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This thesis investigates the causal attributions that students make for teacher behaviour towards them, with the focus being on behaviour likely to be considered “negative.” The term “causal attributions” refers to the causes that people give for the behaviour of others (and themselves). Causal attributions impact on emotions and behaviour and, as a consequence, can have a powerful influence upon individuals and those with whom they live and work. Attribution theory was prominent within the 1980s, although originated before this time. Despite this, interest in attribution theory has endured and the theory continues to be applied in research from a range of different disciplines.

Although earlier studies have investigated causal attributions within schools, these have often focused upon the causal attributions of teachers. Few studies have focused upon the causal attributions of students and a limited number have focused upon the causal attributions that students make for teacher behaviour. Following an extensive literature review, no studies were found which investigated the relevance of Weiner’s models (e.g., Weiner 1995; 2006; 2010) to student causal attributions for “negative” teacher behaviour towards them, including the impact upon the students’ emotions and the level of responsibility assigned to teachers as a result of the behaviour.

Participants comprised over three hundred Year 10 students from three secondary schools within a north-west local authority who completed a questionnaire containing a scenario and both open-ended questions and those which require scaling of responses. Following this, a follow-up study was designed and this was piloted with a further eight Y10 students to gain their experiences and views of completing the questionnaire.

The results of the research suggested that, overall, students attributed the “negative” teacher behaviour to external influences (mainly “stress”) and that, on the whole, they would feel “anger” as a result of the behaviour. The results do not fully support the tenets of attribution theory in general, nor those of Weiner in particular. However, based on the results of the research presented in this thesis, potential extensions to Weiner’s theories and models are proposed and methodological issues relating to exploring attributions are discussed, as are suggestions for future research.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

My interest in attribution theory began as a result of (i) observing the effects of causal attributions within interpersonal relationships (in a range of contexts including in the workplace and educational settings), (ii) its wide application to different areas of human experience and (iii) its connection to mental health and therapeutic interventions. Causal attributions are the causes that we assign to explain the behaviour of ourselves and others, as illustrated in the following examples.

An example of the role of causal attributions with an educational setting would be the case of an educational psychologist (EP) speaking to a parent/carer and/or teacher about a student's performance in an assessment. Imagine that the child was referred to the Educational Psychology Service due to a desire for the school to access additional resources for him or her from the local authority. Also imagine that the parent/carer and/or teacher believe that the EP has some influence in enabling the school to gain these additional resources. The EP might consider that s/he is being helpful by conducting an assessment and providing information about the local authority criteria for allocating resources to students (including that the student’s skills are too advanced to warrant additional support from the local authority), whereas the parent/carer and/or teacher might attribute the comments to a desire to hinder access to resources. Of course, if the parent/carer and/or teacher attribute the EP’s comments to him or her being helpful, they may feel gratitude. On the other hand, if the parent/carer and/or teacher attribute the EP’s comments to some unspoken local authority desire to limit spending funds, they may feel anger. The impact of the causal attribution on the emotions (and, potentially, the behaviour) of the parents/carers and teacher is evident.

A recent example of the causal attributions which might be made by a professional in Social Care was recently discussed with me. This involved a Social Worker visiting a home and being concerned that the mother spent a large proportion of her limited income on using the tumble dryer to dry her children’s clothes (it was explained to me that, “The only piece of furniture was a tumble dryer in the middle of the room”). The initial attributions to this might be, for example, “This mother is unable to manage her money”, “This mother wastes money on luxuries”; “This mother is unable to prioritise”, with the possible emotional response of the Social Worker being frustration, irritation, annoyance, etc. However, following it being explained that, above all else, this
mother makes sure that her children are sent to school in clean clothes, the causal attribution for her behaviour might change to, “This mother takes pride in her children”; “This mother cares about her children”, with the subsequent emotional response of the Social Worker potentially being empathy.

Another example of how causal attributions might influence emotion and behaviour is illustrated via this second, factual example. Whilst waiting in a secondary school reception shortly after nine o’clock one Monday morning, I noticed a young student walk in (clearly, a few minutes late). Before he could report his presence at the reception area, one member of staff, who was walking past, stated loudly, “Let’s hope you are going to have a better week this week, or there will be consequences!” (or words to that effect). Clearly, the student had made a reasonably good start to the week by turning up almost on time and, apparently, without causing any problems. This observation left me wondering how the student might feel following this affront and how this might impact on his behaviour. He might have reflected that, “That teacher never gives me a chance”, “The teachers in this school want me to be excluded”, or, “The teachers in this school hate me”, etc. It would be reasonable to assume that he might feel angry or, at least, disgruntled (due to being admonished, despite apparently behaving well). We could reflect that the event might adversely impact upon his behaviour for the rest of the day (or beyond the day) and, subsequently, damage his relationship with this member of staff. If he receives similar comments in the future from the same, or other, members of staff, he might eventually become less engaged and more oppositional in school in general.

Student behaviour in school can be a challenge for teachers and result in a number of negative consequences including a significant amount of teacher time and school management time in responding to this but, also, in terms of potential stress levels of staff (see Miller, 1994), disruption to education (of peers and the student him/herself) and in funding alternative placements (which might involve additional costs due to factors such as the need for higher adult-student ratios, running costs of other buildings, transport costs and purchasing alternative training opportunities). Although behavioural interventions can be very successful in modifying behaviour, these are frequently unsuccessful, with possible reasons being ineffective rewards/sanctions and, also, difficulties in identifying appropriate and effective rewards/sanctions for older students (in my experience, “catching them being good” and Star Charts, for example, are not as effective as for younger students). In this research, it is argued that a greater knowledge and understanding of the consequences of teacher behaviour in school may aid the establishment and maintenance of positive
relationships. It is the causal attributions that students make for “negative” teacher behaviour towards them, together with their anticipated emotional responses, which is the main focus of this research, based on Weiner’s (e.g., 1995; 2006; 2010) theories and models (recently referred to as his theory of social motivation (see Weiner, 2010)).

1.2 Attribution Theory: An Overview

As stated earlier, the term “causal attributions” refers to the explanations that people give for the causes of the behaviour of themselves and others. Other terms are used to describe similar phenomena including (i) “explanatory attributions” and (ii) “interpersonal attributions”. As might be expected, (i) refers to a situation when explanation might be sought for an event such as having a puncture in a car tyre and (ii) might take place when decisions are being made about people’s behaviour towards each other. However, the term “causal attributions” might be more applicable when we are looking for the causes of behaviour. “Causal attributions” might include components of both (i) and (ii) and it is this category of “causal attributions” which is adopted in this thesis. However, the terms “attributions” and “causal attribution(s)” appear to be used interchangeably within the literature and, when the term “attribution” is used in this thesis, unless otherwise stated, this refers to the “causal attributions” which people make to explain either their own behaviour or that of others. Although there are a number of definitions of attributions and explanations of this area of research, the following are provided as examples:

Jones et al (1971):

“Attribution theory deals with the rules the average individual uses in attempting to infer the causes of observed behavior.” (Jones et al, op cit, p x)

Forsterling (2001):

“Attribution research … is concerned with the particularity of human beings to perceive the causes of events and to make causal inferences …” (Forsterling, op cit, p. 1)
Attribution theory … is a theory (or, better, a group of theories) about how common sense operates or, in other words, about how the “man (or woman) in the street” explains events and the psychological consequences of such explanations.” (Forsterling, op cit, p 3, 4).

Attribution theory, then, is not concerned with the causes of behaviour but with the attributions for the causes of behaviour. Humans are likely to make causal attributions frequently during a normal day and, therefore, the theory has wide relevance, as confirmed by Forsterling (op cit):

“… attribution theory is concerned with the processes that make our everyday circumstances understandable, predictable, and controllable, and, hence, the insights of attribution research are applicable to a wide area of domains such as achievement, love, health, friendship, and pathology.” (Forsterling, op cit, p 4)

Although it is suggested that we make attributions in order to make sense of behaviour and to help make our social environment more predictable, these do not exist in isolation. They impact on a person’s emotions and, hence, on his or her behaviour. A simple example of this would be:

Imagine you see a man staggering and, then, falling over in the street. You might make one of two causal attributions:

i. He is drunk. The subsequent emotion felt by you might be disgust, followed by the behavioural response of walking past and not offering any help.

ii. He is ill. The subsequent emotion felt by you might be sympathy and the behavioural response to this might be helping him.

The causal attributions we make may impact upon our emotions and behaviour but, also, have implications for our self-protection and self-esteem. For example, the survival instinct/self-protection mechanism might be present in the case of a student who persistently fails an examination. S/he might come to one of many conclusions, e.g., (i) “I am not clever enough to pass”; (ii) “I don’t try hard enough”; (iii) “My tutor is
not very good”; (iv) “The subject matter is boring”; (v) “My talents lie elsewhere”. Clearly, there is likely to be a different emotional response to (i) than (iii), with (i) potentially resulting in feelings of depression, lowered self-esteem and a decision not to study anymore and (iii) resulting in feelings of anger but with self-esteem remaining intact and a decision made to continue studying, albeit on a different course of study.

Although attribution theorists view human beings as “naïve scientists” (Fincham and Hewstone, 2001) who process information in a systematic way, error and bias have been observed in these processes, partly due to attributions often being based on limited information and, also, due to the need to protect one’s own self-concept. Clearly, erroneous attributions about the causes of the behaviour of others also affect emotional responses and behaviour. This suggests that we may respond inappropriately (and potentially unhelpfully) following making an erroneous causal attribution. However, in addition to humans being considered to be “naïve scientists”, Weiner (e.g., 1995) suggests that they also take on the role of judges, with judgements being made about responsibility and blame.

As suggested earlier, attribution theory has been extended to many areas of human existence including work, health, motivation, achievement, friendships, marriage and family violence (including abusive relationships) and remains relevant today (e.g., see Weiner, Osborne and Rudolph, 2011). However, studying causal attributions not only aids the understanding and explanation of human behaviour but also has implications for interventions (e.g., Morrissey-Kane and Prinz, 1999; Sinha and Gupta, 2006). Similarly, attribution therapy focuses upon changing a person’s attributions in order to change behaviour. This contrasts with the behaviourist tradition of changing behaviour via focussing upon observable behaviour (with a focus upon rewards and sanctions), an approach which has, arguably, been prominent in schools in managing the difficult behaviour of students.

### 1.3 RATIONALE AND FOCUS OF THE RESEARCH

Following an extensive literature search, it appears that, to date, student attributions for negative teacher behaviour, and the impact of these upon their emotions, is an area that has not been widely researched. This research investigates the causal attributions that Year 10 students make for the “negative” behaviour of a teacher towards them and, in line with attribution theory, a focus is made upon whether the students attribute either “internal” or “external” causal attributions to the behaviour, as well as the extent that the students attribute “responsibility” for the behaviour. In
addition, the anticipated emotional responses of the students are sought, due to the potential effects of these on “acting-out” behaviour and self-esteem. These emotional responses are classified according to them being either “self-directed” or “other-directed”, e.g., with “shame” being a “self-directed” emotion and “envy” being an “other-directed” emotion (see Section 2.4.11 for an explanation). Although it was not possible to gain the potential behavioural responses of students via this research, these may be inferred or hypothesised following the emotional responses (e.g., if a student reported they were likely to feel “angry”, we might not expect a positive behavioural response from him/her).

A scenario depicting a negative situation was used in the research as it tends to be negative or unexpected situations, rather than positive ones, which we question in reality (e.g., we would not question why we walked to the shops without any mishap but we would question why we tripped and hurt ourselves; we would not question why we spent a pleasant evening with one of our friends but we might question why s/he continually has a reason not to meet anymore). This is confirmed by Weiner (2010) who states that a “negative, unexpected and/or important” event will result in a causal search (p 369).

It is anticipated that the results of this research will be useful in informing those involved in working with, and caring for, young people (e.g., classroom teachers, headteachers, psychologists, social workers, counsellors, parents/carers, etc.) of how adult actions (including their own) might be perceived by the young people with whom they work and live. The results, therefore, may have wide relevance.

1.4 **KEY LITERATURE**

Attribution Theory was a prominent area of research in the decades spanning the 1960s - 1980s and, as a result, the work of the more prominent theorists and researchers from this time is relevant to this thesis, together with more recent applications. These are outlined below and explained more fully in Chapter 2.

Attribution theory is considered to have originated with the work of Heider (e.g., 1958) by means of his distinction between “personal” and “impersonal” causality, with the former referring to an intentional act from a person and the latter referring to circumstances within the environment (although there has since been debate about the correct interpretation of Heider’s (1958) contribution, e.g., see Malle, 2011). Following this, Jones and Davis’s (1965) contribution to the field of attribution theory is
based on their “correspondent inference theory”, in which inferences about a person’s dispositions and intentions are made following observations of them.

Kelley (1967; 1971a; 1971b; 1973) added to this and proposed that the “man on the street” uses a scientific method to make decisions about others. He proposed the “covariation” model in which people are considered to make judgements about causes according to the factors present (or not present) at the time. He subsequently proposed the “configuration” model (Kelley, 1973) in which he suggested that people are able to make causal attributions based on little information according to assumptions made about the information that is available, i.e., by using “causal schemata” (see Section 2.3.3 for an explanation).

Despite these earlier contributions, Forsterling (op cit) credits Weiner (1995) with having provided the most thorough account of attributions and motivation in interpersonal behaviour and, similarly, Johnston and Ohan (2005) attest to the attention paid to Weiner’s work:

“Although judgments along a number of different causal dimensions are emphasized across attributional models and research programs, locus, control and stability are the three dimensions originally proposed by Weiner and are among those most consistently used throughout the decades.” (Johnston and Ohan, op cit, p 170-171)

Locus, control and stability are discussed in detail in Chapter 2 (see Sections 2.4.2; 2.4.3; 2.4.8). Bernard Weiner’s work (e.g., see Weiner, 2008, for a summary) has spanned a number of decades and, initially, was largely based on the causal attributions made for success and failure in academic tasks. However, he began to extend his work into other areas (see Weiner, 1980a) and has continued to do so (e.g., see Weiner, 1995; 2006). Weiner (see Weiner, 1979; Weiner et al, 1971) extended the “internal” and “external” causality proposed by Heider (1958), adding the dimensions of “stability” and “controllability”, i.e., referring to a cause being considered “stable” and/or “controllable”, which would impact on an observer’s response. He linked these dimensions to the metaphor of the courtroom and discussed the implications of “responsibility” and “blame” (Weiner, 1995).

It is Weiner’s work which has been used as the basis for the research in this thesis and, in particular, the models of causal attributions shown in Weiner (1995; 2006; 2010) are considered to be relevant, all of which are based on similar sequences,
although the different presentations include various levels of detail (see Appendix I). The following model is provided for the purposes of illustration at this stage:

**Figure 1: Weiner's (2010) Model**

Outcome $\rightarrow$ Cause $\rightarrow$ Causal controllability $\rightarrow$ Responsibility $\rightarrow$ Affect $\rightarrow$ Action

(Weiner, 2010, p 371)

If the example of the outcomes of an EP assessment given earlier (see Section 1:1) is used as an illustration, the following sequences would apply:

**Figure 2: Application of Weiner's (2010) model (i)**

**Outcome**: EP explanation

**Cause**: intention to hinder resource allocation

**Causal Controllability/Responsibility**: EP has control over decision and, therefore, responsibility

**Affect**: anger

**Action**: objection/complaint
As stated previously, earlier research has considered the application of attribution theory to a range of situations including the causal attributions which adults make about children and young people (including teachers for students; parents for children) (e.g., Johnston and Ohan, op cit; Miller, 1995); those that children and young people make (e.g., Miller, Ferguson and Byrne, 2000) and causal attributions in relation to domestic violence, mental health and responses to poverty (e.g., Wallach and Sela, 2008). Research is available which describes interventions which aim to alter causal attributions (if these are considered to be unhelpful or maladaptive) (e.g., see Morrissey-Kane and Prinz, op cit). However, the literature search failed to locate any research that considered the causal attributions that students make about negative teacher behaviour towards themselves and the effect on their emotions, in the context of Weiner's (e.g., 1995; 2006, 2010) theories and models.
1.5 **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

This research comprises an investigation into the causal attributions made by young people for the “negative” behaviour of their teachers towards them. It has a focus upon interpersonal relationships between students and teachers and, in particular, the subjective experience of students in school. The research is based on the assumption that humans actively interact with their environment (including the social environment) and respond according to the feedback they receive. In addition, it is assumed that human beings have a survival instinct that influences the use of self-protection mechanisms.

The research presented in this thesis, and research within this area in general, is based on the supposition that human behaviour follows a general pattern. This research can, therefore, be classed as “positivist” as it is based on there being some predictability in how humans behave. Although the aim has been to objectively gain data, as this area of research is broadly linked to interactions between humans, the potential impact of wider, idiosyncratic factors on the responses of participants is recognised (e.g., personal history, social pressures, social embarrassment, goals and needs). As a consequence, this leads to our understanding of human behaviour taking place within a social context (and this will become apparent via the research studies discussed in Chapter 2) including the impact of culture and of the need to protect one’s own self-concept. In line with this, Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) propose that:

“Where positivism is less successful .... is in its application to the study of human behaviour where the immense complexity of human nature and the elusive and intangible quality of social phenomena contrast strikingly with the order and regularity of the natural world.” (Cohen et al, op cit, p 7)

And add that:

“This point is nowhere more apparent than in the contexts of classroom and school where the problems of teaching, learning and human interaction present the positivistic researcher with a mammoth challenge.” (Cohen, et al, op cit, p 7)

Clearly, Cohen et al’s (op cit) quotes suggest that, although we might seek order in the social arena and, although some predictability might be observed at times, there
are a range of influences upon human behaviour which make prediction or, at least, prediction in all contexts, elusive. However, as suggested by Gephart (1999), in practice, research is not always limited to one paradigm. In addition to the “positivist” approach, the research presented in this thesis does include elements of an “interpretivist” approach, in that it seeks to gain participants’ interpretations of a situation, and the meanings for themselves. The ontological approach adopted is both “deterministic” and “dynamic”, i.e., it is based on events having causes but, also, focuses upon adding to existing knowledge and understanding within the area of attribution theory. The research is investigative in nature in that it primarily seeks to investigate the causal attributions of young people and the emotional impact of these. The aim of this research is, then, to review existing knowledge but, also, to add to this by investigating the causal attributions that young people make for the behaviour of their teachers and their subsequent emotional responses (in the context of Weiner’s, 1995; 2006; 2010 models).

1.6 AIM OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1.6.1 Aim of Research

The overall aim of the research is:

To explore Weiner’s (e.g., 1995; 2006; 2010) model(s) (see Appendix I) of social motivation in relation to student-teacher interactions.

1.6.2 Research Questions

The following research questions will be addressed:

i. What are the causal attributions that students make for the “negative” behaviour of teachers?

ii. What are the emotions reported by students, following these causal attributions?

iii. How responsible do students consider teachers are for this behaviour?

iv. Do students perceive that male or female teachers are more likely to engage in negative behaviour?
Is there a difference in attributions made by male and female students?

1.7 OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY

Year 10 students from three secondary schools in a local authority within the northwest of England were invited to participate in the research. Due to the large number of participants sought, these were taken from three different schools. However, similar schools, in terms of socio-economic status and GCSE (General Certificate of Secondary Education) passes at the end of Key Stage 4 were sought. Students comprised a cross-section relating to gender, ability and additional needs. By inviting participants from mainstream schools (rather than focussing upon a more specific population), it was anticipated that the results would be generalisable to a wider population of students.

