture as a static collection of the elements isolated from each other and from the outside world (Edwards & Kuruvilla). As such, the theory fails to account for the changes in culture caused by genuine maturation, the interaction of the elements with each other, and the external influences on the culture (Edwards & Kuruvilla). The latter change – the change induced by the culture’s interactions with the outside world – has become of specific importance in the recent decade: fast-paced technologic development and better accessibility of new technologies facilitate cross-cultural exchange, borrowing, and even integration as in the case with the national
cultures of the European Union (Scott & Liikanen, 2010). There are, of course, cases of the national cultures, which develop in isolation from the external influences due to the political or economic choices made by the hosting sovereigns (Gabbert, 2007). In such cases, natural maturation and the interaction between the components of the culture become the leading agents of the culture change.

The next discussion, the cultural concept by Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1998) expands Hofstede's typology by adding more levels differentiating national cultures, such as individualism-communitarism, status-by-achievement, universalism-particularism, the notion of time, and so on. The distinct feature of the authors' collection of cultural elements is that the individual elements are not as strictly defined as in Hofstede's concept; moreover, many of them overlap (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner). As a result, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner's cultural concept present a "loose" and rather flexible concept of culture, which allows showing the evolution of a certain culture through the rotation of overlapping cultural elements.

The third discussion worth mentioning here is the analysis of the effect that the system of legal and administrative institutions in a chosen country has on the characteristics of the national culture as well as on the human relations (Whitley, 1996). In his publication, Whitley argues that "set of... structures and institutions create a nationally distinct pattern of organizing [specific] activity" (Whitley, pp. 411-412). The author goes as far as to claim that in selected countries, the impact of the prescriptive values imposed by the national system of institutions is more profound and longer-lasting than the impact of values imbedded in national culture (Whitley).
To summarize the overview above, the key message of Edwards and Kuruvilla’s (2005) argument is the notion of culture as a living concept, which is different at different points in time and so is its reflection in the values and behaviors of the representatives of this culture. In other words, ESL-students with Eastern-European background in 2010 would be different from the students with Eastern-European background in 1980 and so would be their values and behaviors. Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner’s (1998) concept provides a reasonable explanation to the change in culture by arguing that the change in socio-political and economic contexts stimulates the rotation of culture’s components and puts emphasis on different components at different points in time. The authors highlight the fact that many of the components overlap to various extends (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner). Thus, the magnitude of the culture’s change depends first, on what cultural elements are highlighted at a certain point in time and, second, on the extent to which the newly highlighted components overlap with the components that defined the culture during the previous period(s). Finally, Whitley (1996) suggests that culture’s changes might be of a man-made nature: they might be forced through a system of governmental institutions, legal and otherwise. As a result of the forced change, the culture component(s) are hand-selected by the system and reinforced through the routines at all the institutions that belong to the system, including educational institutions (Whitley). Whitley’s conclusion is that it is necessary to account for such forced changes and their effects on educational institutions when analyzing cultural background and its effect on human relations.

Since the cultural context of ESL students’ home country is changing, so do their beliefs, values, and behaviors: the factors affecting their ability to form trusting
relationships with their ESL instructors. The instrument developed in this study can be used to identify ESL students’ expectations of trustworthy educational relations at one specific point in time. In addition, this instrument can be also used to track changes in ESL students’ expectations over a certain period through repetitive measurements. Historical trends in ESL students’ expectations can be then looked at in the light of the political, economic, social, and institutional changes in a specific region to access the possible relations between the changes in ESL students’ educational environment in their home country and the changes in those students’ expectations towards their ESL instructors once the students arrive to the USA. Understanding of such relations can help forecast and prepare to address the variations in ESL students’ expectations, help stimulate students’ trust in their instructors, and reinforce their success at the programs similar to MLI.

**Findings Use: As a Component of a Structural Equation Model**

There are several sectors of ESL student education, which can benefit from using the instrument developed in this study for the purposes of Structural Equation Modeling, SEM (Ajzen, 2002). In this part of the chapter, two of such possibilities are described in more detail. Both spheres have to do with the factors that have a potential to predict international students’ academic success.

The first direction for the research deals with the students and instructors’ intrinsic factors as the predictors of students’ academic achievement. When talking about the students’ intrinsic factors, Berenson, Boyles and Weaver (2008) argue that, “soft skills are pertinent to academic success and may constitute a useful profile of successful… student that maybe applied to marketing, advisement, quality assessment,
and retention efforts” (p. 1). Among the mentioned soft skills, the researchers highlighted emotion intelligence [which] emerged as the most significant direct predictor of GPA” in their study domestic and international online-learning students (Berenson, Boyles & Weaver, p. 1). In the same study, personality of the student was also proven to contribute to the students’ academic success (Berenson, Boyles & Weaver; Block, 1995). Next, in their observations of students of Turkish and Moroccan background in the Netherlands, Meijnen II and Van der Veen (2001) pointed out the importance of cultural orientation and ethnic identity for the international students’ academic success. The authors claimed that positive attitude towards the host country and its culture partially explained the academic success of international students while critical evaluation of students’ own ethnic identity enhanced both positive attitude and academic success. (Meijnen II & Van der Veen). Moreover, Meijnen II and Van der Veen also suggested that motivation was a secondary level predictor of academic achievements; and, in fact, successful international students —did not have to be highly motivated” as long as they sustained positive attitude towards the host country (Meijnen II & Van der Veen, p. 539). Finally, Harris (1995) makes a strong statement to the fact that international students’ hard skills, such as academic intelligence, knowledge of and preparedness to live and function in a different academic and social environments, and grounded expectations towards teaching and learning practices overseas, are one of the strongest if not the primary predictors of International students’ success at Western high-education institutions. Thus, on the one hand, the level of maturity of international students’ soft and hard skills serve as strong determinants of how successful those students become in the educational environment overseas.
On the other hand, however, the same intrinsic factors apply to the domestic instructors of the arriving international students. In their comparative research of UK and international students’ understanding of effective teaching, Bartram and Bailey (2009) evaluated the relative importance of four teacher-factors for the students’ integration into the academic life: teaching skills, teacher’s personal attributes, teacher knowledge, and student-staff relations. The authors concluded that teaching skills and teacher personality attributes, or the hard and the soft skills of the teachers, were regarded as two most critical components of an effective educational process by both groups of the students. In addition, Bartram and Bailey observed that international students tended to strongly emphasize personal qualities of their instructors noting that, “emotional and social upheaval experienced earlier by such students… could make them more prone to prioritizing personal qualities in staff, such as friendliness and a welcoming nature” (p.180). A surprising finding of the study was the fact that teacher knowledge “was afforded a much lower priority” than the other three factors (p. 172). Bartram and Bailey argue that the limited importance of teacher knowledge is reflective of the “potential downgrading of the role of knowledge in teaching, and is symbolic of the global transition into pedagogic pragmatism where teachers are no longer the expected custodians of knowledge but facilitators whose main role is to signpost routes and sources rather than ‘transmit’” (p.181). In the light of this trend, teaching skills and teacher personality appear far more important than the teacher knowledge; moreover, the student-staff relations rise as the key to creating educational environments, in which ‘facilitation’ is not only feasible but also effective. At the stage of designing the study, Bartram and Bailey predicted that both groups of the respondents would treat student-
staff relations as a component of either teaching skills or teacher personal attributes. However, the authors noted that since educational relations were repeatedly singled out in the survey,” it seemed appropriate to once again highlight the value which many students seemingly attach to this aspect” (Bartram & Bailey, p. 181). Thus, the main conclusion of Bartram and Bailey’s study can be summarized as follows: while the global higher-education system is shifting towards a system that facilitates the development of life-long learners rather than transfers of knowledge, the importance of teacher knowledge is fading and is giving way to such teacher-factors, teaching skills and personal attributes that contribute to the development of student-staff relations, which enable the facilitating activities of the teachers and the educational growth of the students.

Since the soft skills and personal attributions of a teacher are confirmed to be, at least partially, responsible for the quality of the teacher-students relations as well as international students’ academic success, it is reasonable to assume that similar connections can be established among students’ soft skills and personal attributes, student-teacher relations, and students’ academic success. In fact, as discussed earlier in this part of the chapter, Berenson, Boyles and Weaver (2008) and Meijnen and Van der Veen (2001) argue that international students’ personalities and soft skills are indisputably related to their academic success; while similar relations to student-staff relations remain less understood. Thus, the first Structural Equation Model (SEM) should explore the relations among such aspects of the educational process as SL instructors’ soft skills and personal characteristics, the trustworthiness/quality of student-instructor relations, and students’ success at MLI-type programs. The latter can be defined through
a combination of the following three factors: whether or not the student passed the TOEFL, number of attempts the student made before passing the TOEFL and the final score after the last/final attempt.

The second possibility for creating a SEM using the instrument developed in this study is to expand the first model described above and explore the relations between ESL students‘ academic success at the MLI-type programs, the students‘ and their instructors‘ soft skills and knowledge, their personal attributes, student-staff relations, plus influential extrinsic factors.

In his paper on the experiences of international students in the UK before, during, and after their stay, Harris (1995) argues that international students‘ experiences begin long before the students found themselves on campus; in some cases, it starts even before students take the selection exam administered by a member of the faculty. Many students are first exposed to the idea of education abroad and to a specific university through their acquaintances, who studied abroad, through cultural-education programs organized by UK or US consulates, through promotional brochures distributed at their schools, and so on (Harris). The content of the informational message about a foreign higher education institution and the context in which this message was delivered have a strong impact on students‘ image of and expectations towards a selected university; later on, the extent to which the university comes up to the pre-formed expectations affect students‘ satisfaction and success at the university once they arrive and engage in the educational processes (Harris). Thus, the quality and intensity/frequency of exposure appear to be two of the extrinsic factors that would have to be included in an expanded SEM. Once the students pass the selection exam, Williams (1985) claims that those students, who receive advance
preparation to their stay in the foreign country in a form of formal recommendations or informal advice, are more likely to adapt to their new social and academic environment, are more likely to feel satisfied with their education, and are better positioned to succeed at their host universities. Following, Morris (1967) reports a variety of factors that affect international students’ experience, satisfaction, and success at a foreign university: for example, the attitudes of the peers, quality of living accommodations, difficulty level of their academic program, costs including university fees, family pressure and family support, and the presence or absence of local cultural Diaspora. Finally, international students are exposed to another set of extrinsic factors that enable their adaptation and success in their own society; moreover, those factors affect the success of returning graduate students as life-long learners and simultaneously define the message, to which the new generation of international students will be exposed (Political and Economic Planning, 1955).

Overall, Harris (1995) concludes that international students are exposed to a variety of extrinsic forces that have a direct and indirect effect on their satisfaction and success at educational institutions overseas throughout their “life-cycle” as international students (p. 83). These factors need to be considered not only when forecasting students’ success but also when preparing to meet the needs of those students upon their arrival to their chosen university (Harris). Therefore, it seems beneficial for both ESL students and hosting universities, or in this case MLI-type programs, to have an operational SEM, which they could use for planning and preparation activities. Such a model has to include intrinsic students’ and teachers’ factors and personal attributes, student-teacher relations, and extrinsic factors pertinent or observable during the international students’ life-cycle.
**Process Use: Impact on Participating ESL Instructors and Students**

While hoping to add to the knowledge base in the fields of education in general and ESL education specifically, the main goal this study pursues is to contribute to the development of the MLI-type programs and help enhance their ability to forecast and meet the needs of international students. In this light, the process use utility of this study, as defined by Patton (2007) becomes at least as important as the findings use.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, Patton (2007) defines process use as a quality of research that stimulates context-dependent "changes in attitudes, thinking, and behaviors" in the environments and agents directly or indirectly involved in the research (p. 99). In this specific study, the context was specified as the MLI educational environment. Subsequently, the researcher aimed to introduce new elements to the attitudes and thinking of ESL instructors and students at MLI through direct involvement in the research as well as through the access to the results of the study: the new instrument, the outcomes of the pilot study, and the recommendations for using the instrument in MLI educational practices.

While not necessarily significant, the impact of the instructors' and ESL students' participation in the study on their attitudes and thinking should not be completely dismissed. Putting the emotional response to the experience of participating in the study aside, the instructors who evaluated the instrument as well as the students who answered the questions had an opportunity to consider professional and personal qualities of an ESL instructor from the researcher’s perspective. Regardless whether or not they agreed to that perspective, it raised, even if to a minimum extent, their awareness of the
factors/characteristics that can contribute to the positive reactions to an instructor’s performance in the ESL educational environment (Patton, 2007).

The forecasted outcome of such awareness is likely to be different for instructors as opposed to students. For instructors, the researcher expects the impact of their participation to adhere somewhat to the theory of behavioral change widely employed in clinical studies and marketing (Gao, Barkhuizen & Chow, 2011; Valente, Paredes & Poppe, 1998). According to the empirical, behavioral change is initiated by the access to information, which stimulates awareness of a fact or phenomenon; the awareness rouses positive or negative response in a form of satisfaction/dissatisfaction or pleasure/distress; depending on its polarity, the emotional response can then stimulate desired changes in behavior, undesired changes, or can stimulate no changes at all (Valente, Paredes & Poppe). While change in awareness is not guaranteed to catalyze behavioral change, it is argued nevertheless to have an impact on attitudes and opinions (Valente, Paredes & Poppe). In the case with participating ESL instructors, awareness of an additional set of factors that might have an impact on ESL students’ relationships with their instructors is expected to at least make them consider those factors in their daily interactions with the students. As a maximum, the researcher hopes that the participating instructors would engage in literature studies of their own and would consciously modify their behaviors to personify their communication with individual students.

As to the participating ESL students, the researcher expects that their participation impact would vary substantially depending first, on students‘ command of English, and second, on whether the students had just arrived to the USA or had been in the country for a certain time prior to taking part in the study. The effect of the level of
English-language proficiency might range from negative to somewhat positive: for example, students, who struggle to understand the questions due to low language proficiency, are likely to remember the struggle rather than try to inquire into what the questions might have meant and why somebody wanted to have them answered by ESL students (Jezek et al., 2010). Opposite to that, students with a higher English-language proficiency level, might form a certain opinion as to the goal of the study while filling in the questionnaire. Regardless of the specifics of those opinions, the fact that the students thought about the goals of the study and the purposes of the questionnaire is important as this would be the display of their awareness. From that point on, the participating students would know about some of the instructor characteristics, professional and personal, that are relevant in the ESL environment. Even if this knowledge never translates into new opinions and believes, it might help raise students‘ awareness that the educational context is a complex environment in which different people seek different ways of self-realization as students and teachers (Engelmann & Hesse, 2011).

The researcher did not have an opportunity to follow up with either the instructors or the students who took part in the study; therefore, the specific impact of their participation on their awareness, attitudes and beliefs is not known. Nevertheless, the empirical research and theoretical discussions cited in this section show that there is always a direct or indirect participation impact, although, its intensity might vary significantly depending on the participation context and participants‘ individual characteristics (Patton, 2007). Thus, as the work on this instrument continues, the researcher is planning to spend some time following up with the future participants of the study to discuss their thoughts on the instrument and on the study in general.
**Process Use: Practical Application of the Instrument**

Aside from the impact on the immediate participants of the study, the researcher foresees another type of process use for the instrument developed in this study: as a part of organizational processes at the MLI. More specifically, the instrument can be imbedded into the MLI educational processes as a component of the student pre-course assessment or as a part of summative student evaluation of teaching (SET).

Thinking about the pre-course assessment, the questionnaire can be given to the students at the time they take their entrance test, which defines if they will be assigned to a Beginning, Intermediate, or Advanced level courses at the MLI. The outcomes of the questionnaire will reflect a student’s prior experience with educators, most likely, in their home country. This experience will provide a picture of the teacher-student relations that the student is used to, perceive positively, and hopes/expect to establish at MLI, whether consciously or otherwise. Once the MLI administration is aware of the student’s expectations, it can make use of this information by either correcting the student’s habitual style of teacher-student relations or adapting to this style. The former goal can be reached through a series of welcoming meetings where the MLI administration and instructors explain to the students the structure and practices of the MLI paying specific attention to the teacher-student relations that are considered fruitful for the MLI students. The discussion can be further developed in individual classrooms and reinforced through the instructors’ behaviors. If the decision is made to adapt to individual student expectations, the MLI administration can achieve this objective by putting students with similar expectations in one class and selecting for each specific class instructors, whose characteristics fit best the expectations of students in this class.
Each of the mentioned ways of building teacher-student relations has its pros and cons. The corrective way of approaching relationship-building will stimulate the ESL students to mix with students from various cultural backgrounds and to explore and adapt to an educational environment that is different from the environment in their home country; yet, some of the students might struggle trying to cope with the challenges of simultaneous educational and personal adaptation. The adaptive style will definitely create a familiar environment for the ESL students and create a supportive network they might need during the first months at the MLI; however, it might slow down their integration into the new educational environment because they will spent most of their time at the MLI within a group of the students from similar cultural environments and will not be challenged to explore the novelties of a foreign university setting. It would be a decision of the MLI administration as to how to use the information about the students’ expectations; but having such information can help the MLI staff better understand the students and the way they integrate into the MLI environment, including teacher-student relations.