Participants were presented with a scenario which portrayed a situation in the classroom when a teacher engaged in “negative” behaviour towards them (Appendix II). The students’ responses to questions (including questions about causal attribution, anticipated emotional response and level of responsibility attributed to the teacher in the scenario) were gained using a questionnaire based on Weiner’s (e.g., 1995, p 189) (Appendix III) and Peterson et al’s (1982) work (Appendix IV).

Although it was proposed that completion of the questionnaires would take place in form time (where a cross-section of students was likely to be present but, also, with the intention of reducing the impact on lessons), in practice the three schools preferred different arrangements and these were taken into account. Support was available for students with additional needs (e.g., in terms of reading and writing difficulties) and clear, written instructions were provided for colleagues who administered the questionnaires in order to promote standardisation of completion (Appendix V).

Following the results of the main study and in the light of some methodological issues that arose, the questionnaire was re-designed and a follow-up study (consisting of a different group of Year 10 students) took place in order to gain students’ experience of completing the questionnaire including their understanding of the questions. This included piloting a revised questionnaire and a focus group discussion. The aim of the follow-up study was: “To gain student perceptions of completing a scenario-based
questionnaire in relation to student causal attributions for teachers “negative” behaviour in school”.

1.8 OUTLINE OF THESIS

Following this introductory chapter, the remainder of the thesis investigates the roots of attribution theory and reviews the relevant literature since this time (Chapter 2). A particular focus is placed upon the work of Bernard Weiner, as the research is based on his models (e.g., 1995; 2006; 2010) (see Appendix I) and the application of attribution theory to wider areas of human behaviour is also explored (in Chapter 2). The method used to gather data and the analysis are explained in Chapter 3 and the results are presented in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 comprises a re-design of the study. This is followed by a discussion of the results (Chapter 6), with Chapter 7 (the Conclusion) focusing on the relevance of the findings to attribution theory in general and to educational psychology practice in particular. Finally, suggestions are made for further research in this area and personal reflections are provided.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 FOCUS OF LITERATURE REVIEW

The research presented in this thesis has a focus upon the causal attributions that students make for “negative” teacher behaviour towards them. In order to place the research in context, the earlier history and development of attribution theory is presented, with the contributions of the main theorists being outlined and those aspects most relevant to this research being emphasised. Studies which concentrate on causal attributions within education are reviewed, as is the application of this field of research to wider areas of human experience. Differences in making causal attributions are discussed (including cultural differences), together with studies that have focussed upon changing causal attributions. A selection of criticisms of attribution theory is also presented. An emphasis is placed upon the work of Bernard Weiner as it is his theories and models (e.g., Weiner 1995; 2006; 2010) (see Appendix I) which have been used as the basis for the research. Initially, an outline of the approach used to search the relevant literature is presented.

2.2 LITERATURE SEARCH

Although literature on attribution theory is available dating back to the 1940s, the focus in this literature review is on research that has been carried out in more recent years. However significant studies, which are directly related to this research and which took place earlier, are also considered.

Literature was sought via a range of methods. Initially, databases for the subject areas of (i) Psychological Sciences, (ii) Sociology, Psychology and Social Sciences and (iii) Education were sought although (iv) Index to Theses was also utilised. These subject areas included the following databases:

(i) Psychological Sciences

- Psycinfo (1872 – date)
- Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts (ASSIA)
- Sociological Abstracts (1963 – date)
- British Library

(ii) Sociology, Psychology and Social Sciences
In addition to (i) above:

- SAGE Full-Text Collection: Sociology

(iii) Education

In addition to (i) and (ii) above:

- Australian Education Index (AEI)
- British Education Index (BEI)
- SAGE Full-Text Collection: Education, Communications, Psychology
- CERUK -Current Educational Research in the UK
- International Education Research Database
- Education-line
- ERIC (1966 to date)
- EvidenceNet
- JISC Medialhub
- Linguistics and Language Behaviour Abstracts

(iv) Index to Theses

The key words used have included the following (with truncation and combinations of these words as necessary):

(i) attribution$
(ii) school$
(iii) child$
(iv) student$
(v) teach$

Additional searches were performed as necessary, e.g., using the following key words:

(i) attribution$
(ii) criticism$
Generic searches were also undertaken via the university’s Library Search which accesses resources from many systems and databases simultaneously, including electronic journals and Web of Knowledge.

A significant number of references were found via “snowballing”, i.e., via searching for references discussed in papers and books. Google Scholar was also accessed.

Weiner’s curriculum vitae was also gained (B Weiner, personal communication, January 31, 2011) which contained all of his publications to the date of the communication.

2.3  EARLY HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF ATTRIBUTION THEORY

Weiner (2008) attests to the long “shelf life” of attribution theory”. Although he acknowledges that “… attribution no longer is the dominant field of inquiry it once was, say in the 1970-1985 era.” (p 151), he proposes that “… it certainly is the case that attribution theory has not died …” (p 151). This is confirmed by more recent studies (including, for example, Kelsey, Kearney, Plax, Allen and Ritter, 2004).

Interest in Attribution Theory has, then, spanned a number of decades and it is Heider’s (e.g., 1944; 1958) work that is frequently considered to have provided the foundations for this area of research. As a consequence, the relevance of Heider’s (1944; 1958) work to the research presented in this thesis is discussed, together with that of subsequent theorists, including Jones and Davis (op cit) and Kelley (1967; 1971a; 1971b; 1973). In support of these contributions, Fiske and Taylor (1991) confirm that “The ideas of Heider, Jones and Davis, and Kelley constitute the early and focal theoretical contributions to attribution theory” (p 41). However, they also recognise the contribution of Bernard Weiner via his work on both achievement and helping, the dimensions upon which attributions can be made and the incorporation of emotional features into his theory.

The contributions of Heider (e.g., 1944; 1958), Jones and Davis (op cit), Kelley (1967; 1971a; 1971b; 1973) and Weiner and colleagues (e.g., Weiner and Kukla, 1970 – Weiner, 2010) are now discussed and the development of Weiner’s theories is reviewed in some detail.
2.3.1 Fritz Heider (e.g., 1944; 1958)

Jones et al (op cit) acknowledged Heider (e.g., 1944; 1958) as being the founder of attribution theory:

“It is to Heider more than to any other single individual that attribution theory can be ‘attributed.’ His early paper on phenomenal causality (1944) emphasized the human motive to stabilize the perceived environment by appropriate cause-effect assignments.” (Jones et al, op cit, p xi-xii)

Similarly, Forsterling (op cit) more recently proposed that “Conceptions of causality … have been most explicitly dealt with by Fritz Heider (1896-1988), who is considered the founder of attribution theory …” (p 7) and his 1958 work, in particular, is frequently referred to in the literature. Fincham and Hewstone (op cit) discuss what they describe as “two classic theories about the way people attribute behaviour to discrete causes.” (p 198) These classic theories are those of Heider (1958) and Kelley (1967; 1973).

Personal and Environmental Influences

Heider (1958) refers to this field of study as “common-sense or naive psychology” (p 4) as, in our daily life, we continually make judgements about other people and social situations and this takes place without any formal “scientific scrutiny”.

Heider (1958) discussed the influence of both “personal” (e.g., “ability”) and “environmental” (e.g., “difficulty of task”; “opportunity”; “luck”) factors on behaviour, stating that “We assess when we attribute action outcome mainly to the person, mainly to the environment, or to a combination of both” (p 99). Although this has remained a fundamental distinction in subsequent research, the assertion of their being “combined” factors appears to have been neglected. Heider (1958) also emphasised the impact of “can” and “try” on behaviour with the former referring to a person having the ability to carry out an action and the latter referring to whether or not a person has the motivation to do so. However, Heider (1958) discussed wider influences on behaviour, including “self-confidence”, “fatigue” and “mood”. Despite this, such factors do not appear to have been emphasised by the later theorists discussed in this review (although some have, at least, been referred to in later studies, including Weiner, 1979; Weiner, Russell and Lerman, 1978).
Following Heider’s (1958) discussion of “personal” vs “environmental” causality (also referred to as “internal” vs “external” causality), Weiner (e.g., Weiner et al, 1971; Weiner, 1979) subsequently added the dimensions of “stability” and “controllability” into his theories and the emergence of these dimensions is discussed later (see Sections 2.4.3. and 2.4.8).

**Intention and Responsibility**

An important contribution to this field of research is Heider’s (1958) work on the search for the underlying causes of events and his proposal that people tend to attribute “personal” or “impersonal” causes, with “personal” causation occurring when an action is “intentional” and “impersonal” causes being when there has been no “intention” in the action (examples of the latter given by Heider (1958) are being in danger due to stones falling down a mountain or when a person stands on a board and accidentally breaks it). However, Heider (1958) also discusses the role of “personal responsibility” in attributions, which links with his theories about “can” and “try”. So, if a person (i) has the ability to carry out an action (“can”), (ii), intends to carry out the action and does so (“try”), then (iii) s/he has some “personal responsibility” for the outcome. Heider (1958) then proposes that “… intention is the central factor in personal causality …” (p 112) and this has also become an important factor in assessment of causality. Weiner et al (1978) acknowledge that it was Heider (1958) who introduced the dimension of “intentionality” into this field of study, which has remained relevant. It is, however, important to consider that there are different levels of responsibility for an event or outcome. Heider (1958) recognised this and he categorised them as (in increasing order of responsibility):

(i) having some association with an event (however tenuous);
(ii) having some responsibility for an event, in that this could only happen if that person was present;
(iii) having a level of responsibility (either directly or indirectly) for the event due to having been able to foresee this, despite not having any specific intention for it to happen;
(iv) having some responsibility due to having an intention for the event to happen; and
(v) having a “justifiable” responsibility, i.e., there was influence from the environment.
To illustrate, an example of (i) might involve being a member of a working party which produced a policy based on erroneous data provided by another group/person and (iii) might involve allowing somebody to drive our car whilst being aware that the brakes needed to be changed. These distinctions would, of course, lead to judgements about “blame” and begin to illustrate the complex decision-making process which can be involved in making causal attributions. The concepts of “responsibility” and “blame” are also included in later theories and models (e.g., Weiner, 1995).

Heider (1958) explains his view of the roles of “personal” responsibility and “environmental factors”:

“Personal responsibility then varies with the relative contribution of environmental factors to the action outcome; in general, the more they are felt to influence the action, the less the person is held responsible.” (Heider, 1958, p 113)

2.3.2 Edward E Jones and Keith Davis (1965)

Correspondent Inference Theory

Another contribution frequently referred to is that of Jones and Davis (op cit). Linked to Heider’s (1958) “personal” vs “impersonal” distinction is Jones and Davis’s (op cit) work which focused upon the premise that people search for stable dispositions in others following an action, hence their “Correspondent Inference Theory” (with the “correspondence” referring to the extent of knowledge gained about another person’s disposition and intentions, following an observation being made of his/her action(s)). The importance of searching for stable dispositions might, of course, be viewed as necessary to enable humans to predict the behaviour of others, as suggested by Weary and Reich (2000): “According to all of the major theorists, people engage in attributional analyses because of their functional needs to understand, predict, and control what goes on around them” (p 321).

According to Jones and Davis (op cit), in order for an observer to make a judgement about another person’s dispositions, they need to compare the results of the person’s “chosen” and “nonchosen” actions. This is based on the proposal that people have (i) a choice about which action(s) they might take but, also, (ii) a choice about whether to take an action or to take no action. Similarities can be seen between this proposal
and Heider’s (1958) notion of “try” and, of course, has links to attributions of “intention”. However, a more complex analysis of a person’s intentions and dispositions is possible. For example, according to Jones and Davis (op cit), following applying the “noncommon effects principle” (when the person being observed behaves in an uncommon way in comparison to other people), then a personal disposition is likely to be attributed to him/her. In addition, when an action is socially undesirable, the “correspondent inference” is likely to be stronger. If an observer, then, believes that they know the reason for (or the disposition which resulted in) another person’s action, then the correspondence would be high. On the other hand, if the observer is unsure about the reasons for (or unsure of the disposition leading to) somebody behaving in a particular way, the correspondence would be low. The main contribution of Jones and Davis (op cit) to this field of research is considered to be their focus on “personal dispositions” (as opposed to “external” influences upon behaviour) and, therefore, is considered to have had limited impact (Fincham and Hewstone, op cit).

2.3.3  **Harold H Kelley (1967; 1971a; 1971b; 1973)**

According to Weiner (1980b), in his discussion of attribution theory, Kelley (1967) is “one of the leading psychologists in this area” (p 229). Kelley (e.g., 1967; 1971a; 1971b) further extended theory within this area of research, with his conceptions about how individuals use the differing amounts of information available to them in order to make causal attributions.

**Covariation Model (1967)**

Following Heider’s (1958) discussion of the “man on the street” using a scientific method to make decisions about others and Jones and Davis’s (op cit) contribution in terms of correspondent inference, Kelley (1967) subsequently proposed the Covariation Model in which people are considered to make judgements about behaviour according to the factors that are present at the time, or not present. Thus, people would take account of the (i) “consensus”, the (ii) “distinctiveness” and the (iii) “consistency” of the information in order to infer causes, with (i) referring to whether other people behave in this way, having been presented with the same situation; (ii) referring to how the individual responds to other stimuli and (iii) referring to how the individual behaves at other times but with the same event. Kelley (1967) also proposed that causes can be identified according to whether they apply to (i) a person; (ii) an entity or (iii) a time (or circumstance). For example, if an observer is attempting to explain why a driver would shout something to another driver, s/he
would consider whether it is something about the driver who shouted (e.g., s/he is a rude/bad-mannered/unpleasant person); something about the driver who was shouted at (e.g., he/she performed a dangerous manoeuvre and, therefore, deserved the comment) or something about the situation (e.g., there was a hold-up on the road ahead and the driver who shouted was warning the other driver). Clearly, Kelley’s (1967) contribution demonstrates the potential complexity involved in making causal attributions and the importance of factors such as (i) normal ways of responding and (ii) previous knowledge of the person observed.

**Causal Schemata (1971a)**

In reality, of course, it may be necessary for individuals to make attributions based on much more limited information than that implied by Kelley’s (1967) earlier work. Kelley (1971a) subsequently discussed what he refers to as Causal Schemata to demonstrate how people make attributions based on limited observations (i.e., as opposed to wider information which is amenable to covariation). The term “schemata” refers to an assumption, pre-conception or belief (based on previous experience) that conditions are present due to other observations. In other words, although all the relevant information may not be available in order to make a judgement (attribution), as certain conditions are present (or absent), other information is assumed and, then, a judgement can be made. Kelley (1971a) then coined the terms “multiple sufficient causal schemata” and “multiple necessary causal schemata”, with the former referring to a situation when sufficient causes are available to infer an effect and the latter referring to necessary causes being available to infer an effect.

Despite some later criticism of Kelley’s (1967) work on covariation, i.e., due to a lack of evidence for this (e.g., see Malle, 2011), it seems that both his Covariation Model (1967) and discussion of Causal Schemata (1971a) have, at least, intuitive appeal.

**2.3.4 Error/Bias in Causal Attributions**

It is relevant to note that a number of theorists suggest that humans can often make errors when making causal attributions. These include the following, which are briefly summarised:
Fundamental Attribution Error (or Correspondence Bias)

In his 1958 work, Heider suggested that, as is the case when people make errors in perceptions of objects, errors can also be made in perceptions of other people, i.e., proposing that observers tend to overemphasise “internal”, personal causes of the behaviour of others (e.g., effort; intention) and to under-emphasise “external”, situational causes (e.g., task difficulty; opportunity). This is now referred to as the “fundamental attribution error”.

Actor-Observer Difference

As explained by Jones and Nisbett (1971) the Actor-Observer Difference (or “perspective”) refers to the tendency for actors to attribute their own behaviour to the situation, whereas the behaviour of those observed to inherent traits. Jones and Nisbett (op cit) discuss earlier studies from the late 1960s and early 1970s which, they suggest, support this notion, although they do acknowledge that “actors” and “observers” have different knowledge about situations (we might argue that an “actor” would have more knowledge of his/her own behaviour than an “observer”). However, following a meta-analysis, Malle (2006) found no evidence for the actor-observer difference.

Self-Serving Bias

Kelley (1971b) discusses what is now referred to as the “self-serving bias”, which is considered to occur when the observer makes judgements which protect his or her own self-esteem. Kelley (1971b) gives the example of a teacher who, when seeing a child succeed, considers that the success is due to his/her own teaching but, conversely, may consider the failure of the same child to be due to something about the child.

Despite error and bias in making causal attributions having since being criticised (e.g., Malle, 2011), it seems that they may be observed in some situations and, on a practical level, an awareness of potential bias can support our understanding of differences in the making of causal attributions.

The early work on attribution theory has, then, made contributions in the form of “internal” vs “external” causation, the roles of “intention” and “responsibility”, making causal attributions with varying amounts of information and potential bias in making
causal attributions. This provides the foundation for Bernard Weiner's work, discussed in the following sections.

2.4 BERNARD WEINER (e.g., Weiner and Kukla, 1970 – Weiner, 2010)

Since the early 1960s Bernard Weiner has been involved in writing a number of books and in excess of two hundred book chapters/articles. His earliest work focussed upon the role of attributions in success and failure within academic contexts, with relevant publications being those of 1979 and 1985. However, as time progressed, he extended his work into other areas of human experience including help-giving, loneliness and parole decisions (e.g., Weiner, 1979). Weiner's theories and models are the basis of the research reported in this thesis (e.g., 1995; 2006; 2010) (Appendix I) and, therefore, the development of his theories are discussed, with the most significant publications in relation to the current study being reviewed. In general, these are presented in chronological order to illustrate the development of his thoughts and theories over time.

2.4.1 Reasons vs Causes

It is relevant, at this early point in the discussion, to endeavour to distinguish between the terms "reasons" and "causes" as, in attribution theory, the term "causes" (of behaviour) is used, rather than the term "reasons" which tends to be used in day-to-day explanations. Weiner (2006) discusses the subtle differences between "reasons" and "causes" and, in his explanation, he refers to his work on achievement motivation, suggesting that we look for the "causes" of successful or unsuccessful outcomes, rather than the "reasons", e.g., proposing that a failure due to lack of ability would be seen as a "cause" rather than a "reason". Perhaps a more convincing argument would be based on “intention”. Weiner (2006) suggests that the term “reason” tends to be used when a behaviour is “intentional” whereas the term “cause” tends to be used for some “intentional” and all “unintentional” behaviours or events. For example, we might talk about the “cause” of blindness rather than a “reason” for this but, conversely, we might talk about the “reason” for somebody thumping another rather than the “cause” of it. Other examples of “reasons” for “intentional” behaviours might be those linked to meeting somebody for coffee, applying for a promotion or having one’s hair cut. However, “causes” for “unintentional” behaviours might be, for example, seeing the “cause” of a car crash or an electricity failure. Despite the lack of clarity which continues, nevertheless, Weiner (2006) proposes that the distinction
between “causes” and “reasons” is relevant in discussions relating to attribution theory.

2.4.2 The Initial Dimension of “Internal” vs “External” Causality (Achievement Related Contexts)

Some of Bernard Weiner’s earliest experiments were documented in Weiner and Kukla (op cit) and these are discussed to illustrate the development of attribution theory and its contribution within achievement contexts. Six experiments are described which investigate the impact upon causal attributions of factors such as level of ability and amount of effort made. The emotional responses of “pride” and “shame”, together with the allocation of either “internal” or “external” causal attributions for success and failure (including “ability” and “luck”) are also considered. A link can be seen with Heider’s (1958) focus upon both the ability (“can”) and motivation (“try”) to achieve goals. This early work incorporates features that have remained relevant in the subsequent decades including emotional responses, “responsibility” and “blame”. In addition, the use of scenarios in data collection, also evident in Weiner and Kukla’s (op cit) work, has remained common in this area of research. The authors briefly mention the role of the consequences of an action (in attributions of “responsibility”) although this is not a feature which appears to have been extended in subsequent research and theory. The experiments are discussed in detail to demonstrate common methods of data-gathering in this area of research.

In the first experiment (Experiment I), twenty male university students were involved (considered to be “comparatively upper class”). They were asked to imagine they were teachers and were provided with scenarios depicting the examination outcomes of students with differing levels of ability and motivation. The participants were asked to imagine they were giving feedback to the students (in the form of 1-5 gold stars as rewards or 1-5 red stars as punishments) based on the outcomes, their levels of ability and their motivation for success. Amongst the results was the finding that students with low ability but high motivation would be provided with positive evaluations from their “teachers” (indicating that an individual of low ability, who works hard, is seen as worthy of praise). It was also found that individuals with high ability but low motivation would be more likely to receive less favourable feedback from his/her teacher (and this would be less favourable than a student who had low ability and low motivation, suggesting that not making use of one’s abilities is seen as particularly blameworthy). This experiment, then, demonstrates how positive
responses (e.g., “praise”) and negative responses (e.g., “blame”) can be a consequence of the causal attributions made about others.

The results of the second experiment (Experiment II), which adopted the same procedure but included students who were considered to be from a lower-middle and lower-middle class sector, showed that the participants placed a higher emphasis on motivation within achievement contexts than did those in Experiment I. According to Weiner and Kukla (op cit), this particular result may be due to the (apparently) often-employed view that lower-class students do not try hard enough and that this influenced the decisions made by the participants. The potential relevance of social circumstances and influences is, then, acknowledged.

The Early Introduction of Emotional Responses

Experiment III involved female student teachers and, in this, early experiment, Weiner’s interest in emotional responses, following the making of attributions, is evident. Forty-seven participants were given a similar task to that adopted in Experiments I and II whilst a further forty-two participants were instructed to indicate how much “pride” and “shame” they might personally feel following the examination outcomes (although the reason for limiting responses to just these two emotions was not given in the paper). Similar results were found to those gained in Experiments I and II. However, in relation to “pride” and “shame”, it was found that feelings of “pride” tended to result from success in achievement-related contexts due to the “effort” made whereas “shame” was likely to be experienced when failure resulted despite high ability. Experiment III is, then, an early experiment linking causal attributions and emotional responses. Experiment IV is not discussed due to its limited relevance to the research presented in this thesis.

Experiment V involved a “real life” situation, as opposed to using scenarios. In this case, seventy-one male participants were involved and an ambiguous situation was presented in which their success could be perceived as either due to “ability” or “luck”. Briefly, the task involved guessing the missing numbers in a list with the instructions suggesting that there might be a pattern, or patterns, involved (however, the actual responses were dependent upon chance). Following task completion, participants were asked to gauge how much of their success was due to “luck” or “skill”, what their scores might be if they attempted the task again and, also, how hard they had tried to gain correct responses. The results showed that students who were high on achievement motivation attributed success to the “internal” factors of “skill” and “effort”
rather than “luck”. They also attributed “internal” factors such as a “lack of skill” to their failures and considered the amount of “effort” that they made had a bearing on outcomes of both success and failure. Conversely, students who were low on achievement motivation tended to attribute their success to “external” factors such as “luck” and they did not make any significantly different inference about the reasons for their failure. Similarly, they did not believe that the amount of “effort” they made would affect their performance. The authors suggest that an explanation for the results for the students high in achievement motivation could be that these students take responsibility for the outcomes, whatever they are, whereas those low in achievement motivation attribute outcomes to factors “external” to themselves.

In the final experiment outlined in this paper (Experiment VI), two classes of psychology students (consisting of thirty male and forty-six female students) were provided with information about a number of individuals and their outcomes on a task. Participants were asked to rate performance according to both “effort” and “ability”. The results included that “internal” attributions for success increased as tasks became harder and “internal” attributions for failure increased as tasks became less demanding. The authors, then, suggest that, as a consequence, a person will experience more “pride” due to having more success on a difficult task and, similarly, a person will experience more “shame” for failure on an easy task.

The results contribute to our understanding of the decision-making process involved when causal attributions are being made for success and failure in achievement-related contexts. This might include (for example) “blame” being assigned due to not using one’s own ability; the effects of the “class system” potentially making a difference to attributions made; “internal” attributions (such as “ability” and “effort”) for a person’s success and failure tending to be assigned by those who have high achievement motivation, with those low in achievement motivation tending to attribute their success and their failure to “external” factors such as “luck”. The paper clearly highlights the link with emotional responses following a causal attribution being made, a link which remains significant in later research and which is relevant to the research presented in this thesis (which involves participants being asked for their anticipated emotional responses following teacher behaviour towards them, as depicted in Appendix II).
2.4.3 Addition of a Second Dimension: “Stability” (Achievement Related Contexts)

Following the establishment of the “internal” vs “external” dimension, Weiner et al (1971) introduced the causal dimension of “stability” and this is now explained in the context of achievement behaviour.

Table 1 (below) illustrates how decisions about achievement behaviour can be classified. “Internal” and “external” factors are those raised in earlier work (e.g., Heider, 1958; Weiner and Kukla, op cit), i.e., “internal” might relate to something within the person such as “effort” and “external” might refer to something about the situation, e.g., “task difficulty” (note that there has been later debate about Heider’s (1958) dimensions, e.g., Malle, 2011). However, following a reflection on the findings of earlier studies (including Weiner and Kukla, op cit), Weiner et al (1971) propose that there are also “stable” and “unstable” factors, referring to those which either can or cannot be changed, e.g., “ability” would be seen as a “stable” factor (as it is likely to be resistant to change) whereas “effort” would be classified as “unstable” (as it can vary).

Table 1: Classification Scheme for the Perceived Determinants of Achievement Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Locus of Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Effort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Weiner et al, 1971)

2.4.4 Causal Attributions and their Influence upon Future Behaviour (Achievement Related Contexts)

Weiner et al (1971) suggest that the causal attributions that people make about success and failure in achievement-related contexts affects their future behaviour, with the dimension of “stability” now being implicated. For example, according to the authors, if a person decides that his/her success is due to a “stable” and “internal” factor such as “ability”, s/he is more likely to believe they will be able to succeed.
again. However, if a person believes that his/her failure is due to an “unstable” and “internal” factor such as “effort”, he/she may be inclined to try harder in future. Conversely, if s/he believes that his/her failure is due to a “stable” and “external” factor such as “task difficulty”, it may be decided that the task is far too difficult, with future plans to continue with their work in this area then being abandoned. In relation to the emotional impact, however, if a person feels that their success is due to an “external”, “unstable” factor (e.g., such as “luck”), they might feel they haven’t really earned the success (and, then, are less likely to feel “pride”). Clearly, then, the causal attributions made, following success or failure, impact on subsequent behaviour (in the form of motivation) and, also, upon emotions (such as “pride” for success or “shame” for failure). It is evident, from this discussion, that the causal attributions made about events can have a significant effect on a person’s feelings and subsequent behaviour.

2.4.5 Linking Emotional Responses to Causal Dimensions: The Internal vs External Dimension (Achievement Related Contexts)

The work of Weiner et al (1978) is discussed in some detail, again, to illustrate methods of data collection in this area of research (including possible pitfalls) and the implications for the research presented in this thesis. They report on an experiment that was designed to investigate the link between attributions for success and failure and the strength of the subsequent emotion. The procedure included compiling “dictionary lists” of possible emotional responses for academic success and failure, together with a list of potential causal attributions for accomplishment in academic activities (adopted from earlier research). Weiner et al (1978) then provided scenarios which depicted causes for success and failure, with the possible emotional responses also being provided. The ten attributions for success were given as: “ability”, “unstable effort”, “stable effort”, “task difficulty”, “mood”, “personality”, “others’ effort”, “others’ motivation and personality”, “luck”, “intrinsic motivation”.

Ninety male and female students from the University of California participated in the study and they were asked to rate the anticipated intensity of the emotional responses, as a result of the scenario. One of the scenarios is given below for the purposes of illustration:
“Francis studied intensely for a test he took. It was very important for Francis to record a high score on this exam. Francis received an extremely high score on the test. Francis felt that he received this high score because he studied so intensely. How do you think Francis felt upon receiving this score?” (Weiner et al, 1978, p 70)

Participants were, also, provided with a causal attribution for failure within the context of a scenario and were asked to rate the intensity of the emotions as before.

Weiner et al (1978) found problems with the analysis, largely due to the same emotion being given for different causes, e.g., participants reported they would have (high intensity) feelings of being “pleased” or “happy” if their success resulted from any of the ten causes. Similarly, participants reported they would have (high intensity) feelings of “upset” if their failure was thought to result from seven of the ten possible causes. As a consequence (i.e., to avoid general terms such as “happy” or “upset”), the authors identified emotions that were specifically reported for each of the potential causes of success and failure (which were, also, considered to be of “high intensity”). Amongst the results were that success:

- due to “luck” would result in feeling “surprise”;
- due to “other’s effort and personality” would result in feeling “gratitude”;
- due to “ability” would result in feelings of “competence” and “confidence”.

On the other hand, failure (for example):

- due to “ability” would result in feelings of “incompetence”;
- due to “other’s efforts”; “other’s motivation and personality” would result in “aggression”; and
- due to “personality” and “intrinsic motivation” would result in “resignation”.

In order to improve on, and add to, the previous (1978) research, Weiner, Russell and Lerman (1979) conducted two further experiments. The participants in the first experiment comprised 79 male and female college students. They were provided with 12 scenarios depicting achievement (either succeeding or failing in a test due to one of six causes, i.e., “ability”; “unstable effort”; “stable effort”, “personality”, “other people” and “luck”). In order to improve the quality of their responses, the participants were asked to recall times (“critical incidents”) when they had, in reality, either succeeded or failed in such a situation. They were then asked to recall three
subsequent, emotional responses (the participants were provided with examples of potential emotional responses in order to aid their completion of the task). The authors decided to incorporate into the analysis those emotions which had been reported by more than 10% of the participants. In the case of the scenarios depicting success, twelve emotions met this criterion and, of these, four were in the examples provided by the researchers (and the authors note that there may have been some influence in the emotions reported, due to some of these being provided). Again, as in the earlier research, broad terms were frequently given by participants (e.g., “happiness”) to describe emotional responses. However, once more, specific emotional labels could be identified and linked with particular causal attributions.

Weiner et al (1979) found that some associations between causes and responses were the same as those found in their 1978 research, i.e., in relation to success: “ability-competence”; “ability-pride”; “stable effort-contentment”; “personality-pride”; “others-gratitude”; and “luck-surprise”. However, some associations were found that had not been found in the 1978 research, i.e., “unstable effort-relief and satisfaction”; “others-excitement”; “luck-guilt” and “luck-relief”.

In relation to the emotions provided by participants for failure, of the 15 emotions provided by more than 10% of the participants, six of these had been suggested by the researchers. The associations between causes and emotions in the case of failure were found to be the same as those found in the 1978 research, i.e.: “ability-incompetence”; “stable effort-guilt” “others-anger”; and “luck-surprise”. However, in the 1979 research, additional associations were found, i.e., “ability-resignation”; “ability-unhappiness”; “luck-sad”; and “luck-stupid”.

Weiner et al (1979) conducted further analysis of the results and, again, found that specific causal dimensions were linked with specific emotional outcomes. It was found that, in the case of success: “pride”, “confidence”, “competence” and “satisfaction” were more likely to be related to “internal” attributions of success. However, “gratitude”, “thankfulness”, “surprise” and “guilt” were more likely to result from “external” attributions of success. In the case of failure, it was found that the emotions of “guilt” and “resignation” were linked to “internal” attributions whereas the emotions of “anger” and “surprise” were linked to “external” attributions.

Weiner et al (1979) observed some clear similarities between their 1979 research and that of 1978 and, therefore, developed the theory of attributions within academic settings via the placing of particular emotional responses along the “internal” vs “external” causal dimension. However, despite these promising results, the authors
suggest that difficulties in the methodologies of both studies are apparent, including the requirement for participants to *imagine* the feelings of others but, also, the possibility that participants might be responding according to the “rules” of how people ought to respond. Although the placing of emotions along dimensions has limited relevance to the research presented in this thesis, some of the pitfalls of data collection in this area of research have been highlighted.

**2.4.6 Causal Dimensions and their Associated Emotions**

Weiner, Graham and Chandler (1982) continued to investigate the role of emotions including their link with particular causal dimensions. Although these are not discussed in depth in this review, it may be interesting to note the results. Following their research in which participants (students from the University of California) were asked to give their view of the cause of “real life” incidents which resulted in the emotional responses of “pity”, “anger” and “guilt”, Weiner, Graham and Chandler (op cit) found that “uncontrollable” causes of negative events resulted in “pity”, regardless of the locus of the cause (i.e., “internal” or “external”). However, both “anger” and “guilt” towards the observed were found to result from “controllable” and “internal” causation.

Following a second experiment, in which participants (again, students from the University of California) were asked to give the extent of “pity” and “anger” they might feel as a result of the scenarios provided (e.g., “He committed the crime because he lived in a depressed area where there were no opportunities for employment or adequate schooling”, p 230), Weiner, Graham and Chandler (op cit) found that, as might be expected, “anger” was more evident when causes were considered to be “controllable” whereas “pity” was more evident when causes were considered to be “uncontrollable”. However, the “anger” was greater when the cause was also considered to be “internal” and “stable”, whereas the “pity” was greater when the cause was also considered to be “internal” and “stable”.

Despite these results, Weiner (1982) suggests that the emotions discussed might not, necessarily, always result from the causal dimensions suggested. There might be, for example, “mitigating circumstances” and, in addition to this, different people might respond differently. For example, he gives the example of “embarrassment” potentially resulting from academic success, rather than “pride”. Also, “guilt” might, potentially, result from an “uncontrollable” cause (as in the case of a person not being able to pay the rent as his or her salary was not paid due to the employer’s cash flow
problems) and, similarly, “anger” might be directed towards the self. However, Weiner (1982) does suggest that the links proposed often occur and that they remain valid.

2.4.7 Using Emotional Responses as Cues to Attributions (Achievement Related Contexts)

In their second experiment, Weiner et al (1979) focused upon the interpretations that might be made about a person’s academic performance, following being given information about their emotions. This experiment is particularly relevant to the research presented in this thesis, as “causal attributions” were made about a person following an observation of his/her behaviour (including their emotional responses) (see Appendix II). The participants comprised 48 male and female students from the University of California. They were presented with twelve scenarios depicting different outcomes and emotional reports. The following is an example:

“A person just received a test back in a course that is very important to him or her. He or she has done very well and feels extremely surprised, astonished, and thankful. Why did this person believe that he or she did so well?” (Weiner et al, 1979, p 1218)

The participants were then asked to rate the likelihood of these emotional responses occurring due to the causal attributions provided. Following an analysis of the results, the authors concluded that people do use emotional responses as cues to decide on why success or failure might have taken place. For example, it was found that, if a person felt “confident”, “competent” or “pleased”, following success, it was inferred that they must have succeeded due to having “ability.” Similarly, if a person felt “surprised”, “astonished” or “thankful” following success, it was inferred that they must have succeeded due to “luck”. In the case of failure, if a person felt “stunned”, “sad” or “displeased” following failure, it was inferred that they must have failed due to “task difficulty” and, if a person felt “bitter”, “furious” or “vengeful” following a failure, it was inferred that this might be due to “others.” Again, it can be seen that some emotional labels were more likely to be linked to specific causal dimensions. We may be able to recall instances within our own experience when we have made causal attributions, not only as a result of the behaviour observed in others but, also, as a result of their emotional responses, e.g., in the case of the parent/carer or teacher discussed in Section 1.1, the EP might conclude that, following angry responses from the parent/carer and/or teacher (resulting from the feedback from the assessment and
subsequent information provided), they believe s/he has some responsibility for the local authority criteria for allocation of resources.

Despite some debate about the methodology of these experiments, it is clear that Weiner et al (1979) made further progress in the development of this theory by identifying emotions which might be linked with particular causal dimensions and demonstrating how causal attributions are made according to the emotional responses observed in others.

2.4.8 **Incorporation of the Third Dimension of “Controllability” (Achievement Related Contexts)**

The third and final dimension of “controllability” is now presented. Weiner (1979) again acknowledges the influence of Heider’s (1958) work and the contribution of the dimension of “intentionality”. However, Weiner (1979) suggests that it is possible to distinguish “intention” from “control” and gives the example of the justice system where “negligence” indicates “control” without “intention”. The example of a driver losing concentration and hitting a pedestrian might illustrate this difference, i.e., s/he could be considered to have “control” but not to have had the “intention” to cause harm to another. Weiner (1979), then, suggests that the term “controllability” is, more appropriate than “intention” and incorporates this into his theory of success and failure and, by doing so, he proposed the development of a “general theory of motivation” with, for example, its application to parole-decisions, loneliness and depression (see Section 2.4.12 for a wider discussion of these).

The following table depicts how “controllability” has been added to the dimensions of “internal” vs “external” and “stable” vs “unstable” in achievement-related contexts. For example, it is clear that “ability” can be viewed as “internal” and “stable” but, also, “uncontrollable”. Similarly, the “typical effort” of a student can be viewed as “internal” and “stable” and, also, “controllable”. However, the “external” and “stable” factor of “task difficulty” might also be viewed as “uncontrollable”.
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Table 2: Causes of Success and Failure, Classified According to Locus, Stability and Controllability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncontrollable</td>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable</td>
<td>Typical effort</td>
<td>Immediate effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task difficulty</td>
<td>Teacher bias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luck</td>
<td>Unusual help from others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Weiner, 1979, p 7)

2.4.9 Another Potential Dimension: Globality (Achievement Related Contexts)

Despite proposing that the main dimensions involved in achievement-related contexts had been established, i.e., “locus of control” (“internal” vs “external”); “stability” and “controllability”, Weiner (1979) acknowledges that other dimensions might be present, including “globality” (earlier proposed by Abramson, Seligman and Teasdale, 1978), i.e., referring to “global” vs “specific” causes. The dimension of “globality” is discussed as it has been incorporated into later research (e.g., Perez-Bouchard, Johnson and Ahrens, 1993, and Wallach and Sela, op cit, in Section 2.5.2). The dimension of “global” vs “specific” might be illustrated by the example of a student’s failure in an English examination being due to him or her having generally limited cognitive ability (a “global” cause) or, conversely, a student might fail an English examination due to being dyslexic (a “specific” cause), both of which would be “internal”. However, in relation to the possibility of there being the dimension of “globality”, Weiner (2006) states that: “I chose not to (strongly) support this contention because the global property does not emerge in empirical studies of causal properties (see Weiner, 1986) although it has intuitive appeal” (Weiner, 2006, p 11).