As to the idea of using the new instrument for the summative SET, this move would be in a line with the current search for additional elements to enhance SET, the search that is evolving in the field of higher education (Anikeeff, 1953; Badri & Abdulla, 2006; Moses, 1988). Based on the review of relevant literature, Yao and Grady (2005) claim that “Student evaluation of teaching [SET] is widely used in higher education” and it is an essential component of the processes and procedures aimed at improving teaching practices and the organization of the student higher-education experiences (p. 107). Roche and Marsh (1993) argue that “SET feedback coupled with consultation is an
effective means to improve teaching effectiveness” (p. 217). In their study, the authors showed that the rating of the faculty, who received end-of-term student evaluation and feedback, improved over time more significantly than the rating of the faculty receiving middle-of-term evaluation/feedback or no feedback at all; moreover, the improvement was mainly concerned with the areas targeted by student evaluation (Roche & Marsh). In addition to its direct use for enhancing teaching practices, SET is often used by administrators for promotion and tenure decisions (Morgan, Sneed & Swinney, 2003).

Despite the important role SET plays in the life of students and their instructors, the acceptability and helpfulness of student evaluations continue to be questioned (Moses, 1988). Yao and Grady agree that SET is a reliable general measure of teaching quality; however, the validity of student evaluation is undermined by a strong bias. For example, Anikeeff (1988) founds strong positive correlation between teachers’ merit rating scores and grading leniency; Badri and Abdulla (2006) add student gender, expected grade, actual grade, course level, class size, course timing, and course subject to the list of the factors that might skew SET outcomes. Overall, because of the objective importance of SET for the quality of student experiences and because of the questionable validity and reliability of SET, Badri and Abdulla argue that “there is a need to supplement it [SET] with other measures of teaching effectiveness” (p. 43).

Going back to the discussion by Berenson, Boyles and Weaver (2008) and Meijnen and Van der Veen (2001) concerning the importance of a teacher's soft skills for the success of an educational process, it appears reasonable to expand the SET to include a measure of some soft skills: in particular, the ability to establish trustworthy relationships with the students. It is important to keep in mind that even a year after they
start their studies at the MLI, most international students will likely retain culturally-biased opinions and attitudes. That is why the researcher recommends the use of the instrument as a part of the SET evaluation that looks at a variety of factors rather than as an independent measure of teacher effectiveness. In fact, the researcher believes that it would be most helpful for the MLI administration and instructors if the instrument is administered to the students twice: at the beginning of their studies and at the end of the first year. This way, the beginning-of-the-year assessment will provide some information of the arriving students‘ expectations and will also set the so-called “pre-test” level, which can then be compared to the summative evaluation results to evaluate the magnitude and quality of the change in how students assess their relationships with the instructors.

Overall, the instrument can be administered to the students at different points of their stay and study at the MLI; at each point, the collected data would provide an interesting and important insight on how students feel about the educational environment at the MLI and about the members of the MLI staff. However, similar to the findings use application, the instrument would be most useful if administered to students at least twice during their studies and together with other assessment/evaluation instruments. This way, it would be possible to assess not only the static condition of the students‘ opinions and attitudes but also trace the change in those opinions and attitudes. In addition, administering the instrument as a part of evaluation procedures would allow the consideration of teacher-student relations in a larger context, which would include a group of factors important for international students at an American university.
Summary and Conclusions

Additional literature review performed in the process of writing this Chapter shows that there are a number of areas, theoretical as well as practical, which might potentially benefit from the new measure of educational relations, especially since the measure addresses the issue of soft—people” skills as perceived by the students. Thus, the objective of the researcher would be to prioritize future research opportunities based on how feasible it is to conduct a specific type of a study and what would be the direct and indirect impact of such a study. However, the first logical direction would be to conduct another series of the instrument calibrations in several different settings to ensure that the set of questions is working well regardless of the specific conditions of the instrument administration.

Once the reliability of the measure is confirmed, the researcher plans to first, focus on practical application of the instrument in the ESL setting. As an international student with an extensive experience at educational institutions in the USA and Europe, the researcher believes that the process use of the study (the practical application) should be a priority over findings use (contribution to the theoretical field). Current international students deserve to benefit of the potentially positive effects of the research on their educational experience as soon as those effects are confirmed without having to wait for the theoretical part being published. The ultimate goal for the future research is to conduct a longitudinal study tracking the effects of the combination of the pre-course and summative administering of the questionnaire on the instructors’ awareness of students’ expectations and on students’ experience at the MLI or a similar program. A 4-5-year-long study requires a serious commitment on the part of an ESL program staff; however,
it is the researcher’s hope that it is possible to demonstrate that the study has clear potential to contribute to the student satisfaction and thus, positively affect the students’ educational experiences and cause the return of business for the program.

While collecting the longitudinal data, the researcher also plans to continue working on the structure of the teacher-student relations. As discussed earlier in this Chapter, there are a number of intrinsic and extrinsic factors that might affect how teachers and student perceive successful educational relations and what type of relations they, in fact, build in the ESL context. The exploration of the impact of each factor requires an approach marrying literature review and qualitative research, most likely, grounded theory (Creswell, 1998). Thus, the researcher will attempt to revise and reuse the methodological approach to the study that was designed for the first study of the teacher-student relations in the ESL context: the study that was not successful as described in Chapter Three. The researcher believes that when studying such intangible phenomena as relationships, trust, personality, and charisma among a few, grounded theory approach has most merit and brings most useful results. However, for this approach to work in such difficult environments as the ESL context, there is a need for more careful planning, for more qualitative research tools (including traditional and non-traditional, visual and digital, research tools), and for more flexibility in using those tools. Having learnt through the prior unsuccessful experience, the researcher still thinks that the grounded theory approach is the best approach to studying educational relationships; moreover, the findings of grounded theory studies would fit well with the measurement study and then SEM study as follow-ups.
Chapter Seven

Conclusions

Review of the Study Objectives

When considering the study in a larger context of the fields of Educational Foundations and SLA, it is helpful to first review the goal and the objectives of the study. As stated in the Introduction, the researcher attempted to contribute to a specific field of education such as second language teaching-learning by exploring the factors with a potential to have positive or negative impact on the teaching and learning outcomes in this field. To narrow the focus of the study, the researcher chose a unique educational setting: a University-based ESL program. Next, the researcher narrowed the scope of the study to one aspect of the mentioned setting: the teacher-student relations. Finally, the study looks at those relations from a mono-perspective; it focuses on the trustworthiness of the teacher-student relations as a basis for open and frequent communication, which corrects and stimulates the progress of a student as a user of English as his/her second language.

The choice of the study focus clearly signals the fact that the researcher assumes that the quality of interpersonal relations have an important impact on the educational process; the qualitative studies in the field of education discussed in the literature review support this assumption. However, qualitative studies do not provide sufficient validation to the positive effect of trust on educational outcomes because qualitative explorations do not allow to clearly separate the effects of various factors integrated into an educational process; a relatively independent from the ‘noise’ evaluation of trust and its impact on the teacher-student relations can be done through a more robust quantitative approach.
Unfortunately, neither the field of education nor other fields exploring trust offer a measure of trust; moreover, as discussed in the Introduction, currently there is no definition of trust on which various fields agree (Blomqvist, 1997). Thus, the researcher believed that a logical start of a research on trust is a development of a measure of trust that would be reliable and also flexible enough to apply to different educational contexts.