In his 1979 paper, then, Weiner (1979) extended earlier work by adding the dimension of “controllability” to “locus” and “stability”. He also began to consider a more general “theory of motivation” and discussed research based on attributions in wider social situations. By this stage he proposed that: “... a general theory of motivation is under development …” (Weiner, 1979, p 3).
2.4.10 Impact on the Self Concept

Weiner, Graham, Stern and Lawson (1982) describe two experiments into the emotional responses of others following the outcomes of an achievement-related task, with participants ranging from five year old children to college students. Although the focus of this work is, again, within an academic-achievement context, it has an added component in that the authors suggest that the emotional response of the teacher, together with the student’s perceived cause of the teacher’s response, might have an impact on the student’s self-concept, a link which is particularly pertinent due to similarities with the research presented in this thesis. For example, if the teacher displayed a “surprised” response to the student’s failure, then the student might believe that the teacher expected him or her to succeed (e.g., due to having a good level of ability, having worked hard, etc). An “angry” response from the teacher might lead to the student believing that he or she must not have worked hard enough. On the other hand, if the teacher displayed an emotional response considered to be “pity” (as a result of the failure), then the student might believe that the teacher didn’t really expect him or her to succeed (e.g., due to a low level of ability).

Developmental differences were found between children’s abilities to link the emotions and causes of (i) “anger” and “effort” and (ii) “pity” and “ability”, with (i) being evident in younger children (including those as young as 5 years of age) as well as older children – and this was a stronger link for all age groups. Conversely, the link between “pity” and “ability” was not evident in children before the age of 9 years (and it was not a strong, dependable link even at this age). In summary, Weiner, Graham, Stern and Lawson (op cit), conclude that:

“The evidence strongly documents that children as young as 9 years are quite adept at using emotional cues to make causal inferences and to understand the unexpressed thoughts of others.” (Weiner, Graham, Stern and Lawson, op cit, p 282)

The results of the experiments of Weiner, Graham, Stern and Lawson (op cit), then, indicate that the emotional responses of others (including teachers towards students) are likely to be important due to the meanings which might be inferred and the potential impact on the self-concept.
2.4.11 Classifying Emotions: “Other-directed”; “Self-Directed”; “Outcome-Dependent/Independent”; “Attribution Dependent/Independent”

In his 1980a experiments Weiner uses the terms “self-directed” and “other-directed” (or “outward-directed”) for emotional responses, with “sympathy” and “disgust” both being “other-directed” (i.e., directed towards the observed person) and “shame” and “guilt” (for example) being “self-directed” emotions (i.e., directed towards oneself). As was raised in 2.4.10, this discrimination is important due to the potentially negative impact of “self-directed” emotions upon the self-concept.

A further distinction within the realm of emotional responses is that given by Weiner (1985), in his discussion of “outcome dependent-attribution independent” emotions, e.g., suggesting that these might include feeling “happy” following “success” and “sad” following “failure”. He proposes that these feelings result from the outcome of an event rather than any attribution about the cause of the event. However, Weiner (1985) suggests that a causal attribution will follow this immediate emotional response which might, in turn, result in other emotional responses. This could be illustrated by a feeling of “happiness” following exam success but, also, “surprise” (if it was, then, attributed to “luck” rather than to “effort” or “ability”). Clearly, then, emotions such as “surprise” would be considered to be “attribution-dependent” but “happiness” would be “outcome-dependent”.

These distinctions are relevant to the research presented in this thesis due to the emotional responses anticipated by students (who engaged in the research) being categorised according to them being “self-directed” or “other-directed” but, also, the dependence of the emotions on either “attribution” or “outcome”.

2.4.12 Development of a General Theory of Motivation

In his 1980a paper, Weiner showed evidence of his developing general theory by describing six experiments linking causal attributions to help-giving. Although the basis of his work initially included some focus on the academic setting, five experiments were focussed upon non-academic settings and these are discussed in some detail to illustrate the application of attribution theory to wider social contexts.
Help-Giving Due to Falling in the Subway (i)

Experiment 2 involved the depiction of a person falling in the subway and participants were asked to rate both the likely cause of the event and the possibility that help might be offered. In one scenario, in Experiment 2, it is suggested that the person is ill and, in the other scenario, it is suggested that the person is drunk. The instructions included:

“Try to assume that you actually are on the subway and try to imagine this scene. Describe your feelings in this situation.” (Weiner, 1980a, p 190)

In this particular experiment, then, the participants are able to “describe” their feelings (as is the case in the research presented in this thesis), as opposed to being provided with potential feelings to choose from. The participants were also asked to rate the likely “cause” of the behaviour according to the three dimensions of “locus”, “stability” and “controllability”. Between the forty participants (male and female), 240 affects were given. These were then grouped into thirteen categories (via inter-rater agreement). The categories were labelled as: sympathy; concern; negative affect (such as “anger” and “disgust”); discomfort (such as “embarrassed”); fear; caution; surprise; positive action (such as “seek help”); apathy; personal shortcomings (such as “helpless”; “inadequate”); information seeking (such as “curious”); description (such as “a wino”) and unclassified. Clearly, some of these responses were not feelings but included actions and descriptions (and, again, this observation is relevant to the research presented in this thesis, when similar results were observed). The results of the experiment demonstrate how the impact of the behaviour upon the observer is likely to be relevant to his or her responses (as in the reported feeling of “fear”, for example).

As might be expected, it was found that emotions such as “disgust” and “distaste” tended to be reported when the observed was perceived to be drunk, whereas emotions such as “sympathy” and “pity” tended to be reported when the observed was perceived to be ill. Again, “controllability” of the cause was considered to be important in the decision-making process.

Help-Giving Due to Falling in the Subway (ii)

Experiment 3 followed a similar format to Experiment 2 but, in this case, the participants were restricted in their responses by being asked to rate their affect
according to scales of “pity and sympathy” and “disgust and distaste”, responses which were dominant in the previous results. Responses were also gained according to the perceived “control” of the observer and anticipated help-giving. The results in this experiment indicated that attributions about “personal control” were negatively related to the positive emotions of “sympathy/pity” and positively related to the negative emotions of “disgust/distaste”. Similarly, attributions of “personal control” were negatively related to anticipated “help giving”. Weiner (1980a) concluded that the results uphold the hypothesis that “control” is linked with “disgust” and “neglect” and “lack of control” is linked with “sympathy” and “help” and he suggests that it is the emotional response (e.g. “anger” or “pity”) which determines whether help will, or will not, be offered.

**Help-giving and “Control”**

In Experiments 4 and 5, similar scenarios were used to those in the earlier experiments although, on these occasions, further information was provided about the levels of personal control involved in being “ill” or “drunk” (e.g., including: “You know that this illness is under control of the person and that he is refusing to take the medication that he should”; “You think that drinking is not under personal control and is an addiction”). Participants in Experiment 4 were required to rate the amount of help that they would be likely to offer in the various circumstances whereas participants in Experiment 5 were asked to rate the level of “disgust/distaste” and “sympathy/pity” they might feel. Weiner’s (1980a) overall conclusion was that the emotional responses to the situation were particularly influential in the action of help-giving although attributions about “control” also had some impact.

In Experiment 6, all conditions were included, i.e., illness/drunkness; affective response; attributions of “control”. Again, it was found that help-giving was most likely when the person observed was considered to have little control and when the anticipated emotional response was “sympathy”. Weiner (1980a) proposes that the results of this series of experiments demonstrate the following links:
Figure 4: Links between Drunkenness, Illness and Help-Giving

\[ \text{drunkenness} \rightarrow \text{perceived personal control} \rightarrow \text{negative outward-directed affective reactions} \rightarrow \text{judgements to neglect} \]

And:

\[ \text{illness} \rightarrow \text{perceived lack of personal control} \rightarrow \text{positive outward-directed affective reactions} \rightarrow \text{judgements to help} \]

(adapted from Weiner, 1980a, p 196)

Wider Applications of Attribution Theory

In his 1980b publication, Weiner (1980b) introduces “an attributional theory of motivation” (p 327) and continues to apply his theory to wider contexts than the academic arena and help-giving, now applying this to parole-decisions, loneliness and depression (for example) and these are briefly discussed in order to illustrate how his theory to date may be applied to other areas of human experience.

In relation to parole decisions, Weiner (1980b) suggests that causal attributions are involved in the decision-making process via a consideration of the facts about a crime committed. These facts would include previous crimes committed by this person, mitigating circumstances and influence of the environment. Weiner (1980b) suggests that a crime (such as stealing) resulting from an “external” and “unintentional” cause (such as “poverty” from unemployment) is likely to result in a more lenient sentence (or being given parole) than one resulting from “internal”, “intentional” causes (such as “greed”, as in wanting money to buy the latest sports car). The “stability” of the cause might also be involved in the decision-making process. For example, if it was thought that a crime had been committed due to an “internal” and “stable” characteristic of the criminal (such as “he is an evil, greedy man”), then this is more likely to be punished than a crime having been committed due to an “internal” and “unstable” cause (such as being hungry as a welfare payment had been delayed and, therefore, the criminal was unable to buy food for himself or his family). Again, the criminal in the second scenario is more likely to be treated with leniency and granted parole.

In relation to loneliness, Weiner (1980b) discusses earlier studies which have found that a person believed to be “responsible” for their own loneliness (i.e., having some “control” over their situation) is less liked by others than a person who is not
considered “responsible”. Similarly, individuals considered to be “responsible” for their own loneliness were less likely to be shown “sympathy” than individuals who were not considered to be “responsible”.

Weiner (1980b) also discusses earlier studies to illustrate how his theory can be applied to depression. For example, a person who attributes his/her difficulties to “internal” and “stable” factors (such as not being able to get a date due to being unattractive), is more likely to feel depressed than a person who attributes his/her failure to an “external” and “unstable” factor (such as the person who has been asked for a date already has arrangements for the evening). Of course, it should be noted that there are situations when “external”, “uncontrollable” and “unstable” factors might result in depression (as in the death of a friend via a natural disaster).

2.4.13 The Influence of Responsibility on Attributions

By 1995 Weiner (1995) had advanced his attributional theory of motivation and extended it far beyond achievement contexts. In his 1995 book, “Judgments of Responsibility”, he aimed to “identify some of the rules of social motivation” (p xi) and to “extend an attributional theory of motivation that relates thoughts and emotions to behavior” (p 3). This is considered to be an important publication due to the extension of Weiner’s theory and, of course, its emphasis on “responsibility”.

The focus of Weiner’s (1995) book, then, is the emotional and behavioural results of believing that another person is either “responsible”, or “not responsible” for his or her actions. Weiner (1995) considers the role of “responsibility” and reflects, not only on studies of achievement evaluation but, also, on responses to other areas of human experience than those mentioned earlier including AIDS, mental illness, alcoholism and stigmatization; aggression; abuse and making excuses for behaviour.

Weiner (1995), again, uses the metaphor of life being similar to a courtroom, where individuals are judged upon their actions and, subsequently, given sanctions. However, it is suggested that, when there are mitigating circumstances for actions (such as the influence of the environment), then the sanctions might be more lenient. The role of “responsibility” for actions, then, in both the courtroom and in wider situations, impacts on the judgements made about people (e.g., the level of blame) and, then, the resultant responses towards them. Weiner (1995) explains that mitigating circumstances (or “invalidating conditions”) could be due to factors such as low ability, age, culture and mental health (for example). The metaphor of the
courtroom can clearly be envisaged in these circumstances, where debates take place about levels of responsibility according to the different circumstances of the individual.

**Responsibility and Controllability**

Weiner (1995) reiterates the fundamental distinction between “personal” and “impersonal” causality (or “person” vs “situation”) and he also confirms the distinction between “controllability” versus “uncontrollability” in which, of course, (i) the former refers to a person having some control over an action/event and (ii) the latter refers to a person not having control over the action/event. As explained earlier, (i) the former might refer to a person gaining qualifications due to having made an “effort” (therefore, having “control”) and (ii) the latter might refer to a person being late due to a hold-up on the roads (therefore, arguably, having “no control” over the event). Clearly, in the first scenario, the person is likely to be held as having some responsibility for his/her examination success whereas the person in the second scenario is unlikely to be held responsible for the hold-up (unless, of course, s/he didn't leave enough time to reach his destination through the rush hour traffic, in which case, s/he might be held responsible).

Weiner (1995) then differentiates between “causal controllability” and the role of “mitigating circumstances” when making judgements of responsibility. For example, if the person who encountered a hold-up in the traffic had set off for his or her appointment at a time of day that normally has a low volume of traffic, he or she is likely to be considered to have been subject to “mitigating circumstances” for being late and, therefore, be unlikely to be held “responsible” due to having “no control” over this. Similarly, an interviewee who fails to attend an interview due to illness is unlikely to be held “responsible” (arguably, not having “control”), whereas an interviewee who failed to attend an interview due to oversleeping is likely to be held “responsible” (due to probably having “control” over this event). Weiner (1995), then, suggests that, in order to be held “responsible”, a person must have some “controllability” for the action taken. He adds that “… responsibility is lessened or entirely lifted if there are mitigating circumstances” (p 11) and he suggests that there are stages of decision-making following an action being made, depicted as follows:
Figure 5: The Role of “Controllability” and Mitigating Circumstances

Responsibility and Intention

As did Heider (1958), Weiner (1995) discusses the extent of “responsibility” assigned and the role of “intention”. However, he also discusses the relevance of the term “negligence”, i.e., where a person may have some “responsibility” for an outcome although this may have been “unintentional”. Again, the metaphor of the courtroom is applicable. For example, if a driver crashes his or her car due to driving in icy and snowy conditions, s/he might be held “responsible”, although the event might not have been “intentional”. However, the driver could be considered “negligent” by deciding to make a journey in such dangerous conditions.

Weiner (1995) differentiates between “responsibility” and “blame” explaining (for example) that a person could be “responsible” for an action but be assigned a small amount of “blame” and this might be due to the outcomes of the action. For example, if we consider the case of the driver who chose to drive in icy conditions and damaged his or her car, we might say s/he is “responsible” and allocate a certain amount of “blame”. However, if the driver had skidded onto the pavement, knocked somebody
over and killed him/her, it is likely that s/he would be held “responsible” but, also, to have a greater degree of “blame” assigned to him or her. However, Weiner (1995) suggests that “responsibility” and “social responses” are mediated by emotions rather than “blame”. He depicts this as follows:

Figure 6: The Impact of Responsibility

\[ \text{sequence of responsibility} \rightarrow \text{anger and/or sympathy} \rightarrow \text{social behaviour} \]

Rather than:

\[ \text{responsibility} \rightarrow \text{blame} \rightarrow \text{social behaviour} \]

(Weiner, 1995, p 15)

In a number of studies in his 1995 publication, Weiner’s questionnaires include ratings of the extent of responsibility (i.e., using a Likert scale), therefore acknowledging the influence of factors such as mitigating circumstances, controllability and intention (see Appendix III for example).

Punishment vs Help

Weiner (1995) further explains his theory (and the link between causal attributions, emotions and behaviour), again, drawing on the achievement context, by describing a situation where two school students fail in an examination. The teacher is likely to search for reasons for the failure of the students. Weiner (1995) explains that, in the area of achievement, success and failure tend, largely, to be due to either “ability” or “effort” (both “internal”, “personal” causes). If the teacher believes that the first student failed due to a lack of effort (an “internal”, “controllable” cause), s/he is likely to hold the student “responsible” and feel “anger”. Conversely, if the teacher believes the second student failed due to a lack of ability (an “internal”/“personal” but “uncontrollable” cause), despite having worked hard, s/he is likely to believe that the student is not “responsible” for the failure and, therefore, feel some “sympathy” and offer support. Weiner (1995) depicts the first scenario as follows:
Weiner (1995) further illustrates the role of “responsibility” in social life and this is discussed in the following sections.

2.4.14 Causal Attributions, Responsibility and Health

Weiner (1995) discusses the causal attributions made about people with poor health, suggesting that, as is the case in achievement motivation, those having poor health are likely to be subject to different emotional and behavioural responses of others, according to the judgements made about the “responsibility” for this. Differences between some causes of ill health are apparent. For example, obesity might be considered due to the “controllable” cause of overeating and/or little exercise (however, other, potential causes of obesity are acknowledged, e.g., thyroid problems). On the other hand, neurofibromatosis or congenital blindness might be viewed as being due to “uncontrollable” genetic causes. As is the case in his theories around responses to success and failure in the area of achievement, Weiner (1995) suggests that “anger” or “pity”, together with either a “negative social reaction” or a “positive social reaction”, will result following the causal attributions made for the cause of the ill health. In the case of obesity, for example, (i) (below) might apply and, in the case of neurofibromatosis or congenital blindness, for example, (ii) might apply:
2.4.15 Causal Attributions, Responsibility and Poverty

A similar sequence to that presented in Figures 9 and 10 would apply in response to a person suffering from poverty, i.e., (i) if the observer believes that s/he had some "control" over the cause of the poverty (and, then, is assigned with having some "responsibility" for this), then negative emotional and behavioural responses are likely to follow. On the other hand, (ii) if the observer believes that s/he did not have "control" over the cause of the poverty (and, therefore, did not have "responsibility" for causing this), then more positive emotional and behavioural responses are likely to follow. Following his discussion of the human response to such stigma, then, Weiner (1995) suggests that there is a "general lawful sequence" which applies, i.e.:

Figure 11: Proposed “General Lawful Sequence” (including “responsibility attributions”)

causal thinking $\iff$ inference of responsibility $\iff$ emotional response $\iff$ action

(Weiner, 1995, p 142)

Weiner (1995) also explains how this “general lawful sequence” can be applied to other stigmas such as suffering from “mental illness”, “alcoholism” and “AIDS”, with the attributions about “responsibility” having implications for “help” being offered.
2.4.16 Causal Attributions, Responsibility and Aggression

Weiner (1995) proposes that the same motivational laws apply to aggression as to the other areas discussed so far, and he presents his theory as follows, with (i) referring to an event when the cause of the aggression (which resulted in harm) is considered “controllable” and (ii) referring to an event when the cause of the aggression (which resulted in harm) is considered “uncontrollable”:

Figure 12: Sequence for Causal Attributions in Relation to Personal Harm (e.g., Aggression)

i. Event (personal harm) $\Rightarrow$ Attributional search $\Rightarrow$ Personal agency, controllable causality, no mitigating circumstances $\Rightarrow$ Inference of responsibility $\Rightarrow$ Anger $\Rightarrow$ Tendency to retaliate

ii. Event (personal harm) $\Rightarrow$ Attributional search $\Rightarrow$ No personal agency, uncontrollable causality, or mitigating circumstances $\Rightarrow$ Inference of nonresponsibility $\Rightarrow$ No anger $\Rightarrow$ No tendency to retaliate

(Weiner, 1995, p 187)

Some idiosyncrasies in the case of “anger” are noted. In relation to feelings of “anger” following a causal attribution for a “personally relevant negative event” (including “a perception of responsibility”), Weiner (1995) stresses that “anger” may not always result. He suggests that:

“My position on this issue – and again it is without empirical confirmation – is that one indeed can learn not to feel anger following an assignment of responsibility to another individual for a personally adverse outcome. But this is quite atypical – perhaps evident only in our most religious people.” (Weiner, 1995, p 19)

Despite earlier hopes of a “general lawful sequence”, Weiner (1995) makes the point that, in relation to aggression, he is not proposing a complete “theory of aggression”, or any other specific category of conduct. Nor does he believe that it is possible to have a complete theory, due to the potential array of precursors to the behaviour. He states that:
“Rather, what is being offered is a mechanism or process that can in part account for some types of aggressive conduct on some occasions, as well as some types of helping on some occasions.” (Weiner, 1995, p 188)

It seems, then, that by this stage there is some acknowledgement that human behaviour may be too complex for a “general lawful sequence” - and resistant to predictive processes.

Extending the discussion of causal attributions and aggression, Caprara, Pastorelli and Weiner (1997) presented three experiments with Italian students. These experiments (and, particularly Experiment 3) are discussed as, again, the models used are particularly pertinent to the research presented in this thesis.

In the first experiment, students were presented with situations in which teachers were reported to be either “angry” or “sympathetic” towards students who had failed in an exam. The results confirmed that, when “anger” was shown, the students interpreted this to mean that the teacher believed they didn’t try. Conversely, when “sympathy” was shown, then the recipient interprets this to mean that the teacher does not hold him/her personally “responsible” for the exam failure as this is due to “poor ability”.

In the second experiment, a selection of scenarios, each depicting a social wrongdoing was presented, e.g.: “Pretend that your classmate invites you to play at his house after school ... You never showed up at your friend’s house.” (Caprara et al, op cit, p 158). Following this, participants were required to choose an example of a “controllable” cause (e.g., “You decided to stay home and watch TV”) and an “uncontrollable” cause (e.g., “You became sick and had to rest in bed.”). When the transgressor was thought to have “control” over his/her behaviour, the respondents reported that “anger” and “retaliation” were likely to be the outcomes (and, then, the transgressor would be likely to try to hide the reason for the behaviour). However, when the transgressor was thought to have “no control” over his/her behaviour (or not to be personally “responsible”), it was reported that “anger” and “retaliation” would not be likely outcomes and, then, there would be no reason for the transgressor to try to hide the cause of his/her behaviour. This sequence of events would be represented as follows:
Figure 13: Causal Attribution Sequence for “Social Wrongdoing” (including attributions of “responsibility”)

Responsibility $\implies$ Anticipated anger $\implies$ Response withholding

And:

Non-responsibility $\implies$ No anticipated anger $\implies$ Response revealing

(truthfulness)

The third experiment considered the response of “help giving” following harm being inflicted on another either deliberately or not. One of the scenarios is given below to illustrate:

“Pretend that you and your parents are going on vacation. You ask your friend, who lives next door, to feed your fish while you are away. When you return you find that the fish has not been fed and it is very sick.” (Caprara et al, op cit, p 160)

Caprara et al (op cit) found that help-giving would be likely to follow if the perception was that harm had occurred “unintentionally” and, conversely, help would be withheld if the perception was that the harm had been inflicted “intentionally”. Again, the emotions of “anger” and “sympathy” were considered to be experienced according to whether the harm was inflicted “intentionally” or “unintentionally”. The sequences are depicted as follows:

Figure 14: Causal Attribution Sequence for “Social Wrongdoing” (including attributions of “intention”)

Intentional harm $\implies$ Inferred responsibility $\implies$ Anger, no sympathy $\implies$ Lack of help

And:

Unintended harm $\implies$ No inferred responsibility $\implies$ Anger, sympathy $\implies$ Help

The authors add that, following judgements about personal “responsibility”, an observer will experience an emotion, such as “anger” or “sympathy”, depending upon
whether personal “responsibility” is perceived or not and the following figures demonstrate this sequence of events (Figures 15 – 16).

**Figure 15: General Causal Sequence: Link between “Cause”, “Affect” and “Behavior”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causal ascriptions</th>
<th>Affective reactions</th>
<th>Behaviour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(Caprara et al, op cit, p 154)

This depiction can be extended by adding detail according to whether the causal ascription (“attribution”) is positive or negative:

**Figure 16: Causal Attributions: Link between “Responsibility” and “Emotion”**

- **Attributions of responsibility**
  - for a negative event ➔ Anger ➔ Antisocial response

- **Attributions of nonresponsibility**
  - for a negative event ➔ Sympathy ➔ Prosocial response

(Caprara et al, op cit, p 154)

In his 2006 model (see Appendix I, Model 5 (ii)), Weiner did not include that the “unintentional” aggressive act of another would lead to “sympathy” (which was included in his 1995 model - see Appendix 1, Model 6 (ii) for a comparison). Via a personal communication (B Weiner, personal communication, July 29, 2012) he explained that, although an aggressive act towards oneself may be “uncontrollable” (and, therefore, not involve “responsibility”), any “sympathy” is likely to be “muted”. He added that this omission in his 2006 model is due to “a retreat to less complexity” rather than “a fundamental shift” in his thinking.

Clearly, over the last four decades, Weiner has developed his theory of causal attributions into a “Theory of Social Motivation” (Weiner, 2010), albeit with some qualifications (or limitations) (see previous paragraph), which includes the three causal dimensions of (i) locus of control; (ii) stability and (iii) controllability. However, Weiner and colleagues (e.g., Weiner, Graham and Chandler, op cit; Weiner et al,
1978; Weiner et al, 1979) have, also, extensively investigated the role of emotions. The following studies demonstrate how his models have been adopted by other researches and applied to wider human experience, some of which have a particular focus upon schools and children/young people.

2.5 WIDER APPLICATIONS OF ATTRIBUTION THEORY: FURTHER STUDIES

2.5.1 Causal Attributions for Behaviour Difficulties in School

A selection of studies has focused upon causal attributions for behaviour difficulties in schools and these are discussed below.

Teacher Causal Attributions

Miller (1995) discussed the potential causes of difficult student behaviour in school and the subsequent link with “blame”. He highlights Weiner’s (1980a) theory that attributions fall along three dimensions, i.e., “locus” (of control, i.e., “internal” or “external”), “stability” and “controllability”.

Miller’s (1995) research was based on real-life experiences. Participants comprised 24 primary school teachers, nominated by educational psychologists, who had been involved in largely successful interventions which included a behaviourist approach. With the exception of two teachers, those in the study worked in different schools. The 24 students in the study were taken from across the primary school age range, with the mean age being 7.1 years. Data were gathered from teachers via a structured interview with the aim being to gain teachers’ causal attributions for the origins of the difficult behaviour (i.e., of the student subject to the intervention), together with causal attributions for the improvement in behaviour. Amongst the results were that teachers tended to attribute the causes of difficult student behaviour to the pupils (n = 21 attributions) but, also, to parents (n = 15 attributions). However, the teachers attributed just 10 of the causes of difficult student behaviour to themselves, therefore demonstrating that they thought both parents and students were mainly implicated in the causes of difficult student behaviour rather than themselves. For the purposes of illustration, some of the causes which teachers attributed to the pupils were as follows:

- attention-seeking
- attention span
- lack of acceptance of school rules

A selection of causes which teachers attributed to the parents are:

- punitive/violent home
- absence of father
- lack of attention to child

Finally, some of the causes which teachers attributed to themselves are:

- interest level of work set
- work expectations/steps set
- teacher’s anxiety

In relation to causal attributions for the improvement in pupil behaviour, teachers considered that they were the cause of the improvement in the behaviour significantly more than were parents or students (i.e., with the number of causal attributions being made to parents, pupils and the teachers themselves for improved behaviour being 3, 13 and 20 respectively). Some of the causal attributions for the improvement in pupil behaviour are as follows:

Attributions to pupil:

- maturity
- knowledge of specific school rules
- respect for teacher

Attributions to parents:

- encouragement of child
- feeling supported by teachers
- general management of child
Attributions to teachers:

- positive attention to pupil
- interest level of work set
- incentives/tangible rewards

Miller (1995) analysed the results further, in terms of the individual’s “controllability” for the difficult behaviour (and, therefore, the “responsibility”) and found that teachers considered themselves and parents to have low “controllability” for the origins of difficult student behaviour, but considered students to have high “controllability” (with the number of teachers making these considerations for parents, pupils and themselves being 3, 22 and 1 respectively). However, the teachers reported that they, themselves, had the highest “controllability” for the improved behaviour. As the teachers felt they were less implicated in the causes of difficult behaviour than were others and, as they believed they were more influential in positive outcomes than were the others, there was some support for the “self-serving bias” in the results (see Section 2.3.4). In his discussion, Miller (1995) emphasises the potential difference in the attributional styles of teachers and stresses the relevance of incorporating attributions into interventions:

“… the attributions teachers make for pupil behaviour are likely in some instances to remain considerable stumbling blocks to any form of intervention, unless incorporated more explicitly into the legitimate domains for EPs’ enquiries and action.” (Miller, 1995, p 469)

This suggests that a teacher’s causal attributions about student misbehaviour are likely to impact on how s/he responds. It is likely, then, that a teacher having knowledge of his or her own causal attributions might impact on his or her management of students in school and, then, this might have implications for in-service training as well as for conversations (between teachers, parents, students and other professionals) about student difficulties.

Miller (1995) reflects on the method employed in his study and, for example, suggests that teachers may respond differently if their attributions were being gained during the course of an intervention, rather than asking for their attributions following an intervention. He also proposed that a teacher’s attributions for the cause of a student’s difficult behaviour may be different according to whether the intervention
was successful or not, e.g., s/he might accept some responsibility for the cause of the behaviour if his or her intervention was successful but not if the converse were true.

As was the case with Miller's (1995) work, Bibou-Nakou, Stogiannidou and Kiosseoglou's (1999) research also considered teachers' attributions for behaviour difficulties in school, together with their “preferred practices” or “coping practices” in relation to behaviour difficulties. Bibou-Nakou et al (op cit) suggest that research has found a significant correlation between teacher burnout and student discipline although they add that, at the time, little attention had been paid to the link between attributions and teacher burnout. In their 1999 paper, the impact on teacher “burnout” was also included (with “burnout” comprising “emotional exhaustion”, “depersonalisation” and “reduced personal accomplishment”). The research involved gaining the explanatory (“causal”) attributions of 200 elementary school teachers from Greece for four types of behaviour difficulty. The majority of the teachers were female (62.8%), below the age of 35 years (84.7%) and had up to nine years teaching experience (80.1%).

A questionnaire was used to gather the data and this enquired about the regularity and extent of the four examples of behaviour difficulty (chosen as a result of evidence suggesting their significance for teachers), i.e., “disobedience”; “playing the clown”; “disturbance of others” and “off-task behaviour”. The questionnaire included the dimension of “internal” vs “external” causality and enquired about the teachers’ causal attributions for these behaviours, categorised as either (i) “internal” or “external” teacher-related causes (e.g., “personality traits” in the case of “internal” causes and “teaching experience” in the case of “external” causes); (ii) “external” student-related causes (e.g., “situation-specific behaviour”) and (iii) “internal” student-related causes (e.g., “students’ personality”). The teachers’ anticipated behavioural response to each of the behaviours was also sought (e.g., “punishment”; “removal from class”) and finally, teacher burnout was measured using The Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, 1986, as cited in Bibou-Nakou et al, op cit). For the purposes of this discussion, it is teachers’ causal attributions which will be emphasised. The authors found that, for the teachers who participated in this study, it was “internal”, student-related factors (such as “disrupts others”) which were the most likely to be seen as being the cause of the behaviour difficulties in class, as in Miller's (1995) research. In addition, it was these “internal”, student-related attributions which were related to higher emotional exhaustion. The link between the causal attributions made about others and the emotional impact on the observer is apparent.
The authors acknowledge that gaining their data via questionnaire might be problematic (as it might not reflect what happens in practice) and they also acknowledge the impact of (for example) organisational and personal factors on a teacher’s likelihood of experiencing burnout, as well as his or her ability to manage disruptive student behaviour. Similarly to the conclusion made by Miller (1995), Bibou-Nakou et al (op cit) conclude that:

“One means of more adequately dealing with teacher burnout might involve the evaluation of teachers’ attributions and perceptions regarding work stressors.” (Bibou-Nakou et al, op cit, p 209)

Poulou and Norwich (2000; 2002) discuss their research which also considered students with EBD (Emotional Behavioural Difficulties) and involved an examination of the causal attributions of teachers and the subsequent effects on their emotions, cognitions and behaviour (including their “coping strategies”). They state that:

“Teachers’ ideas about the causes of students’ behaviour in turn affect the attitudes they adopt towards their students, their dispositions and the eventual decisions to help them overcome their difficulties.” (Poulou and Norwich, 2000, p 560)

The study consisted of asking elementary school teachers from 60 schools in Athens to complete an Attribution Inventory containing vignettes depicting problem behaviour (ranging from “mild”/ “severe conduct”; “mild”/ “severe emotional” and “mild”/ “severe conduct and emotional”). The vignettes were largely compiled using information gained from a behaviour inventory (completed by teachers) and from interviews with teachers, with events from “real life” situations being incorporated. Four potential causes of EBD were incorporated, i.e., those stemming from the “child”, “family”, “teacher” and “school”. Statements were included which intended to discover teachers’ feelings about the children as well as their emotional, cognitive and behavioural responses. Three hundred and ninety one inventories were completed and returned.

In the case of the causal attributions for the children’s EBD, the authors found that, across all the categories of EBD, the causal attributions were greater for the impact of the “school” and “teacher” on the behaviour of the “child” (although with causal attributions to the “school” being lower than to the “teacher” in the categories of “mild” and “severe emotional” difficulties). In addition, attributions to the “child” for the cause
of the behaviours were lower than were attributions to the “family” in the case of “mild” and “severe” conduct difficulties, as well as “mild emotional” difficulties. These results clearly differ from those of Miller (1995) and Bibou-Nakou et al (op cit) who found that, overall, teachers attributed the cause of student misbehaviour to the students themselves.

In relation to teachers’ cognitive responses (in response to the vignettes), teacher’s reported they would have a “desire to help” and have feelings of “responsibility” across all vignettes. In relation to teachers’ emotional responses to the children with EBD described in the vignettes, feelings of “sympathy” were higher than were feelings of “anger”, “irritation” and “indifference” across all categories of EBD.

Finally, the findings for teachers’ reported “actual coping strategies” showed that “positive” interventions were higher than other responses across all categories of behaviour, with “individualised” approaches also being rated highly. The application of “negative” coping strategies was particularly low across all categories of EBD.

Following further analysis, Poulou and Norwich (2002) found that (for example):

- EBD which were attributed to “teachers” were more likely to be viewed as changeable;

- EBD which tended to be attributed to “schools” were more likely to result in negative feelings for teachers such as “stress”;

- EBD that was attributed to the “child” tended to result in the teachers feeling emotions such as “stress” and “helplessness”;

- in relation to the emotional responses of teachers to students with EBD, teachers reported “self-directed” emotions such as “stress” and “helplessness” (for example) if the cause of the EBD was considered to be “within child” or the cause of the school (e.g., as in “irrelevant curricula”);

- as teachers felt more negative emotions (such as “anger”, “irritation” and “indifference”), as a result of a child with EBD, the less likely they were to offer support.
In summary, it was found that the Greek teachers who participated in this research felt that the cause of the behaviour difficulties were more likely to be linked to the school and the teachers themselves than to the family and the child which, as stated earlier, differs from earlier research results (e.g., Miller, 1995; Bibou-Nakou et al, op cit). One potential reason given for this is that the teachers may have responded according to “social expectations”, i.e., they responded according to how they might be expected to. However, we might also reflect that the teachers were giving responses according to the behaviour of other teachers, not themselves (even though the vignettes suggested it was the teacher completing the questionnaire that was portrayed in the vignettes). This could, of course, mean that they would give different responses if the situation was a real-life situation involving themselves. It is also possible that the different categories of EBD resulted in different results to those found by Miller (1995) and Bibou-Nakou et al (op cit). For example, in Poulou and Norwich’s (2000) research, “mild” conduct difficulties included “untidiness” and “fidgeting”; “severe” conduct difficulties included “disobedience” and “offensive language”; “mild” emotional difficulties included “excessive shyness” and “overdependence on teacher” and “severe” emotional difficulties including “anxiety about failure” and “depressive mood”. Reflecting on the range of EBD presented in this research may have resulted in teachers taking a more benevolent and empathetic view of the difficulties faced by students.

Finally, Mavropoulou and Padeliadu (2002) conducted a study with the aim of considering the link between teachers’ causal attributions and their perceptions of control in relation to behaviour difficulties in school (with the impact of level of teaching experience also being sought). The authors refer to Weiner’s (1985) theory in their study, i.e., the three dimensions of (i) locus of control; (ii) stability; and (iii) controllability.

Three hundred and five participants were involved in the research, consisting of approximately equal numbers of male and female elementary school teachers (with the average teaching experience of the participants being 13.8 years). Participants were given a vignette which described a student displaying behavioural difficulties and were asked to rate each of the twelve potential causes of the behaviour difficulty on a 4-point Likert scale. These causes were adopted from earlier research and classified according to: (i) “pupil-related factors” (such as “learning problems”; “brain damage”); (ii) “family-related factors” (such as “parental attitude”) and (iii) “school-related factors” (such as “number of students in class”). A measure of control was also administered (The Spheres of Control (SOC) by Paulhus, 1983, as cited in Mavropoulou and...
Padeliadu, op it), in which “control” was considered according to (i) “personal efficacy”, (ii) “social relationships and interactions (interpersonal control)” and (iii) “socio-political factors”.

Again, for the purposes of this literature review, it is the causal attributions for the behaviour which is focused upon. As was the case in Miller’s (1995) research and that of Bibou-Nakou et al (op cit), the results suggested that teacher’s attributions for student behaviour problems were largely linked to “pupil-related factors” and “family-related factors”. However, overall, “school-related factors” were not considered to be implicated in student behaviour problems.

An interesting, and significant, finding of this research was the association between teachers’ longer length of experience and the attribution of a student’s behaviour problems to factors “external” to the teacher. It was reflected that this might be due to experienced teachers believing that they have the skills to manage difficulties and, if difficulties are beyond their management, then “external” causes must be the source.

With the exception of Poulou and Norwich’s (2000) research, then, teachers tend to attribute student EBD to factors within the students and families, rather than to themselves. Miller’s (1995) appears to be unique in that it is based on situations in which teachers had been involved, whereas the research conducted by the other researchers was based on other methods including questionnaires containing vignettes.

Of course, we cannot be sure how the participants in some of the studies approached the questions asked, e.g., whether they believed they were commenting upon a fictitious teacher and student, or whether they responded according to themselves being the teacher in question. This would, of course, have an impact on responses, i.e., there is likely to be a difference in how teachers report teachers ought to respond and how they do respond in practice.

**Parental Causal Attributions**

Miller, Ferguson and Moore (2002) conducted a study into the causal attributions of parents, with participants comprising 144 parents (mainly mothers) whose children were pupils at the same primary school. Following parents giving potential causes for behaviour difficulties in class, a 61-item questionnaire was devised incorporating these. The results of this research were that parents largely attributed difficult student
behaviour in the classroom to (i) “fairness of teachers’ actions”, (ii) “pupil vulnerability to peer influences and adverse family circumstances” and (iii) “differentiation of classroom demands and expectations” (with both (i) and (ii) being considered more significant than (iii)). These results indicate that the parents did consider that the actions of the teachers had some impact upon the student behaviour but, also, that wider (e.g., home circumstance) might have an adverse effect. It should be noted that the parents in this study were not, necessarily, making judgements about themselves as parents, but about the parents in the school in general (which, of course, might have influenced their responses).

**Student Causal Attributions**

An earlier study, linked to the above, was conducted by Miller, Ferguson and Byrne (op cit) into the causal attributions of students for difficult classroom behaviour. Following initial, small-group interviews (with students placed in their first year of secondary school), conducted in order to identify factors from within the primary school which might cause difficult student behaviour, a questionnaire was constructed and completed by 105 students (again, within their first year at secondary school). Overall, it was found that students mainly attributed the causes of difficult student behaviour to “fairness of teacher’s actions” and “pupil vulnerability” (with the former referring to actions such as “teacher injustice” and the latter referring to factors such as “emotional problems” and pressures resulting from other peers or school work). In addition, “adverse family circumstances” and “strictness of classroom regime” were also considered to be causes. However, the authors note some methodological concerns (e.g., the research was based on retrospection). These results appear to reflect that the students felt some empathy for their peers within the primary school, largely blaming teachers or other “external” factors for their behaviour.