And talking about the context, the choice of the MLI – a University-based ESL program – was made for two main reasons. First, the researcher expected that the relations in the ESL context would be slightly exaggerated because of the higher power asymmetry and weaker sense of belonging that leads ESL students to seek more support and different type of support from the teacher than regular student in a traditional educational environment do. Therefore, the ESL classroom was expected to be more receptive as a research setting. Second, the researcher is an ESL-student; therefore, it was important for the researcher to give back to the field that enabled the researcher's educational achievements.

To summarize, this study was aimed to contribute to the advancement in the fields of Educational Sociology and SLA by supporting the exploration of the teacher student relations that support and promote students’ educational success in a specific environment, an ESL classroom. The purpose of this chapter is to consider the process and findings of the study in the light of the recent developments in the fields of Educational Foundations and SLA. The discussion aims to confirm that the study suggests a topic that is timely and important to both fields; in addition, the chapter looks at the research outcomes in terms of their practical and theoretical value as well as importance for the researcher's future academic pursuits.
Place of the Study in the Current Academic Discourse

As discussed in Chapters I and II, the last century’s developments in the field of educational theory and philosophy displayed a shift from viewing education as a mechanical transmission of information to seeing it as a collaborative process, in which the roles of and results for a teacher and a student were equally important and, at times, even interchangeable (Dewey, 1916). Following the shift in the image of the educational process was a discussion of such educational relations, or the teacher-student relations, that translate into cooperation and/or collaboration (Freire, 1993; Putnam, 1993; Raider-Roth, 2005). The interdisciplinary discussion involving the spheres of organizational management and marketing highlighted trust as one of the factors that enable the participants of the educational process to abandon fear of unknown and open up to educative experiences (Freire; Raider-Roth; Rice, 2006; Walker, 2001). Although somewhat limited, empirical research generally corroborated the impression that trustworthy classroom relations might be more fruitful than neutral or untrusting relations (Morris & Tarone, 2003; Rotenberg, Boulton & Fox, 2005).

The review of the literature on SLA and Language Pedagogy demonstrated that the idea of educational success being somewhat related to the quality of relations among all the participants of the educational process is not new. SLA was focused on the human aspect of language and language acquisition as well as on the role of the educator at the wake of the field of linguistics during the time of Paul and Winey (Koerner, 2006). The next period in SLA history was dominated by the theories of de Saussure, Chomsky and Vygotsky, which weakened the sociological focus on language teaching-learning because they favored a biological interpretation of the linguistic processes (Chomsky, cited in...
Putnam, 1994/1995; Bredella & Righter, 2006; Beliavsky, 2006). However, in the late 1990s and early 2000s, the linguistics, SLA and LP made a full circle to return to the discussions of the social nature of language and the role of interpersonal relations in language acquisition (Bernstein, 1996; Gibbons, 2006). By that time, the field of education changed; the context of SLA and LP also developed following the new geopolitical trends in the world: the end of the Cold War, the dismissal of the Soviet Union, and so on. (Walker, 2001). Those trends stimulated international collaboration and increased the importance of second language acquisition, mainly the acquisition of English, as a tool appropriate for communicative interactions in a variety of fields including business, education, international development and others.

Since the new collaborative efforts were not limited to the framework of academia but existed in various types of socio-political and economic context, second-language teaching-learning was forced to gain the flexibility, which allowed it to adjust to the needs and expectations of the learners not only coming from different socio-cultural background but also pursuing different professional interests (Walker, 2001). The global geopolitical transformations in the late 1990s early 2000s expanded the range of opportunities for self-realization in a large part of the world; this expansion stimulated the revolution in the role of a foreign/second language, whose value transformed from symbolic to a very practical one. In other words, language no longer served to define a person who was well-educated and well-placed in a society; language now turned into a tool, which any person could use to gain access to better education and better position in a society. To summarize, second/foreign language has become personified because as a tool it is expected to provide an individual with the communicative abilities necessary for
the specific personal and professional pursuit of this individual and also compatible with
the individual's characteristics and immediate context. To be able to serve such
personified needs and expectations, SLA and language pedagogy had to focus on
individual without losing focus on the content (communicative capabilities in a second
language).

The interjection of the elements of marketing, management, and TESOL into to
the fields of SLA and LP reflected the personification of the second language. The most
important result of such interdisciplinary exchanges was the attention to relations among
the participants of SLA processes because it is at the level of such relationships that the
learners signal their expectations and the educators adjust their activities to fit those
expectations. In ideal, such informational exchange is consistent and multi-level; it
stimulates development in both learner and educator as the educational process unfolds.
The degree of consistency and number of levels depends on the quality of teacher-student
relations and on their ability to enable frequent, open, and comprehensive informational
exchanges. In the new global context, a second-language teacher and learner have to
establish and sustain such educational relations that will help them to adjust their
activities to each other's capabilities and expectations. This is SLA as a process of
educational co-creation as envisioned by Dewey (1916) in the early 20th century;
however, it took nearly a century for the fields of SLA and LP to get shaped into adopting
this process under the pressure of the globalizing educational context.

Since the philosophy of SLA and ESL education is changing to follow Dewey's
framework (1916), it appears reasonable to follow the same framework to identify the
key agents that enable growth as a process and an outcome of education. The
personification of ESL students’ expectations towards both (educational process and outcomes), makes such elements of standardized ESL education as, for example, specific content or testing relative. Thus, the elements or agents that remain essential are, in fact, the teacher and the students, who shape the educational process by negotiating their personal needs and expectations. Successful negotiations are, thus, critical to the teacher and student‘s ability to realize their goals through the process of educational cooperation. However, such negotiations are only possible if both parties are honest and believe in the honesty/benevolence of each other, otherwise, educational interaction would lead to no result at best and the results harming both parties at worst (Blau, 1964).

Barber (1983) argues that the believe in the negotiations partner’s goodwill defines trustworthy relations; Bryk and Schneider (2002) name benevolent behavior among the four factors, which school children and their parents consider when they decide whether or not they are going to trust a teacher. Thus, contemporary discussions in ESL consider Dewey’s educational philosophy from the perspective of personification of education, which requires teacher and student to trust each other when they engage in educational collaboration (Raider-Roth, 2005; Rice, 2006). However based on the literature review, the research on trust in education is just at its early stages; the discussions on trust in other fields are substantive but non-conclusive. Overall, it appears that this study is timely as it fits the general trend in the fields of Educational Foundations and SLA; it also has a potential to contribute to the two fields by suggesting a different potential direction for the research than previous studies did.
The study and LP practices

Chapter VI discussed in detail the potential for practical application of the ETM once the measure is fully-developed. However, it is important to look at the practical value of the general issue explored in this study: the teacher-student relations. As discussed in Chapter One, Lightbown (2000) argues that until today, ESL as a field continues to struggle while trying to reconcile the theoretical foundations of linguistics provided by SLA with the practices developed by Language Pedagogy and also with the reality of the ESL classroom. Lightbown goes further to suggest that historically language teaching-learning theory and practice were developing independently from each other. While the “history factor” can partially explain the problem currently faced by ESL, there is another factor that stems from the issue faced by the field of education in general.

When talking about the current state of education in the USA, Fishman and McCarthy (1998) claims that educational philosophers, such as Dewey, share a strong belief that their philosophies can be applied to various educational contexts in a variety of ways. However, Fishman and McCarthy also suggest that for a teacher, who is not adequately prepared, an opportunity for creative application of a theoretical framework often turns into a personal struggle, which might result into a severe distortion and/or abandonment of the theory altogether. Along the same lines, Landsman (2009) argues that “Our teacher training institutions can… be vigilant in their demands: for openness, for knowledge of subject matter, and for grasp of diversity and inclusive education” (p. 130). However, Landsman does not believe that currently teacher training institutions are successful in creating teachers capable of making a difference through their teaching;
thus, he urges those institutions as well as practicing educators to rethink this profession [and] redefine it” (p. 130). In other words, Fishman and McCarthy and Landsman agree on the fact that there is a gap between theory and practice in the field of education and that teachers are expected to bridge this gap through their experiences in both theory and practice. However, the contemporary teacher-training institutions frequently fail to prepare future teachers for the practical challenges of teaching; thus, practicing teachers frequently abandon the philosophical principles of the profession and focus on keeping up with their daily routines.

The practical challenges faced by ESL teachers are even more serious than those experienced by teachers in other fields because, as discussed in Chapter One, the make-up of ESL student population strongly depends on the global geo-political and economic environments (Cooper, 1999; MacKillop, 1983; Maull & Pick, 1989). Therefore, socio-cultural background and demographic characteristics of students arriving to study at MLI might vary significantly from year to year; and ESL instructors frequently have to modify their teaching styles and educational materials in a reactive rather than proactive manner (B. Sayers, personal communication, December 4, 2007). Overall, the challenges faced by MLI are not unique to the institution or two the field of second language teaching and learning. In fact, the field of education faces a similar problem of a disconnect between theory and practice; and the professional group that is expected to resolve this issues, teachers, is not always adequately prepared for or supported through the challenges of the real-life practices and, unable to cope with theoretical advancement and practical workload at the same time, tend to abandon the former in favor of the latter.
In a search for the force with a potential to address the abovementioned challenge aside from practicing teachers, the field of Education turned to a new discipline Educational Foundations, which resides partially in academia and partially in the real world of everyday professional practices. Shulman (1990) argues, “The answer was to put it in the university and provide an academic foundation for practice” (pp. 3-4). Burgess (1984) goes further to state that the social foundations of education can furnish teacher training with “the broad basis of psychology, logic, history, literature, and philology… to give it the life and energy for an ever continuing development” (pp. 15-16). Both authors highlight the dual nature of social foundations as the key to its potential because the discipline merges the developments in both academia and practice while avoiding the mono-perspective of either of the spheres (Burgess; Shulman). By balancing theory and practice while still engaged in a detailed exploration of both, social foundations helps educational practitioners recognize and overcome the barriers that might prevent them from implementing educational ideals in real life classrooms.

Marrying theory and practice is only one advantage of the social foundations of education. Tozer, Senese and Violas (2006) argued that “historical perspective, philosophical insight, and sociological knowledge” were required components of the social foundations of education as the foundation for professional educators‘ ability to understand “the larger society in which schools are embedded (p. 4). Landsman (2009) goes further to say that the trainees in the social foundations of education should be also exposed to economy, politics, and cultural studies otherwise their perspective will not develop as truly multi-level. Green (1989) concludes that to be able to make a difference in their student‘s life educators not only have to know their subject matter but should also
be able to ‘make sense of the impinging world’ (p. 143). Because of its unique position as a liaison among various disciplines and in addition to bringing together theory and practice, the social foundations of education also borrows from various disciplines to enrich the field of Education by enhancing the intelligence of the fields‘ practitioners.

TESOL is another proof that the above combination defines a successful discipline. As discussed earlier with the reference to Wedell (2003), the success of TESOL in achieving its practical goals as its early stages of development as a discipline laid in the fact that TESOL was borrowing intelligence from a variety of governmental agencies and from some very practical disciplines such as, for example, marketing and management. TESOL‘s problematic feature is a somewhat scarce inter-disciplinary dialogue with SLA and limited reliance on the theoretical knowledge accumulated by it (Hinkel, 20006). However, TESOL compensates these deficiencies by focusing on and learning from human interactions of the members of the teaching-learning process.

Coming from a social foundations of education background, the researcher shares the opinion that the disciplines that have a potential to contribute the most to their respective fields of study are considerate of the academic value of the new ideas, have a good understanding of the practice, and are able to freely draw from other disciplines in their field or otherwise. And this study was conceived as a research that merges theory and practice in the field of SLA while also considering knowledge accumulated by other disciplines. This study was inspired by the researcher‘s personal experience as an ESL student and then as an ESL instructor. While the research focused on a narrowly-defined practical issue, the researcher explored current theoretical trends in SLA, TESOL, Educational Foundation, management, marketing, psychology, and sociology in a search
for a possible theoretical framework that will help to address that issue. The researcher
developed the study through a multidisciplinary approach and expects the outcomes to
have theoretical and practical value. To summarize, the study was designed not only to
follow a theoretical trend currently important in SLA but also was looking at this trend in
a manner applied to many of contemporary studies: by exploring and connecting the
findings about a specific issue done by various, sometimes not even related, disciplines. It
is the researcher’s belief that such an approach gave the study a deeper insight, which
will allow the research, at its conclusion, to contribute the SLA and, possibly, the social
foundations of education.

Conclusions

According to Apple (1979), “one does not accept the illusions of the epoch, the
participants’ own commonsense appraisals of their intellectual and programmatic
activities (…); rather, the investigator must situate these activities in a larger arena of
economic, sociological, and social conflict” (p. 13). Apple goes on to argue that
education as a field of study does not have a strong tradition in such ‘situating’” and,
therefore, cannot arm incoming teachers to recognize and employ educational context in
their favor. Luckily for SLA, it was initiated as a response to a specific context, which
made ‘situating’ a part of the discipline not a separate field of knowledge. The
contemporary SLA faces a number of problems not because of the lack of situating but
rather because there are several layers of situating. The general situating is done at the
level of SLA; it provides an umbrella framework for understanding the theoretical view
on the SLA context. A more detailed situating is performed by TESOL and is unique for
each country; this situating provides useful practical framework but the big picture it
creates is fragmented and lacks cohesion. ESL provides a third, also unique, layer of situating by bringing TESOL students to an English-language environment alien to them and their socio-cultural background. The researcher believes that the best contribution to the development of SLA can be done by a study that would suggest a way to tie together the “layers of situating” by merging the current trends in the field of Education and in disciplines related to English teaching and learning. This specific study suggests the strategy for bridging theory and practice and also for borrowing successful/useful ideas from other unrelated disciplines (such as business leadership and marketing). While the ETM development process is still in its infancy and the measure require further calibration, the outcomes of the pilot study and the analysis of the utility of this measure show that the researcher’s vision has a merit and a potential to make an important contribution to ESL theory and practices.
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Appendix A

Pilot Study Instrument

Q 1: Please, think about the American instructor, whom you like. Do you agree that the following characteristics of this instructor contribute to the good relationships between you and this instructor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Instructor understands students' cultural background</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Instructor knows that it is a challenge to be an international student in a foreign country</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Instructor has a good knowledge of what is acceptable and what is not in the American educational environment</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instructor makes learning interesting</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instructor enjoys the fact that all students in ESL classroom are different</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Instructor provides emotional support and motivation to students when they feel frustrated</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Instructor informs students of what is acceptable and what is not in the American educational environment and encourages the students to follow the set of rules</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Instructor encourages students to share their unique experiences related to their life back home and in the USA with each other</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>During the class, the instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture or their personal experience and use those examples to explain the topic</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>It is easy to talk to the instructor in and outside the classroom, ask for advice, or discuss a topic that is important to the student(s).</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Instructor makes sure that his/her own behavior serves as an example for students' behavior</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Instructor offers more information than available in the textbook and is willing to stay after the class to help students understand a difficult topic or assignment</td>
<td>□4</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q 2: Think about the same American instructor that you like. Please, tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I do not mind if the instructor penalize me for my mistakes because s/he does it to improve my skills and not to humiliate me</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I take all courses this instructor offers and I recommend my friends and acquaintances to take courses with this instructor.</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I accept my grades without contest, even when they are low, because this instructor provides fair evaluation of my work every time</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I do not mind if my instructor decides on my class-schedule because my instructor knows what skills I need to learn to succeed</td>
<td>□1</td>
<td>□2</td>
<td>□3</td>
<td>□4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please, tell me a little about yourself:

How old are you? ___________________________years

Are you a male or a female?        □ Male        □ Female
What country are you from? ________________________________
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Figures: First Round of Instrument Calibrations

Figure 1.