There appear to be few studies which consider student attributions for teacher behaviour. However, McPherson and Young (2004) conducted a study into the reasons given by college students for teachers’ displays of anger within the classroom. There were two research questions: (i) “What reasons do students provide for their teacher’s anger?” and (ii) “How do students’ reasons for their teacher’s anger influence their perceptions of teacher anger, including attributions of internality, evaluations of appropriateness, perceptions of anger expression as aggressive and perceptions of anger expression as assertive?” (p 360). McPherson and Young (op cit) differentiated “anger” according to it being “aggressive” or “assertive”, with the former referring to anger which is threatening/hostile to others.
(including verbal abuse) and the latter referring to anger which is based on assertively voicing one’s opinions.

The research participants consisted of 301 undergraduate students attending a university in the western United States comprising multiethnic backgrounds, with the age span being 17 – 50 years and 189 participants being female and 110 being male. The students were asked to “think of a specific teacher who became angry in one of your college classes within the last year” and, then, “describe the angry episode or event.” It should be noted, then, that the students were not specifically asked to recall an event when teacher anger was directed to themselves (and the direction of the anger was not identified as being an important factor in the procedure). The participants then completed measures to ascertain factors such as the intensity of the anger, how appropriate it was and the level of “internality” assigned to the behaviour (i.e., “internal” to the teacher). However, for the purposes of this literature review, it is the reasons given for the teacher behaviour which is focussed upon (note that, although the authors acknowledged that the term “causes” is used in attribution theory, the method involved asking the students for the “reasons” for the teacher anger). Using a coding scheme to categorise student reasons for the teacher anger, seven categories emerged, named as (in order of number of respondents, with these being given in brackets):

i. Student misbehaviours (n = 90)
ii. Lack of student effort (n = 57)
iii. Student-teacher power challenges (n = 55)
iv. Students’ poor performance (n = 32)
v. Teacher personality issues (n = 27)
vi. Teacher life circumstances (n = 16)
vii. Lack of teacher skill or preparedness (n = 13)

Three reasons are, then, specifically linked to the teacher (v; vi; vii) and four reasons largely linked to the students (i; ii; iii; iv). In relation to questions asking about the reasons for the teacher’s anger, the “overwhelming majority” of students gave reasons relating to students, as is evident from the above participant response numbers (in brackets).

Of course, in this particular research, the participants were asked to recall an incident which took place during the preceding year. Depending upon how recent the incident was (which was not considered via the research), it would be reasonable to question
the level of detail recalled as time progressed. In addition, an important weakness of the research must be that there was no differentiation about whether the anger expressed by the teachers was directed towards the participants, to the class in general, or to another student. It would seem logical to expect a student’s feelings (and, possibly, their reasoning about the behaviour) to differ according to whether or not s/he is the target of the anger. Also, as it is possible for all of the incidents recalled by the 301 participants to be different (involving different teachers, different contexts, different reasons for the teacher behaviour, etc), it would seem problematic to draw broad conclusions based on these potentially very different events. We should also consider the possible impact of previous knowledge of the teacher, including the history between teacher and class/student, which may be present due to “real life” situations being used in the research. A final criticism of McPherson and Young’s (op cit) research, is that students were asked to give the reason for the teacher behaviour which, it would seem, may result in different responses if students were asked to give the potential cause. To illustrate this distinction (refer back to Section 2.4.1 for a discussion), if we consider one of the responses provided in the paper as an example of a “reason”, i.e., “Students didn’t follow directions”, it is clear that this might be an accurate reason for a teacher become angry. However, if (for example) the teacher anger was extreme and appeared unjustified, the “cause” of the behaviour might have been given as, “He was under stress due to problems at home”. In other words, it would seem that asking for a “reason” for a behaviour might result in an obvious (or “literal”) explanation whereas asking for a “cause” suggests that there might be something else underlying the behaviour. Therefore, in research relating to causal attributions, it seems important to determine whether a “reason” or a “cause” is being sought and to acknowledge this in the method and results.

Kelsey et al (op cit) also conducted research into college students’ attributions of teacher misbehaviours, with participants’ ages ranging from 17 – 39 years. Twenty eight categories of teacher “misbehaviour” had been identified from earlier research and these were, then, categorised into three groups labelled as (i) “incompetence” (including “boring lectures” and “apathetic toward students”); (ii) “offensiveness” (including “sarcasm/putdowns” and “verbal abuse”) and (iii) “indolence” (including “unprepared and disorganised”). The authors’ hypotheses included that (i) students would make more “internal” attributions for teacher misbehaviour (than “external”) and (ii) teacher misbehaviour which is consistent would result in more “internal” attributions than would their inconsistent behaviour (the latter of which would be attributed to “external” causes). The method included an open-ended question asking for reasons why a teacher might engage in such misbehaviours. The results indicated
that, overall, the students gave reasons which would indicate “internal” causality (e.g., “My teacher misbehaves because she/he has a bad attitude”) and the authors suggest that their results support the proposals of attribution theory (e.g., assigning “internal” attributions to others for negative behaviour). Kelsey et al (op cit) suggest that discovering student attributions for teacher behaviour is important for a number of reasons including the impact these attributions may have on student attitudes towards their teachers, as well as their learning and conformity. In addition, they add that a knowledge of the attributional processes that students adopt may support educators in anticipating student reactions to their teachers’ behaviour.

2.5.2 Causal Attributions within the Family

A number of studies have considered the role of causal attributions within the family (including, for example, the causal attributions of parents for their child’s behaviour, children’s causal attributions in relation to themselves and those associated with domestic violence) and a selection of these are discussed.

Grace, Kelley and McCain (1993) found that the negative causal attributions of mothers and their teenagers positively correlated with conflict between them. However, the main reliable predictor of conflict was the conviction that the behaviour of the other was a result of “global” factors. Despite some cautionary comments relating to the limitations of the research (including the direction of causality, i.e., whether negative attributions adversely influenced teenage behaviour or vice-versa), Grace et al (op cit) suggest that:

“... it might be clinically important for clinicians to target negative attributions made by mothers and teenagers experiencing high levels of conflict. Possibly by teaching individuals to interpret one another's behaviour more benevolently, conflict might be reduced and negative interactive cycles might be prevented.”
(Grace et al, op cit, p 208-9)

Johnston and Ohan (op cit) reflected on earlier research and considered the attributions of parents towards their children who had been diagnosed with having Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity (ADHD) and other “disruptive behavior disorders”. The authors acknowledge the difficulties which parents can experience when managing their children who have “disruptive disorders” (such as ADHD) and confirm that, when a parent makes a decision about his or her child’s behaviour, this will be based on information gained across the three dimensions proposed by Weiner, i.e., “locus”,
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“stability” and “control”. However, they suggest that these parental causal attributions can be a hindrance and illustrate how parents can give different explanations for the same “difficult” child behaviour, e.g., a child who keeps getting up during the night might be viewed as deliberately trying to annoy the adult or, on the hand, it might be decided that s/he had difficulty in sleeping because the light is on. Clearly, these interpretations are likely to result in different emotional and behavioural reactions for the parent. In terms of Weiner’s theory (e.g., see Appendix I, Models 1 and 2), the former interpretation would link the child’s behaviour to “internal” and “controllable” factors, therefore, likely resulting in “anger” for the parent (and him/her reprimanding the child). However, the latter interpretation would link the child’s behaviour to “external” and “uncontrollable” factors (in relation to the child’s behaviour), therefore potentially resulting in “sympathy” for the child (with the adult taking some responsibility for the situation and, therefore, turning the light off/down). Whether the child’s behaviour in the first scenario is considered to be “stable” or “unstable” may not significantly affect the adult’s subsequent responses (i.e., whether the child frequently tries to annoy the parent, or whether this is a rare occurrence). Johnston and Ohan (op cit) then give another illustration, i.e., the example of a child who will not eat the food prepared. The parent might consider whether (for example) this is due to the child choosing to be defiant (an “internal”, “unstable” and “controllable” cause) or whether it is due to the child being temporarily unwell (an “internal”, “unstable” but “uncontrollable” cause). According to Johnston and Ohan (op cit) the attribution made (which might include bias, of course) would, as in the earlier example, affect the subsequent parental response to the child, with the former likely to incite more negative responses than the latter. The “social-cognitive” model discussed, then (see below), is based on the parental attribution mediating between the child’s behaviour and the parent’s response. Any potential emotion is not included in this model but, based on earlier discussion, the role which might be played by this may be anticipated. The application of the model to children diagnosed with ADHD is clear.

**Figure 17: Model of Parental Attributions in Parent-Child Interactions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child’s Behaviour</th>
<th>Parental Attributions</th>
<th>Parent Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(adapted from Johnston and Ohan, op cit, p 171)

Johnston and Ohan (op cit) acknowledge that this model is limited as earlier research has found that there are other factors involved in the process including (for example) goals of the parents, personality of the parents, parental mood and both the social and
cultural circumstances (however, they add that these aspects can be very difficult to take account of in research). However, the authors propose that researchers should endeavour to include such wider factors into their research into parental attributions. Following their review of the literature, Johnston and Ohan (op cit) conclude that “…there is compelling evidence that parental attributions play an influential role as contributors to the difficulties facing parents and children with disruptive behavior” (p 179). The authors add that interventions based on cognitive therapy techniques are beginning to show some benefits in reducing the difficult behaviour of children with ADHD and aggressive behaviour, i.e., via altering parental attributions of blame towards their children. Linked to this is an earlier paper by Morrissey-Kane and Prinz (op cit), in which they reviewed previous research and concluded that, overall, there was support for the notion that parental attributions either positively or negatively affect their seeking of, and engagement within, mental health treatments for their child. There does then appear to be compelling evidence for the impact of causal attributions on relationships between children, young people and their parents.

Perez-Bouchard et al (op cit) focussed their research upon the attributional style of children of substance abusers. The authors suggest that earlier studies have concluded that having a negative attributional style can result in depression (i.e., attributing negative life events to “stable” and “global” factors is likely to lead to hopelessness which, then, leads to depression). Perez-Bouchard et al (op cit) studied forty male children between 8 and 14 years of age, 50% of whom had a parent who had engaged in substance abuse and 50% of whom did not. Data were gathered via a number of methods including questionnaire completion (including the Children’s Depression Inventory (Kovacs, 1983, as cited in Perez-Bouchard et al, op cit) and the Children’s Attributional Style Questionnaire (CASQ) (Peterson, 1991, as cited in Perez-Bouchard et al, op cit), in order to investigate both depression and attributional style in the context of other conditions such as parental separation/ divorce. The CASQ (Peterson, op cit) contains the dimensions of “internality”, “stability” and “globality”. As hypothesised, children who had substance abuse within the family were significantly more likely to have a more depressive attributional style than those who did not, with the children being significantly more likely to attribute “internal”, “stable” and “global” reasons for negative life events. This was even more likely if the children came from families where the parents had separated or divorced. Additional analysis found that it was the “stability” and “globality” dimensions that accounted for the differences in attributional style between children of substance abusers and children of non-substance abusers. The authors note the potential problems for such children in terms of future depression and anti-social behaviours including drug abuse.
but add that some success had been found in altering the attributional style of children via “attributional retraining” (as was also suggested by Johnson and Ohan, op cit).

Another study which considered children’s causal attributions is that by Gable and Peterson (1998) who conducted a study into eight year old children’s causal attributions for their own naturally-occurring minor injuries (such as “minor cuts and scrapes”, “tripping” and “choking on food”, for example). Their study was based on the assertion that, by school age (and partly due to spending time at school rather than with their parents), children are expected to take steps to manage their own safety. However, the authors suggest that it could be that parents overestimate their children’s ability to understand why injuries occur and, for example, their own role in injuries. Of course, being aware of the cause of a minor injury is important in avoiding such an injury in the future. Gable and Peterson (op cit) aimed to discover whether the children in their study attributed their minor injuries mainly to “external” causes, their own behaviour, fate or a mixture of these causes.

The research involved sixty-one mothers and their children being interviewed every two weeks over the course of a year. Approximately 50% of boys and 50% of girls comprised the sample. A number of exclusion criteria was applied, including if the child had a learning disability or physical disability (which might, arguably, have had an impact on risk-taking behaviour or the likelihood of the children inadvertently hurting themselves). Data collection included parents completing “injury monitoring data sheets” following their child’s injury and children being asked to rate how much they thought their injury was a result of the situation, their own behaviour or fate.

Over the course of the study, the authors state that the children reported over one thousand injuries altogether, with the average number of injuries for each child being seventeen (and the range being from two – forty three). Following analysis of the results, it was found that, overall, the children in the study attributed the cause of their injury (i) to “fate” in 30% of cases, (ii) to the “situation” in 25% of cases, (iii) to “themselves” in 18% of cases, (iv) to both the “situation” and “fate” in 10% of cases, (v) to both “themselves” and the “situation” in 6% of cases, (vi) to all three causes in 6% of cases and (vii) to both “themselves” and “fate” in 5% of cases (from (iv) to (vii) the attributions to each cause were equal in measure). That 65% of injuries were attributed to causes other than the children themselves may be surprising (to “fate” and/or the “situation”), i.e., the children did not appear to hold themselves in any way responsible for the injury. In only 18% of cases did the children consider themselves to be solely responsible for the injuries. No significant differences were found in the
results in relation to gender, nor in relation to the number of injuries an individual child had over the year. Following a discussion of the results, the authors suggest that it is important for parents to communicate with their children about what behaviour is acceptable and which is unacceptable but, also, to discuss “safety rules”, with the reasons for this being to support children in seeing the link between their own behaviour and their injuries. Or, to place this in “attribution terms”, to attribute injuries to their own behaviour, therefore hopefully encouraging them to alter their behaviour which might lead to injury.

A number of studies have considered the role of causal attributions in instances of domestic violence and Wallach and Sela (op cit) reviewed the research on the use of causal attributions in domestic violence when engaged in by males. The authors chose to adopt the dimensions of “internal-external”, “stable-unstable” and “global-specific”. In their review of the literature, Wallach and Sela (op cit) found differences between the violent male’s view of his wife’s positive and negative behaviour. In relation to his wife’s positive behaviour, “The violent male views his spouse’s positive behavior as external, specific and unstable” (p 657) and, also, linked to “selfish” and “unintentional” purposes and, therefore, not worthy of praise. Conversely, in relation to his wife’s negative behaviour, the violent male “… views her negative behavior as internal, global, stable…” (p 657) but, also, linked to “selfish” and “intentional” purposes and, then, worthy of blame. The authors add that males who batter their wives and take responsibility for this, still attribute their own behaviour to pressures such as outside (“external”) influences or factors which might be considered “unintentional” and, therefore, not blameworthy, such as stressful situations, alcohol consumption or lack of control. Wallach and Sela (op cit) suggest that it has been found that attributional styles are different between violent and non-violent men and conclude that, in interventions to address domestic violence, it is important to discover the causal attributions of the perpetrator but, also, to target these in interventions.

The studies discussed demonstrate how the dimensions involved in making causal attributions have been applied in research within different social situations. These clearly show evidence of the self-serving bias (i.e., protecting oneself and justifying one’s own behaviour via the causal attributions made) as well as the impact of causal attributions on “blame” and the observer’s emotions and behaviour. There is some agreement on the benefits of retraining attributions in order to promote positive relationships and personal stress levels. The studies also demonstrate how there can be significant differences between the causal attributions of actors and observers for the same behaviour, how “responsibility” and “blame” are more likely to be assigned
to others for negative behaviour and how causal attributions affect emotions and behaviour in a wide variety of different situations.

2.6 **ATTRIBUTIONS FOR NEGATIVE BEHAVIOURS**

As is evident from the earlier research discussed, research into attribution theory has largely focused upon negative behaviours and/or situations. Some studies have included both a “positive” and “negative” focus although these appear to be in relation to academic success and failure (e.g., see scenarios in Caprara, Pastorelli and Weiner, op cit, Experiment 1; Weiner and Kukla, op cit; Weiner et al, 1978; Weiner et al, 1979). A large number of other studies which have a focus upon negative behaviours and/or situations have been discussed in the current chapter. For example: Grace, Kelley, and McCain (op cit) focused upon conflict between teenagers and mothers; Gable and Peterson (op cit) considered children’s attributions for their own minor injuries; Johnston and Ohan (op cit) looked at parental attributions of children with ADHD and other disruptive behaviours and Wallach and Sella (op cit) looked at the link between domestic violence and attributions. A number of studies have focused upon teacher, parents and student causal attributions for difficult student behaviour in school, e.g., Bibou-Nakou, Stogiannidou and Kiosseoglou (op cit); Miller, Ferguson and Byrne (op cit); Miller, Ferguson and Moore (op cit); Miller (1995); Mavropoulou and Padeliadu (op cit) and Poulou and Norwich (2000; 2002). However, Kelsey et al (op cit) are the only researchers identified in the current review to consider *student* attributions of *teacher* misbehaviours.

Although these studies had a focus on what might be considered “negative” situations, this may not necessarily have been emphasised by the researchers. However, there are some studies when the authors have specifically used the term “negative”. For example, Caprara, Pastorelli and Weiner (op cit) acknowledge that they have used “negative scenarios”, i.e., in relation to Experiment 3 they state that “… the two scenarios … varied the controllability of the cause of a negative outcome.” (p 159). In addition, Weiner, Graham and Chandler (op cit) (Experiment 1) include the term “negative” in their research which involved asking participants to recall situations in which pity, anger and guilt were experienced (e.g., with it being hypothesised that “pity” related to “negative state”, “anger” was due to a “personally relevant negative outcome” and “guilt” resulted from “a negative consequence.”).
2.7 DIFFERENCES IN THE MAKING OF CAUSAL ATTRIBUTIONS

Some differences in making causal attributions have been noted between individuals, cultures and groups within cultures. A simple explanation of a difference in making attributions is given by Weiner (2006) and this is followed by a selection of pertinent studies.

Weiner (2006) notes the impact of the meaning of events for the individual. For example, in the case of a student achieving a B in an examination, for one student, this might be considered a success (e.g., s/he might reflect, “Achieving a B is enough for me to start the college course that I wanted”) but, for another, this might be considered a failure (e.g., s/he might reflect, “My brother and sister always got straight As. Achieving a B has let down my family”). However, the meaning of events for an individual is an area that has achieved scant attention in this area of research.

MacGeorge (2003) acknowledged “the strength of Weiner’s model” in helping contexts (i.e., his “attribution-emotion-action” model) and applied this to her study into the influence of gender on attributions and emotions. Over 1,000 undergraduate students comprised the participants, each of whom were provided with a hypothetical scenario and questions describing a friend who was upset by some personal challenge (the “support seeker”). The scenarios indicated different levels of responsibility for the situation as well as different levels of effort made to overcome the challenge presented. Following analysis of the data, some gender differences were found, including that the males (described as the “support givers” on this occasion):

- attributed more responsibility to male help-seekers (depicted as having responsibility) for their “challenging” situations and who made low effort to solve these;

- reported more feelings of anger towards male help-seekers than female help-seekers who were depicted as having some responsibility for their “challenging” situation; and

- tended to assign “blame” more than did females in help-seeking situations.