*WinSteps: Round 1 of Instrument Calibrations Summary of Category Structure.*

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>OBSERVED</th>
<th>OBSVD SAMPLE</th>
<th>INFIT OUTFIT</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LABEL</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>% AVRGE EXPECT</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1.76</td>
<td>-1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|            |          |              |              |           |          |           |         |
| MISS       | 11       | 3             |              | -1.34     |          |           |         |

```

*NOTE: OBSERVED AVERAGE is mean of measures in category. It is not a parameter estimate.*
Figure 2.

WinSteps: Round 1 of Instrument Calibrations Map of Items

INPUT: 32 ESLSTUDENTS 12 Items MEASURED: 30 ESLSTUDENTS 12 Items 4 CATS 3.62.1

---

ESLSTUDENTS MAP OF Items

<more>|<rare>

4 +

| 10012

3 +

X | T

2 +

X |

1 XX S+ Instructor provides extra information and is willing to stay after the class

XX | Instructor knows the subject they teach (ESL) well

XXX |

XXXXXX |

XXX M| Instructor looking for the ways the students can expand their experiences

XX |

0 XXXX <M

X | Instructor enjoys the fact that all students in ESL classroom are different

XX S|

XX | Instructor shows understanding and support for the students’ experiences in the foreign country

XX | Instructor encourages the students to follow the set rules

Instructor has a good knowledge of what is acceptable in ESL context

-1 T+ Instructor understand students’ unique background

| Instructor knows how it feels to be an international student in a foreign country

| Instructor enjoys talking to students about the subject and about the students’ experiences

-2 +

<less>|<freq>
Appendix C

Figures: Second Round (Part I) of Instrument Calibrations

Figure 3.

_WinSteps: Round 2 Part 1 of Instrument Calibrations Summary Statistics of Participants and Items Separation and Reliability Scores_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF 19 MEASURED (EXTREME AND NON-EXTREME) ESLSTUDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL RMSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL RMSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. OF ESLSTUDENT MEAN = .66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = .95 (approximate due to missing data; CRONBACH ALPHA (KR-20) ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE RELIABILITY = .91 (approximate due to missing data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMMARY OF 12 MEASURED (NON-EXTREME) Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL RMSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL RMSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. OF Item MEAN = .55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES: Item RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = -.99 (approximate due to missing data);

192 DATA POINTS. APPROXIMATE LOG-LIKELIHOOD CHI-SQUARE: 275.92
**WinSteps: Round 2 Part 1 of Instrument Calibrations Summary of Category Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>OBSERVED</th>
<th>OBSVD SAMPLE</th>
<th>INFIT OUTFIT</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LABEL</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>AVRGE EXPECT</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**NOTE:** OBSERVED AVERAGE is mean of measures in category. It is not a parameter estimate.
Figure 5.

WinSteps: Round 2 Part 1 of Instrument Calibrations Summary of Category Structure

INPUT: 22 ESLSTUDENTS 12 Items MEASURED: 19 ESLSTUDENTS 12 Items 4 CATS 3.62.1

---------------------------------------------------------------

ESLSTUDENTS MAP OF Items

<more>|<rare>
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Instructor offers more information than available in the textbook and is willing to stay after the
Instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture or heir personal experience
M|S It is easy to talk to the instructor in and outside the classroom
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X     |  Instructor likes when students share their experiences related to learning with other students in t
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|          |
-1      +  Instructor makes learning easy and interesting
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Instructor knows how it feels to be an international student in a foreign country
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|7

~4

<less>|freq>
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Figures: Second Round (Part II) of Instrument Calibrations

Figure 6.

WinSteps: Round 2 Part 2 of Instrument Calibrations Summary Statistics of Participants and Items Separation and Reliability Scores

SUMMARY OF 17 MEASURED (EXTREME AND NON-EXTREME) ESLSTUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAW</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>INFIT</th>
<th>OUTFIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX.</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REAL RMSE: 1.21  ADJ.SD: 2.00  SEPARATION: 1.66  ESLSTU RELIABILITY: .73
MODEL RMSE: 1.19  ADJ.SD: 2.01  SEPARATION: 1.68  ESLSTU RELIABILITY: .74
S.E. OF ESLSTUDENT MEAN = .59

NOTES: ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = .93 (approximate due to missing data); CRONBACH ALPHA (KR-20) ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE RELIABILITY = .91 (approximate due to missing data)

SUMMARY OF 12 MEASURED (NON-EXTREME) Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAW</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>INFIT</th>
<th>OUTFIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX.</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL RMSE</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>ADJ SD</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL RMSE</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>ADJ SD</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. OF Item MEAN</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: UMEAN=.000 USCALE=1.000; Item RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = -.91 (approximate due to missing data); 143 DATA POINTS. APPROXIMATE LOG-LIKELIHOOD CHI-SQUARE: 164.33
### WinSteps: Round 2 Part 2 of Instrument Calibrations Summary of Category Structure

**SUMMARY OF CATEGORY STRUCTURE. Model="R"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>OBSERVED</th>
<th>OBSVD SAMPLE</th>
<th>INFIT OUTFIT</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>label</td>
<td>score</td>
<td>count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>avrge expect</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>-.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** OBSERVED AVERAGE is mean of measures in category. It is not a parameter estimate.
Figure 8.

WinSteps: Round 2 Part 2 of Instrument Calibrations Map of Items

INPUT: 20 ESLSTUDENTS 12 Items MEASURED: 17 ESLSTUDENTS 12 Items 3 CATS 3.62.1

ESLSTUDENTS MAP OF Items

<more>|<rare>
5 XXXXX +
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 |
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S |
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 |
 |
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 |
S |
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 |
|
X |
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X |
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 |
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Instructor knows the subject they teach (ESL) well
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Figures: Third Round of Instrument Calibrations

Figure 9.

WinSteps: Round 3 Summary Statistics Of Participants and Items Separation and Reliability Scores

INPUT: 24 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items MEASURED: 24 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items 4 CATS 3.62.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAW</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>INFIT</th>
<th>OUTFIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>MEASURE</td>
<td>ERROR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX.</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>-5.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REAL RMSE: .58 ADJ.SD: 1.59 SEPARATION: 2.75 ESLSTU RELIABILITY: .88
MODEL RMSE: .54 ADJ.SD: 1.60 SEPARATION: 2.95 ESLSTU RELIABILITY: .90
S.E. OF ESLSTUDENT MEAN = .35

VALID RESPONSES: 98.4%

NOTES: ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = .97 (approximate due to missing data); CRONBACH ALPHA (KR-20) ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE RELIABILITY = .86 (approximate due to missing data)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>59.6</th>
<th>23.6</th>
<th>.00</th>
<th>.45</th>
<th>.95</th>
<th>-.2</th>
<th>1.31</th>
<th>.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX.</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>-5.46</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REAL RMSE</th>
<th>.47</th>
<th>ADJ.SD</th>
<th>3.56</th>
<th>SEPARATION</th>
<th>7.64</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>RELIABILITY</th>
<th>.98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MODEL RMSE</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>ADJ.SD</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>SEPARATION</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>RELIABILITY</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. OF Item MEAN</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-----------------------------

MOTES: UMEAN=.000 USCALE=1.000; Item RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = -1.00

(approximate due to missing data); 378 DATA POINTS. APPROXIMATE LOG-LIKELIHOOD CHI-SQUARE: 476.78
Figure 10.

*WinSteps: Round 3 of Instrument Calibrations Summary of Category Structure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>OBSERVED</th>
<th>OBSVD SAMPLE</th>
<th>INFIT OUTFIT</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LABEL</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>COUNT %</td>
<td>AVRGE EXPECT</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73 19</td>
<td>-5.12 -5.19</td>
<td>.96 .94</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114 30</td>
<td>-2.07 -1.93</td>
<td>.94 1.53</td>
<td>-4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112 29</td>
<td>2.25 2.11</td>
<td>.96 1.48</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>79 21</td>
<td>4.72 4.78</td>
<td>.95 .95</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: OBSERVED AVERAGE is mean of measures in category. It is not a parameter estimate.
Figure 11.

**WinSteps: Round 3 of Instrument Calibrations Map of Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESLSTUDENTS MAP OF ITEMS</th>
<th>&lt;more&gt;</th>
<th>&lt;rare&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I accept my grades without contest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I let my instructor decide on my schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I recommend this instructor's courses to my friends</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I let the instructor penalize me for my mistakes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor provides extra information and is willing to stay after the class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor's behavior serves as an example for the students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>It is easy to talk to the instructor in and outside the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>XXXX M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor likes when students share their experiences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor encourages students to follow a set of rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XX S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor encourages the students when they feel frustrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor enjoys the fact that all students in ESL classroom are different</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor has a good knowledge of what is acceptable in ESL context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor makes learning simple and interesting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor knows how it feels to be an international student</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructor understand students’ unique background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;less&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;freq&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Figures: Pilot Study Total Sample Analysis

Figure 12.

*WinSteps: Pilot Study Summary Statistics of Participants and Items Separation and Reliability Scores for the Total Sample*

### SUMMARY OF 24 MEASURED ESLSTUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RAW</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>INFIT</th>
<th>OUTFIT</th>
<th>INFIT</th>
<th>OUTFIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>MEASURE</td>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
<td>ZSTD</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX.</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL RMSE</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>ADJ.SD</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>SEPARATION</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>ESLSTU RELIABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL RMSE</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>ADJ.SD</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>SEPARATION</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>ESLSTU RELIABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. OF ESLSTUDENT MEAN = .22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DELETED: 6 ESLSTUDENTS

VALID RESPONSES: 99.0%

NOTES: ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = .95 (approximate due to missing data); CRONBACH ALPHA (KR-20) ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE RELIABILITY = .87 (approximate due to missing data)

### SUMMARY OF 16 MEASURED Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RAW</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>INFIT</th>
<th>OUTFIT</th>
<th>INFIT</th>
<th>OUTFIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>COUNT</td>
<td>MEASURE</td>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
<td>ZSTD</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX.</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN.</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL RMSE</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>ADJ.SD</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>SEPARATION</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL RMSE</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>ADJ.SD</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>SEPARATION</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. OF Item MEAN</td>
<td>= 0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+-----------------------------------------------------------------------------+

NOTES: UMEAN=.000 USCALE=1.000; Item RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = -0.99 (approximate due to missing data); 380 DATA POINTS. APPROXIMATE LOG-LIKELIHOOD CHI-SQUARE: 647.75
Figure 13.

**WinSteps: Pilot Study Summary of Category Structure for Total Sample**

INPUT: 30 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items MEASURED: 24 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items 4 CATS 3.62.1

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>OBSERVED</th>
<th>OBSVD SAMPLE</th>
<th>INFIT OUTFIT</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LABEL</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>COUNT %</td>
<td>AVRGE EXPECT</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MISSING

4   1   1.51

NOTE: OBSERVED AVERAGE is mean of measures in category. It is not a parameter estimate.
Figure 14.

WinSteps: Pilot Study Map of Items for Total Sample

INPUT: 30 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items MEASURED: 24 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items 4 CATS 3.62.1

ESLSTUDENTS MAP OF Items
<more>|<rare>

4  +
   |
   |
   ?|
   X |
3  XX +
   |T LTCOM I do not mind if my instructor decides on my class-schedule
   |
   XX S|
   XX | LTINT I accept my grades without contest
   LTRSP I do not mind if the instructor penalizes me
2  +
   X |
   X | LTBBH I take all courses this instructor offers

XXXX M|S
   XX |
   1  +
   XX |
   XX |
   X |
   X S|

0  +M BHCOM Instructor offers extra information and extra time to help students
   X | EMBRH Instructor provides emotional support and motivation
      | BHINT Instructor's behavior serves as an example
      CGRSP Instructor understands students' cultural background
      EMRSP Instructor enjoys that all students are different
   XX | CGERS Instructor knows the challenge of being an international student
   CGCOM Instructor makes learning interesting
   T|

-1  + CGINT Instructor knows what is acceptable in educational environment
   EMINT Instructor informs students of what is acceptable in a classroom
      | BHBBH Instructor is approachable
   S |
   | BHRSF Instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture
   HCOM Instructor encourages students to share their unique experiences

-2  +
   <less>|< freq>
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Figures: Pilot Study Female Students Sub-Sample Analysis

Figure 15.

WinSteps: Pilot Study Summary Statistics of Participants and Items Separation and Reliability Scores for Females

INPUT: 14 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items MEASURED: 12 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items 4 CATS 3.62.1

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------
SUMMARY OF 12 MEASURED ESLSTUDENTS
+-----------------------------------------------------------------------------+
|           RAW                          MODEL         INFIT        OUTFIT    |
|          SCORE     COUNT     MEASURE   ERROR      MNSQ   ZSTD   MNSQ   ZSTD    |
+-----------------------------------------------------------------------------+
| MEAN      49.8      15.9        1.31     .39      1.00     .1    .97     .0   |
| S.D.       3.7        .3         .64     .04       .28     .8    .29     .8   |
| MAX.      55.0      16.0        2.62     .49      1.49    1.5   1.52    1.5   |
| MIN.      43.0      15.0         .34     .35       .48   -1.6    .51   -1.3   |
+-----------------------------------------------------------------------------+

| REAL RMSE    .41  ADJ.SD     .49  SEPARATION  1.19  ESLSTU RELIABILITY  .59 |
| MODEL RMSE   .39  ADJ.SD     .50  SEPARATION  1.29  ESLSTU RELIABILITY  .63 |
| S.E. OF ESLSTUDENT MEAN = .19                                                |
+-----------------------------------------------------------------------------+

DELETED:      2 ESLSTUDENTS

VALID RESPONSES:  99.5%
NOTES: ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = .95 (approximate due to missing data); CRONBACH ALPHA (KR-20) ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE RELIABILITY = .45 (approximate due to missing data)

SUMMARY OF 16 MEASURED Items
+-----------------------------------------------------------------------------+
|           RAW                          MODEL         INFIT        OUTFIT    |
|          SCORE     COUNT     MEASURE   ERROR      MNSQ   ZSTD   MNSQ   ZSTD    |
+-----------------------------------------------------------------------------+)

203
| MEAN   | 37.4 | 11.9 | .00 | .45 | 1.03 | .1 | .97 | .0 |
| S.D.   | 6.4  | .2   | 1.09 | .06 | .39 | 1.1 | .35 | 1.0 |
| MAX.   | 44.0 | 12.0 | 2.01 | .55 | 1.92 | 1.9 | 1.69 | 1.4 |
| MIN.   | 25.0 | 11.0 | -1.21 | .38 | .29 | -2.7 | .30 | -2.6 |
| REAL RMSE | .49 | ADJ.SD | .98 | SEPARATION | 1.98 | Item | RELIABILITY | .80 |
| MODEL RMSE | .46 | ADJ.SD | 1.00 | SEPARATION | 2.18 | Item | RELIABILITY | .83 |
| S.E. OF Item MEAN | .28 |

NOTES: UMEAN=.000 USCALE=1.000; Item RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = -.98 (approximate due to missing data); 191 DATA POINTS. APPROXIMATE LOG-LIKELIHOOD CHI-SQUARE: 349.77
Figure 16.

WinSteps: Pilot Study Summary of Category Structure for Female Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>OBSERVED</th>
<th>OBSVD SAMPLE</th>
<th>INFIT OUTFIT</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LABEL</td>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>COUNT %</td>
<td>AVERGE EXPECT</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1   1      10   5</td>
<td>-.17  -.67</td>
<td>1.58  1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>( -2.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2   2      36  19</td>
<td>.03   .14</td>
<td>.86   .78</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3   3      64  33</td>
<td>1.13  1.25</td>
<td>1.05   .94</td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   4      81  42</td>
<td>2.16  2.08</td>