In relation to wider groups, Skitka, Mullen, Griffin, Hutchinson and Chamberlin (2002) undertook research based on differing political stances, i.e., into the differing attributions that conservatives and liberals make for the adverse circumstances of
individuals within society (such as “crime”, “poverty” and “obesity”). They state that: “Research has consistently found that liberals and conservatives prefer different attributions for the causes of various social and personal problems.” (p 470). For example, they suggest that conservatives attribute poverty to a deficit on the part of the individual (e.g., “self-indulgence”; “lack of moral standards and intelligence”). On the other hand, they suggest that liberals have a more benevolent view (e.g., that an individual suffering from poverty is a consequence of “unjust social practices”) and that these different attributions result in different policies and aims. Their 2002 research confirmed that conservatives and liberals have different attributions for an individual’s problems if the initial “personal attributions” they make are in opposition to their ideologies and aspirations. Henry, Reyna and Weiner (2004) found similar differences in attributions made about individuals on “welfare” and those who are “poor”, with the former being subject to less favourable public opinion than the latter due to attributions of “control” (and, therefore, “responsibility” for their circumstances).

A more recent paper by Weiner, Osborne and Rudolph (op cit) considered the impact of causal attributions on both emotions and behaviour in relation to those in poverty. They draw on the dimensions of “locus” of cause, “stability” and “controllability” and agreed with Henry et al (op cit) that those who are considered to be “responsible” for their circumstances are likely to be subject to “anger” and “neglect” from others. The authors apply their analysis of attributions in relation to poverty to other negative circumstances including achievement failure, abortion and rape and, as has been the case in earlier publications (e.g., Weiner, 1979; Weiner, 1980b), the authors state that, “It is our hope that some general rules of social motivation will emerge from these analyses” (p 199).

In addition to gender differences and group differences, whole-culture differences in the making of causal attributions have been identified. For example, Choi, Nisbett and Norenzayan (1999) discussed earlier studies and concluded that East Asian people are more likely to consider context or situational influences when making causal attributions about others. Similarly, Ho (2004) completed a study which focussed upon the differences in attributions made by teachers in Australia and those in China (Hong Kong). Ho (op cit) described the Australian culture as being “individualistic” (and similar to Western culture) and the Chinese culture as being “collectivist”. A total of 473 teachers completed questionnaires containing vignettes for six different “problem behaviours” (which had previously been highlighted as problematic in both cultures, i.e., “daydreaming in class”; “not completing homework”; “talking in class”; “lesson disruption”; “bullying” and “rudeness to teacher”) and attributing these behaviours to: “student lack of ability/skills”, “student lack of
effort/self-discipline”, “student’s family background” or “teacher/teacher-related issues”. Amongst the results was that:

- teachers from both cultures attributed student misbehaviour mostly to the “effort” of students but least of all to the “teacher”;

- Australian teachers tended to attribute problem behaviours to “internal” student characteristics (i.e., “effort” and “ability”) and perceived students as being responsible for their behaviour;

- Chinese teachers attributed problem behaviours more to “family background” than did the Australian teachers (and this was a significant result).

These results confirm the finding of Choi et al (op cit) (i.e., that the influence of factors wider than the individual are considered to impact on a person’s behaviour in Asian cultures). Due to cultural differences in making causal attributions having been identified, Ho (op cit) suggests that there are implications for a different approach to interventions in each of the cultures, e.g., with the involvement of the family likely to be helpful in Chinese cultures. There are, then, implications for schools having students from multicultural backgrounds.

2.8 ATTRIBUTIONAL RETRAINING

Weiner (1990) suggests that, around the 1960s and 1970s, behaviour therapists had begun to recognise the impact of thoughts on emotions and behaviour. In both Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (CBT) (e.g., Beck, 1995) and Rational Emotive Therapy (RET) (e.g., Ellis, 1993), for example, the approaches focus upon challenging the thought processes of the patient (or “negative automatic thoughts”, “errors in thinking” and “cognitive distortions” in the case of CBT and “dysfunctional thoughts”, “irrational beliefs”, “self-disturbing thoughts” and “misleading inferences” in the case of RET) in order to effect change in both their emotions and subsequent behaviour. Beck (op cit) suggests that, in CBT:

“The therapist seeks in a variety of ways to produce cognitive change – change in the patient’s thinking and belief system – in order to bring about enduring emotional and behavioural change.” (Beck, op cit, p 2).
Similarly, in the case of RET, Ellis (op cit) proposes that:

“Emotional disturbance – and especially what is often called neurosis – has several important cognitive, emotive, and behavioural sources and does not only arise from but is heavily influenced by cognition or thinking.” (Ellis, op cit, p1)

“Unhelpful” or “maladaptive” causal attributions have been discussed within achievement-related contexts (see Section 2.4.4). For example, if a student who fails an examination believes that this is due to the “internal”, “unstable” and “controllable” cause of “lack of effort”, then s/he may be motivated to make an effort next term and to have an improved outcome. However, if a student believes his or her failure is due to the “internal”, “stable” and “uncontrollable” cause of “lack of ability”, then s/he is unlikely to be motivated by trying harder next time and may decide to abandon his or her course of study. If the student in the second scenario receives attributional therapy or retraining, it is clear that being supported in re-evaluating his/her attributions might result in motivation to continue with his/her studies. Note that retraining causal attributions has been demonstrated in achievement-related contexts (e.g., see Loh, 2005; Perry, Hechter, Menec and Weinberg, 1993). Similarly (and also based in the academic arena), Sinha and Gupta’s (op cit) research was based on the “self-worth” of students and the tendency for some students to withdraw effort in order to protect their feelings of self-worth (in the case of failure). Sinha and Gupta (op cit) investigated the effects of an intervention programme and found benefits in terms of improving the self-esteem and the “distorted perceptions of high self-worth protective” students. The intervention included a CBT approach and comprised (for example) support to re-interpret situations and problem-solving.

Retraining of attributions is also considered to benefit other areas. For example, following their research (in which participants, comprising forty mothers, were shown video tapes of parent-child “discipline interactions” and which they rated according to their levels of arousal levels as well as their attributions), Smith and O’Leary (1995) found that both maternal cognitions and emotions maintained negative (“over-reactive or harsh”) parental interaction. They propose that interventions into parenting may be more beneficial if they target both emotional responses and attributions, as well as consider strategies, as the follow quote indicates:
“The present results suggest that mothers’ emotions and cognitions influence the harshness of their parenting. If we attempt to teach new parenting behaviors without helping the parents also modify their characteristic emotional and cognitive responses to their children's behavior, changes in parents' behavior may be difficult to achieve and even more difficult to maintain.” (Smith and O'Leary, op cit, p 469)

It is clear, then, that attribution therapy/retraining can have benefits, in both academic and social settings (including those linked to mental health and parenting).

2.9 ATTRIBUTION THEORY WITHIN EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY PRACTICE

A wide range of psychological theories and approaches are applied by Educational Psychologists in the course of their work but it seems that these are often assimilated into day-to-day practice, as opposed to being made explicit. For example, this might include the use of “scaling” to enable others to identify and express the level of their distress, a strategy used in Solution-Focused Therapy (see Curwen, Palmer and Ruddell, 2000) and Cognitive Behaviour Therapy (see O'Connell and Palmer, 2003), the providing of the “core conditions” (as promoted in person-centred counselling - see Frankland and Saunders, 1995; Mearns and Thorne, 1988) and a reflection on Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs when considering the emotional needs of children (see Maslow, 1970). This also seems to be the case with attribution theory which is likely to be applied in consultations with both children and adults in the course of Educational Psychology practice.

Wagner (2000) explains consultation as follows:

“Consultation in an EPS context aims to bring about difference at the level of the individual child, the group/class or the organisational/whole-school level. It involves a process in which concerns are raised, and a collaborative and recursive process is initiated that combines joint exploration, assessment, intervention and review.” (Wagner, op cit, p 11)

However, she also states the following, which clearly indicates the potential application of different approaches, i.e, consultation is:
“… a voluntary, collaborative, non-supervisory approach, established to aid the functioning of a system and its inter-related systems. Within this broad definition, there is a possibility for different practices and models.” (Wagner, op cit, p 11)

Similarly, in relation to group consultation in schools (linked to students’ difficulties with emotional and behavioural difficulties), Farouk (2004) states that:

“During the group consultation sessions teachers are encouraged not just to focus on within child factors or home influence, but also to look for contextual and systemic factors that influence a child’s behaviour. In addition, a fundamental part of the process involves the restoring of objectivity and confidence in teachers, where personal feelings may have come to intrude into their professional practice.” (Farouk, op cit, p 208)

This statement suggests that the subjective feelings of the adults are targeted within consultations (and, of course, feelings/emotions can be clearly influenced by the causal attributions made). Farouk (op cit) discusses approaches to consultation and the methods adopted, including “process consultation”, “problem solving”, “psychodynamic psychology”, “interactional systemic thinking” and “solution-focused questioning”. It is, of course, possible to apply attribution theory under the guise of some of these terms (including “problem solving” and “solution-focused questioning”).

To illustrate this point, Kennedy, Frederickson and Monsen (2008) considered 17 case studies undertaken by a total of 10 educational psychologists (EPs) and found that the theories the EPs said they used in practice were largely based on (i) solution-focused approaches and (ii) problem-solving/analysis. Out of the responses that were given, 19% referred to “solution-focused” approaches, 13% referred to “problem solving/problem analysis” and a further 11% referred to Personal Construct Psychology. Other percentages ranged from 3 – 8% and were based on (for example) “systems theory” and “neuro-linguistic programming”. “Attribution theory” was mentioned but was contained within the generic “Other” category, together with other theories such as “appreciative enquiry”, “social learning theory”, “interactionism” and “transactional analysis” (totalling 19% of responses in all). This suggests that it is the case that attribution theory is not as widely used as other approaches, such as solution-focused approaches.

A number of the studies previously discussed are, clearly, relevant to the work of EPs and would be useful if their findings were incorporated into consultations. For example, the original studies on achievement motivation by Weiner and Kukla (op cit)
and Weiner et al (1971) (see Section 2.4) remain relevant to student motivation in academic settings. Similarly, the work of Miller and his colleagues (see Section 2.5.1) on the role of causal attributions in working successfully with others in behavioural interventions remains relevant. As explained in Section 2.5.1, Miller (1995) found that teachers largely attributed the “causes” of difficult student behaviour to parents and students, whereas they largely attributed the “solutions” to themselves. Their findings therefore suggest the potential impact of the self-serving bias (see Section 2.3.4 for an explanation). In contrast to the findings of Miller (1995), and as discussed in Section 2.5.1, Miller, Ferguson and Byrne (op cit), in their study of pupils’ causal attributions for difficult classroom behaviour, found that students largely attributed student misbehaviour to “fairness of teacher’s actions” and “pupil vulnerability”. Similarly, Miller, Ferguson and Moore’s (op cit) study involved a consideration of parental causal attributions for difficult student behaviour. Their results included that parents also attributed difficult student behaviour largely to “fairness of teachers’ actions” as well as “pupil vulnerability to peer influences and adverse family circumstances”. These studies demonstrate the potentially different causal attributions of participants in consultations and how these might hinder successful outcomes unless they are acknowledged and addressed.

The work of Bibou-Nakou et al (op cit) and others (also discussed in Section 2.5.1) also remains relevant due to the impact of causal attributions on teacher stress and burnout (note that one of the implications of the results of Bibou-Nakou et al (op cit) was that a recognition and re-evaluation by teachers of their causal attributions may be beneficial in terms of their stress levels, mental health and risk of “burnout”). Similarly, the work of Grace, Kelley and McCain (op cit) and Johnston and Ohan (op cit) (see Section 2.5.2 for a discussion) emphasise the impact of parental causal attributions on their response to their children’s behaviour and on the strategies adopted and, of course, any potential bias involved in the making of causal attributions is relevant to consultations with a range of personnel, including teachers and parents/carers.

Despite the clear impact of the causal attributions made by adults and children, there are a number of potential reasons why educational psychologists do not place a greater, or more explicit, emphasis on attribution theory in their work. For example, it may be that the terms used in attribution theory are unfamiliar to those with whom they work on a practical level (including students, parents/carers and teachers), e.g., the term “causal attribution” as opposed to more commonly used terms such as “reason”, “perception” or “explanation”. It may be that attribution theories are not emphasised on educational psychology training courses or, merely, that other theories
and approaches to understanding behaviour are currently in vogue (such as cognitive behavioural approaches and attachment theory, for example).

In addition to the application of attribution theory in consultations, this has been applied in more formal assessment tools. For example, the Coding Scheme of Perceived Causality (Elig and Frieze, 1979) is an instrument designed to assess student or teacher causal attributions for success and failure (in both academic achievement and social situations). It includes reference to “locus of causality” (“internal” and “external”), as well as “stability” and “intentionality”. However, the scheme includes reference to additional aspects including the interactions between people. As is frequently the case in research within this area, the scheme involves presenting a scenario with the examiner asking questions about this, e.g., in the case of an achievement-related situation, a scenario might be: “Imagine that a pupil in your class has just done particularly well on a reading test. Why do you feel this pupil has done so well?” In the case of a social situation, the scenario might be: “Imagine that you find yourself in a fight in the playground and no-one helps you. Why do you feel this might happen to you?” Following presentation of the scenario, and the asking of open-ended questions, the responses are coded to assess the nature of attributions. The outcomes of this might inform practitioners of the attributional styles of individuals and, if these appear to be unhelpful (as in students consistently blaming themselves for negative outcomes), this might suggest that an intervention to reconsider these could be beneficial.

In relation to social interactions in schools, Hudley et al (1998) discuss The BrainPower Program, designed to reduce aggression towards peers in elementary school students. The authors discuss earlier studies in which it was found that particularly aggressive boys tend to attribute intent to unintentional actions (e.g., being bumped into by another), whereas less aggressive students tend to believe the cause was unintentional. Following intervention via The BrainPower Program, which comprised a twelve-lesson intervention (and included a focus upon reinterpreting the behaviour of others and reassigning responsibility for this), the authors found positive results, i.e., the programme was successful in reducing aggressive responses by supporting students in changing their attributions of intent in social situations. However, it should be noted that it was found that some students did not make any improvements following involvement in the programme and the authors discuss the need to consider the differences between students such as the type of aggression they engage in, e.g., reactive vs proactive, with the former potentially being amenable to change via changing attributions. This implies that further research into proactive aggressive behaviours would be helpful. Hudley et al (op cit) conclude that
interventions such as The BrainPower Program may be useful for schools to adopt and, of course, it is also the case that this might be a useful tool for EPs to use and/or recommend to schools. In summary, although attribution theory is rarely recognised as a tool for EPs to apply, there is evidence that it is applied informally in consultations and in some formal interventions.

2.10 WIDER PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES ON BEHAVIOUR

Different theoretical standpoints offer differing explanations for human behaviour and common theories include those relating to the psychodynamic, behavioural, cognitive, humanistic and biological explanations. It is suggested that the perspective a psychologist has upon the determinants of behaviour will influence the intervention offered and these different perspectives are discussed below.

2.10.1 Psychodynamic

Psychodynamic psychology emerged around the beginning of the 20th century. According to Ayers, Clarke and Murray (2000) and Comer and Gould (2011) the psychodynamic approach to understanding behaviour focuses upon the current effects of unconscious conflicts experienced in early childhood (i.e., with the individual being unaware of the effects of his or her earlier experiences). Behaviours are considered to be present in order to protect a person's sense of identity and self-worth. Terms such as “transference” and “projection” are used in psychodynamic theory to refer to defence mechanisms which the individual might use, with the former referring to a person transferring earlier feelings about somebody in his or her past to a person currently in his or her life (e.g., a student who has been rejected in his or her earlier life may expect rejection from other adults, including teachers). However, “projection” refers to projecting one's own negative feelings on to another (e.g., a person who is critical of others may accuse others of being critical).

2.10.2 Behavioural

The behavioural approach emerged during the latter 1800s/early 1900s and is based on observable behaviours, with a focus being placed upon reinforcement (which might be either “positive” or “negative”) which would increase the likelihood of the behaviour occurring again (see Comer and Gould, op cit). To illustrate this, if a student behaves inappropriately in school, an emphasis might be made upon rewarding desirable behaviours (“positive reinforcement”). However, an example of “negative reinforcement” might be evident when a student behaves in an inappropriate way in class in order to disguise his or her learning difficulties, i.e., with the behaviour
enabling the student to avoid the embarrassment/humiliation of being unable to access the lesson or to complete the task provided by the teacher. Despite the limits of behaviourism (e.g., its limited acknowledgement of thought processes), it continues to have a place in the understanding and modification of behaviour today.

2.10.3 Cognitive

Following the early focus on behaviourism (and in contrast to strictly behavioural approaches to understanding and modifying behaviour), interest in the cognitive approach appeared with a focus upon information-processing and the influence of, for example, “thoughts, beliefs, attitudes and attributions” on behaviour (Ayers et al, op cit). Cognitive approaches to changing behaviours might then be based upon supporting the individual in considering alternatives to their thoughts and beliefs as in Cognitive Therapy (Beck, op cit) when strategies might include identifying evidence for one’s beliefs, considering alternative explanations for events and behavioural experiments (e.g., to challenge beliefs).

2.10.4 Humanistic

A focus upon humanistic psychology arose during the mid-1900s, with an emphasis upon human qualities and desires such as motivation, hopes and free will (Comer and Gould, op cit). Both Carl Rogers (1951) and Abraham Maslow (op cit) are prominent humanistic psychologists and their work continues to be referred to. Carl Rogers (op cit) was the found of client-centred therapy, an approach which is commonly used in counselling (frequently referred to as “person-centred counselling”) and has a basis on establishing a positive relationship between counsellor and client and offering acceptance, genuineness and “unconditional positive regard" in the therapeutic relationship (see Frankland and Saunders, op cit). Abraham Maslow (op cit) is best known for his “hierarchy of needs”, which depicts human needs as being increasingly complex, beginning with (i) physiological needs (such as hunger and thirst), (ii) safety needs, (iii) belonging and love needs (including to be accepted), (iv) esteem needs (e.g., to achieve) and, finally, (v) self-actualisation needs (relating to self-fulfilment). A humanistic approach to managing behaviour in school might link to a recognition that a student’s poor attendance at school might be due to him or her recently having been fostered, joining a new school and not yet having any friends in school (i.e., potentially relating to (ii) safety needs as well as (iii) belonging and love needs currently not being met). Support provided might include ensuring the student has full information about his or her placement and ensuring that s/he is provided with a “buddy” in school until new friendships are established.
2.10.5 Biological

Interest in the influence of biology on behaviour has been present for a significant length of time and continues today. The biological approach to understanding human behaviour is based on the premise that humans respond according to biological precursors or influences. For example, believing that ADHD (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder) is based on a biological, chemical imbalance, would lead to an intervention based on medication to address this imbalance. A similar intervention might result from a diagnosis of depression or anxiety if these are also considered to result from a chemical imbalance. Blair (2012) discusses the cognitive neuroscience perspective of anger including anger within social settings. He links anger to the amygdala, hypothalamus and periaqueductal gray (described as “the basic threat system”) and suggests that the response to “extreme threat” (for example) would trigger responses from this system. This is also discussed by Holt, Bremner, Sutherland, Vliek, Passer and Smith (2012) who explain that the amygdala is able to produce an emotional response without the involvement of the cerebral cortex (which would enable an assessment of the situation to take place before a response). This mechanism has benefits for survival in that a person is able to respond to a potentially threatening situation without being delayed by the cerebral cortex’s prior consideration. This might be apparent when we instantly move away from a dangerous object, for example.