<td>.85   .90</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>(  2.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING   1   1</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: OBSERVED AVERAGE is mean of measures in category. It is not a parameter estimate.
Figure 17.

WinSteps: Pilot Study Summary of Category Structure for Female Students

INPUT: 14 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items MEASURED: 12 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items 4 CATS 3.62.1

-------------------------------------
ESLSTUDENTS MAP OF Items
<more>|<rare>
3    +
   |
   |
X 7|
   |
   |T
2   X S+ LTCOM I do not mind if my instructor decides on my class-schedule
XX | LTRSP I do not mind if the instructor penalize me
   | LTINT I accept my grades without contest
X  |
   |
M| LTBBH I take all courses this instructor offers
XX |S
1   XX +
   |
XX S|
   | RNCOM Instructor offers extra information and extra time to help students
   |
X  |
   |
0   T+M
   | CGCOM Instructor makes learning interesting
   | CGRSP Instructor understands students' cultural background
   | EMBBH Instructor provides emotional support and motivation
   |
   | BHBHR Instructor is approachable
   |
   | BHRSP Instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture
   | CGHSB Instructor knows the a challenge of being an international student
   | EMSP Instructor enjoys that all students are different
   |
-1  + BHINT Instructor's behavior serves as an example
   | S CGINT Instructor knows what is acceptable in educational environment
   | EMCOM Instructor encourages students to share their unique experiences
   | EMINT Instructor informs students of what is acceptable in a classroom
   |
   |
   |
-------------------------------------
| -2 | +

<less> <freq>
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Figures: Pilot Study Male Students Sub-Sample Analysis

Figure 18.

WinSteps: Pilot Study Summary Statistics of Participants and Items Separation and Reliability Scores for Males

INPUT: 16 ESLSTUDENTS  16 Items  MEASURED: 13 ESLSTUDENTS  16 Items  4 CATS 3.62.1

SUMMARY OF 13 MEASURED ESLSTUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RAW</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>INFIT</th>
<th>OUTFIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>MEASURE</td>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>INFIT</td>
<td>OUTFIT</td>
<td>INFIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAW</td>
<td>MEASURE</td>
<td>ERROR</td>
<td>MNSQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL</td>
<td>INFIT</td>
<td>OUTFIT</td>
<td>INFIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAL RMSE</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>ADJ.SD</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODEL RMSE</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>ADJ.SD</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. OF ESLSTUDENT MEAN = .44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DELETE: 3 ESLSTUDENTS

VALID RESPONSES: 97.6%

NOTES: ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = .96 (approximate due to missing data); CRONBACH ALPHA (KR-20) ESLSTUDENT RAW SCORE RELIABILITY = .94 (approximate due to missing data)
| MEAN      | 36.2      | 12.7      | 0.00 | 0.52 | 0.99 | 0.0 | 0.99 | 0.0 |
| S.D.       | 7.2        | 0.5       | 1.73 | 0.02 | 0.43 | 1.1 | 0.41 | 1.0 |
| MAX.      | 44.0      | 13.0       | 3.50 | 0.55 | 2.11 | 2.3 | 1.98 | 2.1 |
| MIN.      | 21.0      | 12.0       | -1.76 | 0.48 | 0.30 | -2.2 | 0.30 | -2.0 |
| REAL RMSE | 0.56      | ADJ.SD 1.64 | SEPARATION 2.92 | Item RELIABILITY 0.90 |
| MODEL RMSE | 0.52      | ADJ.SD 1.65 | SEPARATION 3.20 | Item RELIABILITY 0.91 |
| S.E. OF Item MEAN | .45 | |

NOTES: UMEAN=.000 USCALE=1.000; Item RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = -.99 (approximate due to missing data); 203 DATA POINTS. APPROXIMATE LOG-LIKELIHOOD CHI-SQUARE: 316.46
Figure 19.

**WinSteps: Pilot Study Summary of Category Structure for Male Students**

INPUT: 16 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items MEASURED: 13 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items 4 CATS 3.62.1

| CATEGORY OBSERVED|OBSVD SAMPLE|INFIT OUTFIT||STRUCTURE|CATEGORY|
|-------------------+------------+------------++---------+--------|
|LABEL SCORE COUNT %|AVRGE EXPECT| MNSQ MNSQ||CALIBRATN| MEASURE|
|-------------------+------------+------------++---------+--------|
| 1 1 17 8| -2.94 -2.73| .78 .79|| NONE |( -3.96)| 1 |
| 2 2 50 24| -.35 -.56| 1.04 1.00|| -2.81 | -1.43 | 2 |
| 3 3 82 39| 1.28 1.40| 1.22 1.18|| -.01 | 1.42 | 3 |
| 4 4 54 26| 3.50 3.43| .85 .87|| 2.82 |( 3.97)| 4 |
|-------------------+------------+------------++---------+--------|
|MISSING 5 2| -.18 | | | |

**NOTE:** OBSERVED AVERAGE is mean of measures in category. It is not a parameter estimate.
Figure 20.

**WinSteps: Pilot Study Map of Items for Male Students**

INPUT: 16 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items MEASURED: 13 ESLSTUDENTS 16 Items 4 CATS 3.62.1

| ESLSTUDENTS MAP OF Items | <more>|<rare> |
|--------------------------|----------------|
| 4                        | + |
| XX                      | LTCOM I do not mind if my instructor decides on my class-schedule |
| | T |
| 3                        | X + LTRSP I do not mind if the instructor penalizes me |
| | S | LTINT I accept my grades without contest |
| 2                        | X | LTBBH I take all courses this instructor offers |
| | S |
| | |
| 1                        | M+ |
| XX                      | |
| X | |
| | |
| X | BHINT Instructor’s behavior makes serves as an example |
| 0                        | +M EMRSP Instructor enjoys that all students are different |
| X | EMBBH Instructor provides emotional support and motivation |
| X | S | |
| | CGRSP Instructor understands students’ cultural background |
| XX                      | |
| -1                       | + CGBBH Instructor knows the a challenge of being an international student |
| ENINT Instructor informs students of what is acceptable in a classroom |
| BHCOM Instructor offers extra information and extra time to help students |
| CDOM Instructor makes learning interesting |
| CGINT Instructor knows what is acceptable in educational environment |
| | |
| | S BHBBH Instructor is approachable |
| BHRSP Instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture |
| EMCOM Instructor encourages students to share their unique experiences |
| -2                       | 7+ |

| <less>|<freq> |
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Figures: Pilot Study Sub-Sample Comparison between Male and Female Students

Figure 21. Differential Item Functioning (DIF) Bias Analysis by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>MEASURE S.E.</th>
<th>CLASS</th>
<th>MEASURE S.E.</th>
<th>CONTRAST S.E.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.28 .48 M</td>
<td>-.39 .49</td>
<td>.10 .68 .15</td>
<td>21 .8821</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CGRSP Instructor understands students’ cultural background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.52 .49 M</td>
<td>-.66 .47</td>
<td>.14 .68 .21</td>
<td>22 .8394</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CBBBH Instructor knows the challenge of being an international student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.34 .59 M</td>
<td>-.89 .49</td>
<td>-.45 .76 -.59</td>
<td>21 .5614</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>CGINT Instructor knows what is acceptable in educational environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.28 .48 M</td>
<td>-1.16 .53</td>
<td>.87 .71 1.22</td>
<td>21 .2343</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>CCOM Instructor makes learning interesting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.77 .51 M</td>
<td>-.02 .45</td>
<td>-.75 .68 -1.10</td>
<td>22 .2839</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EMRSP Instructor enjoys that all students are different</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.06 .46 M</td>
<td>-.23 .46</td>
<td>.16 .65 .25</td>
<td>22 .8041 .3173 +</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>EMBBH Instructor provides emotional support and motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.37 .59 M</td>
<td>-.66 .47</td>
<td>-.71 .75 -.94</td>
<td>22 .3571 .3173 +</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>EMINT Instructor informs students of what is acceptable in educational env.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-2.24 .77 M</td>
<td>-1.39 .52</td>
<td>-.85 .92 -.92</td>
<td>22 .3674</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ENCOM Instructor encourages students to share their unique experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-1.74 .65 M</td>
<td>-1.39 .52</td>
<td>-.36 .83 -.43</td>
<td>22 .6721</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>BRSSP Instructor often asks students to give examples from their culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-1.05 .54 M</td>
<td>-1.39 .52</td>
<td>.34 .75 .45</td>
<td>22 .6555 .3173 -</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>BHBBH Instructor is approachable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>-.77 .51 M</td>
<td>.07 .47</td>
<td>-.84 .70 -1.21</td>
<td>21 .2398</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>BINT Instructor’s behavior makes serves as an example</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.55 .44 M</td>
<td>-.66 .47</td>
<td>1.20 .65 1.86</td>
<td>22 .0758</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>BHCN Instructor offers extra information and extra time to help students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.01 .42 M</td>
<td>2.56 .47</td>
<td>-.55 .64 -.86</td>
<td>22 .4007</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>LTRSP I do not mind if the instructor penalize me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.83 .42 M</td>
<td>1.53 .44</td>
<td>.30 .61 .50</td>
<td>22 .6240 .3173 -</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>LTBHH I take all courses this instructor offers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.56 .43 M</td>
<td>1.92 .45</td>
<td>.64 .62 1.02</td>
<td>22 .3166</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>LTINT I accept my grades without contest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.75 .44 M</td>
<td>2.79 .49</td>
<td>-.04 .65 -.06</td>
<td>22 .3554</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>LTCOM I do not mind if my instructor decides on my class-schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Size of Mantel-Haenszel slice = .100 logits