2.10.6 Attribution Theory

Attribution theory would be placed within the cognitive approaches to understanding human behaviour due to its focus upon the impact of thought processes on both behaviour and emotional responses. Similarly, attributional retraining (see Hudley et al, op cit; Perry et al, op cit) would be categorised as a cognitive intervention, with an emphasis being placed on considering alternative attributions in order to change behaviour. Attribution theory differs from some of the other theories of human behavior as it is based on current events (as opposed to psychodynamic theory) and it places a significant emphasis on thought processes (unlike biological approaches and strictly behavioural approaches). We might argue that is has some similarities with humanistic approaches due to the recognition of both human needs and drives, including the impact of relationships with others and a need to maintain self-esteem.

Despite the different standpoints, it seems that all of the approaches discussed have merit and continue to be utilised. For example, the behaviourist approach to modifying behaviour continues in both educational and clinical settings, as does the
biological approach (e.g., in relation to understanding and modifying ADHD, as stated earlier), the cognitive and humanistic approaches continues to be applied in counselling (and other) settings and psychodynamic terms continue to be used to explain behaviour. This discussion of some of the different perspectives on explaining behaviour illustrate how those working with children and young people, including educational psychologists, might consider different viewpoints when both seeking the cause of a behaviour difficulty and when deciding upon an appropriate intervention. Despite the number of years since some of these theories emerged, it is clear that they have been recognised as valid and useful approaches to understanding human behaviour and have prevailed over time.

2.11 ATTRIBUTION THEORY: SOME CAUTIONS AND CRITICISMS

Weiner (e.g., 1979; 1980b; 1983; 1985) acknowledged that there were some “dilemmas” in his work to date. There have also been criticisms (or “cautions” in accepting all of his proposals) from other theorists and a selection of these is discussed.

2.11.1 Dimensions of Causality

Weiner (1980b) recognised the frequent criticism of the “internal” vs “external” dimension of causality and the claim that some causes can be “internal” or “external”. He acknowledges, for example, that the normally-considered “internal” factor of “ability” can be variable as in when a player might say, “I played well today” (suggesting there might be influence from “external” factors). Also, differing attributions for the same event can be seen. For example, a person who wins the lottery might state that, “I am a lucky person” (an “internal” cause) or s/he might state that, “Lady Luck must have been smiling on me” (an “external” cause). Similarly, following a period of ill health, a person might suggest that this is because, “I am an unhealthy person” (an “internal” cause) or, conversely, the event is due to having “caught the flu bug” (an “external” cause). Weiner (1980b) suggests that such differences are due to the “subjective meaning” for the individual and that, to overcome this difficulty in categorisation (e.g., when conducting research), the “subjective” or “personal” meaning must be taken into account. Although he admits that it is not always easy to differentiate between “internal” and “external” attributions, Weiner (1980b) states that “… despite possible individual variation, there is general agreement on the classification of causes as internal or external” (p 345).
Similarly, Weiner (1983) discusses the “stable” categorisation of “task difficulty” when, in practice, difficulty of a task can be “unstable”. A simple example might be an examination paper which might be easier or at least experienced as easier one year than another year for different reasons (e.g., personal interest in particular aspects of the content; having covered areas of assessment in detail before, etc). Similarly, he suggests that the “stable” and “internal” categorisation of “ability” may not always be accurate as, for example, “ability” (whether this refers to level of knowledge or practical skill) can be improved via study and practice and, therefore, could be “unstable”. Another potential complication is that (for example) a student might be considered to have high “ability” in English Literature but the same may not be true of his or her competence with Information Technology, which might be average or poor. However, again, Weiner (1985) defends his theory and states that:

“… although the interpretation of specific causal inferences might vary over time and between people and situations, the underlying dimensions on which causes are “understood” or given meaning remain constant.” (Weiner 1985, p 555)

A number of theorists, including Malle (2011), suggest that there has been a fundamental misunderstanding of Heider’s (1958) distinction between “personal causality” and “impersonal causality” and with the former referring to “intentional behaviour” and the latter referring to “unintentional behaviour” and that this has mistakenly been taken to refer to “internal” vs “external” causality. However, as is explained in Section 2.3.1, Heider (1958) did make the distinction between “internal” and “external” (or “environmental”) causes: “We assess when we attribute action outcome mainly to the person, mainly to the environment, or to a combination of both” (p 99). In support of his criticism, Malle (2011) also states that: “… most scholars falsely claim that Heider himself used the simplified terms “person versus situation” (p 302). This may or may not be true, but Heider (1958) did use the terms “person” and “environment” which, it could be argued, refer to the same. Rather than the distinction between “personal” and “situational” causes (or “internal” vs “external”), Malle (2011) proposes that the distinction between “intentional” and “unintentional” behaviours is more appropriate, with “intentional” behaviours relying on reasoning and “unintentional” behaviours being based on “cause and effect”. However, of course “intentionality” has been emphasised by later researchers and theorists (e.g., see Weiner’s models in Appendix I (Model 4 (i), Model 4 (ii) and Model 5)) as well as by Heider (1958), and this is discussed further in Section 2.8.2.
Based on earlier discussions, (e.g., see Section 2.4.8), it does seem unfair and, probably, erroneous, for Malle (2011) to state that, in relation to “traditional attribution theory” “… the complexity of people's explanations was boiled down to a compact dichotomy of person causes and situation causes.” (p 334) In practice, of course, attribution theory has developed to incorporate a range of factors including the “stable” vs “unstable” dimension, the “controllable” vs “uncontrollable” dimension, in some cases the “global” vs “specific” dimension as well as the role of emotions, “responsibility” and, of course, “intentionality”.

2.11.2 Intention

Poulou and Norwich (2002) suggest that Weiner did not take note of “the probability of intentional action” (p 115) in his model, which appears to be an inaccurate observation (see Section 2.4.13 and Appendix I (Models 4, 5 and 6) for evidence of the incorporation of “intentionality”). Similarly, it does appear to be unreasonable (and possibly inaccurate) for Malle (2011) to suggest that his own work considers “… the previously overlooked unique properties of intentional action explanation” (p 301) and that “… decades of attribution research forgot about people’s concept of intentionality…” (p 392) when, of course, the role of intention has been included into the research of a number of theorists and researchers (e.g., in addition to Weiner, e.g., 1995, and Heider, 1958: Kelsey et al op cit; Wallach and Sela, op cit).

2.11.3 Research Methods

In his 1986 book, Weiner (1986) admits that he and his co-workers (Weiner et al, 1971) were hasty to advocate that the main causes of success and failure were “ability”; “effort”; “task difficulty” and “luck”, adding that: “This judgment was based on no data whatsoever …” (Weiner, 1986, p 37). Following a review of other studies, Weiner (1986) states that he found that “The potential causes of an achievement-related outcome are infinite ….” (Weiner, 1986, p 37). These include “mood”, “interest”, “attention”, “prior experience” and “cheating” although he does suggest that both “ability” and “effort “ remain the most dominant causes.

Malle (2011) continues to criticise earlier research on causal attributions due to it frequently including “fixed” rating scales based on the “person” vs “situation” proposition and he implies that causal attributions require more complex measurement. This criticism may have some validity, i.e., rating scales do restrict responses of participants and is a procedure which has been avoided (in part) in the
method adopted in the research presented in this thesis. As was also suggested by Weiner (1986), adopting restrictive methods of data analysis does appear to be a downfall of some of the earlier research into attributions.

2.11.4 Impact of the Social Environment

Poulou and Norwich (2002) propose that, despite the merits of Weiner’s work, no acknowledgement has been made of the influence of the social context on the actor, i.e., stating that, “An actor is not driven solely by his/her personal dispositions, but most of the time is restricted by the power of social norms and standards” (p 114). However, again, this does not appear to be strictly the case. For example, Weiner (1995) suggested that the process of not helping somebody due to them being “responsible” for what happened, may be different if a blood relative is involved (i.e., despite being held responsible for their actions, the offer of help might still be made). Also, the comments in Section 2.8.3 (i.e., the role of “interest” and “prior experience”) suggest that acknowledgement has been made of the influence of wider factors. Similarly, although personal involvement in an observation might normally result in “anger” (as in having one’s car stolen), the resultant emotion might be much less apparent, if apparent at all, when no personal involvement is present (as in watching an event on a television News programme). However, Weiner (1995) proposes that, whenever a moral standard has been contravened, an emotion such as anger may result, despite there being no personal involvement (e.g., we might reflect on the angry responses of the general public when a criminal receives a lesser sentence than is deemed necessary). However, of course, we might expect the level or extent of the emotion to vary according to whether personal involvement takes place. These explanations do suggest that Weiner (1995) has noted the social context, i.e., in the case of a blood relative and in the case of having direct involvement in a situation although, it is acknowledged that wider factors have not been formally incorporated into his models.
2.12 SUMMARY

This review of the literature has demonstrated how attribution theory has developed since Heider (1944) and, in particular, it has outlined the evolution of Bernard Weiner’s work (e.g., Weiner and Kukla et al, op cit – Weiner, 2010). The three causal dimensions of (i) locus of control (“internal” vs “external”), (ii) “stability” and (iii) “controllability” have been explained, together with the role of emotions and the impact on behaviour. Although Weiner’s (e.g., Weiner et al, 1971) work initially focussed upon the achievement context, he later extended this to a wide range of other areas of human experience and his theories have been adopted by other researchers. Despite having established his model of social motivation and social justice (see Weiner, 2006, p 39), Weiner acknowledges that there are influences which result in alternative depictions. These include the role of cultural differences and individual differences (including mitigating circumstances). The application of attribution theory to educational psychology practice in particular, and to education in general, has been discussed, as has the influence of wider psychological theories on understanding and changing behaviour.

Despite the criticisms of attribution theory, this area of research has produced a convincing framework upon which illustrations of interpersonal relationships can be presented and, in particular, Fincham and Hewstone (op cit) attest to the value of Weiner’s work:

“… the attributional analysis of motivation has led to the documentation of highly robust and easily replicated phenomena. This alone attests to its usefulness. In addition, it has resulted in important advances in attribution theory. Whatever one thinks of Weiner’s theory, one cannot help being impressed by its comprehensiveness.” (Fincham and Hewstone, op cit, p 225-6)

2.13 FOCUS OF THE CURRENT RESEARCH

The research presented in this thesis is based on the models of causal attribution shown in Weiner, 1995; 2006; 2010) (see Appendix I). However, it should be noted that, as explained earlier, an unpublished communication from Weiner (B Weiner, personal communication, July 29, 2012), reflecting on his 2006 work (and, in particular, Model 6 displayed in Appendix I) indicates that he thought that, following an “unintentional” act of “aggression”, a person is unlikely to feel “sympathy” or, at least,
not very much “sympathy”. He suggests that this is the reason for the “aggressive act of another” (which is “unintentional”) having been omitted from his model (compare last lines of Models 5 – 6 in Appendix I). This appears to be a re-consideration of his 1995 work (i.e., see Model 6 in Appendix I, when “unintentional” aggressive act of another is included).

In the main body of research presented in this thesis, students were presented with a scenario which depicted a teacher directing aggressive (or “negative”) behaviour to a student for an innocuous action. The causal attributions of the participants were sought, together with the anticipated emotional responses and their attributions of responsibility. It should be noted that behavioural responses were not sought, although these might be presumed via the anticipated emotional responses. Following this, a redesign of the questionnaire took place and this was administered with a further small group of Y10 students. A focus group discussion then took place in order to gain students’ experience of completing the questionnaire including how well they understood the questions. The current study incorporates a number of features from attribution theory in general and from Weiner’s theories in particular (see Appendix I for models), including the:

- differentiation between “internal” vs “external” causality;
- emotional responses reported due to “aggressive” (or “negative”) behaviour from others;
- attributions of responsibility (which incorporates attributions of “control” and the potential for attributing “blame”);
- “self-directed” vs “other-directed” emotions.

The research aimed to investigate the causal attributions of students for “negative” teacher behaviour in order to consider the impact on students in particular and the wider impact on relationships in general. However, this was placed within Weiner’s (e.g., 1995; 2006; 2010) framework with the intention being to consider its relevance to interactions between students and teachers.
CHAPTER 3: METHOD

3.1 AIM OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

As stated in Chapter 1, the overall aim of the research is to explore Weiner’s model(s) of social motivation in relation to student-teacher interactions (see Appendix I for models) and the research questions are as follows:

i. What are the causal attributions that students make for the “negative” behaviour of teachers?

ii. What are the emotions reported by students, following these causal attributions?

iii. How responsible do students consider teachers are for this behaviour?

iv. Do students perceive that male or female teachers are more likely to engage in negative behaviour?

v. Is there a difference in attributions made by male and female students?

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

3.2.1 Preparation and Development of Questionnaire

In preparing the questionnaire, a school was asked to nominate a small group of Y8 students (approximately eight) to take part in the development of an instrument to answer the research questions. A decision was made to gain scenarios from the students themselves rather than to provide them with an adult-generated scenario in order for students’ own language to be used (as opposed to adult language being imposed). Schools were asked to select students who might be willing and able to contribute in the form of recalling, and producing in writing, a scenario. Following the school’s selection of potential students, a letter was sent to parents/carers requesting consent for their child to participate and eight parents/carers gave permission. As one student was absent on the day, seven students took part. The group was asked to provide scenarios of “real life” situations when they have been upset by the behaviour of a teacher (with the aim being to incorporate one of these into the questionnaire).
The written and verbal instruction was as follows: “Please given an account of a real-life example of behaviour from a teacher which has upset you in some way.” The opportunity for students to ask for clarification was available. As can be seen from the scenarios provided in Appendix VI, a number of those were immediately discounted for obvious reasons, e.g., Scenario 4 depicts a situation in Reception Class and others contain relatively little detail (e.g., Scenarios 3, 5, and 6). However, Scenario 1 explains clearly an event which resulted in some upset and this was chosen as being the most typical of those provided. Despite this, it was necessary to exclude some aspects which were that the (i) scenario originally took place in primary school, (ii) it involved a test situation and (iii) the student felt “confused and upset”. The reasons for these elements being omitted were that (i) the research participants were in secondary school, (ii) a test situation would involve an additional factor to consider (when a day-to-day situation was required) and (iii) participants were asked to consider their own emotional responses.

A decision was made to allow students to choose their own emotional label for how they might feel. Examples of moods were selected from Padesky and Greenberger (1995) as these were judged to be age-appropriate. Again, this method of gaining potential emotional responses is similar to that of Weiner et al (1978), as explained in Section 2.4.5. Additional questions were incorporated enquiring about perceived responsibility for the behaviour and, also enquiring about gender differences (see Appendix II). George, Carroll, Kersnick and Calderon (1998) found that females showed more empathy towards friends in need of help than did males. Similarly, MacGeorge (op cit) found some evidence suggesting that males are more likely to blame others in helping situations whilst females were more likely to report feeling sympathy towards help-seekers. It was, therefore, considered relevant to include a question involving sex differences. As stated in Chapter 1, a questionnaire format was adopted based on Weiner’s (e.g., 1995, p 189) (Appendix III) work and Peterson et al’s (op cit) work (Appendix IV), i.e., including both a scenario and questions based on scaling. Other reasons for designing the questionnaire as it was are given in Section 3.2.2.

3.2.2 Rationale for Research Design

Use of a “Negative” Scenario

As explained in Section 2.6, Weiner’s studies (and others in the area of attribution theory) have frequently been based on negative scenarios and a selection of studies which provide clear examples of scenarios in both social and academic settings is
discussed for the purposes of illustration. In Weiner (1980a), Experiment 2, for example, the following scenario is used:

“At about 1:00 in the afternoon you are riding a subway car. There are a number of other individuals in the car and one person is standing, holding on to the center pole. Suddenly, this person staggers forward and collapses. The person is carrying a black cane and apparently is ill”. (Alternate form: “The person apparently is drunk. He is carrying a liquor bottle wrapped in a brown paper bag and smells of liquor”.) (p 190)

Caprara, Pastorelli and Weiner (op cit) conducted a series of experiments. Experiment 2 included eight short vignettes were involved describing broken social contacts (clearly, both likely to be viewed as “negative” situations), e.g., not having “showed up at your friend’s house” due to reasons such as, “You did not feel like going”; “You became sick and had to rest in bed” and “Your bike had a flat tyre on the way to your friend’s house” (see Section 2.4.16 for further details).

Again, with a focus on Weiner’s work, his 1995 publication (book entitled Judgments of Responsibility) centred on “responsibility” and this did concentrate upon negative situations (e.g., responsibility for obesity, poverty, aggression, etc). All of the scenarios contained in this book involve negative situations (unless they are based on both positive and negative events relating to academic success/failure, in which case the positive event of academic success is included). When researching attribution in schools, in addition to Weiner, other researchers have also used “negative” scenarios. For example, Mavropoulou and Padeliadu (op cit) used the following scenario (or “vignette”) in their research into teacher causal attribution for problem behaviour:

"During the class session, Alexandros is constantly talking with his peers and his attention is distracted. He refuses to work on his assignments and asks his teacher to repeat the instructions for the completion of the assignment. His relationships with his peers are not good, as they complain that he is hitting other children and uses bad language during the break.” (Mavropoulou and Padeliadu, op cit, p 202)

The examples discussed illustrate that the use of “negative” scenarios is common in this area of research.
Scenario Construction

Although researcher-generated scenarios appear to be dominant within this area of research, some studies have been based on “real-life” situations, e.g., Gable and Peterson (op cit) (see Section 2.5.2); Miller (1995) (see Section 2.5.1), McPherson and Young (op cit) (see Section 2.5.1) and Weiner, Graham and Chandler’s (op cit) first experiment (see Section 2.4.6). Similarly, Poulou and Norwich (op cit) used vignettes party based on events from “real life”, with the authors stating that:

“Teachers’ descriptions of real pupils with problematic behaviour offered information for the construction of scenarios, which though hypothetical could be deemed representative of classroom reality.” (p 562)

Other research has been based on earlier findings (e.g., Mavropoulou and Padieliadu (op cit) state that the “student (male) illustrated in the vignette emerged from literature on the type of behaviour that are most common and troublesome for teachers ...” (p 194). However, others (including the following) do not include any information about how the scenarios were obtained and it is assumed that they were constructed by the authors. For example, Weiner and Kukla (op cit) used a scenario to look into the attributions about feedback given in an exam although there does not appear to be any explanation of how the scenario was compiled. To illustrate, the scenario begins as follows: “Assume for a moment that you are a teacher in a grade-school classroom. You have given an exam and now must convey some feedback to the pupils.....” Similarly, there is no explanation of how the scenarios were developed by Weiner in his 1995 work unless they were based on real-life figures (e.g., famous people in The News). Although Weiner’s (1980a) scenario was based on the work of Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin (1969), following a review of Piliavin et al (op cit), it seems that the scenario was created by the authors (rather than being based on earlier research data, for example). Weiner (1995) states that the vignette shown in Appendix III was taken from Betancourt and Blair (1992). Again, this paper was examined and there is no information about how the scenario was developed. Similarly, although Caprara et al (op cit) used vignettes in Experiment 1, based on the earlier work of Weiner, Graham, Stern and Lawson (op cit), there is no information about how the scenarios were devised in either paper.
Use of “Personalised” versus “Depersonalised” Scenarios

For the purposes of this discussion, “personalised” scenarios are defined as those in which the participant in the research is asked to imagine him or herself being an actor (often a main actor) within the scenario. Conversely, “depersonalised” scenarios are defined as those in which the participant is asked to imagine him or herself as an observer of the situation depicted.

As can be seen via the examples given, some researchers use scenarios which ask participants to imagine themselves being a main actor in the situation portrayed. However, others suggest that the participants should imagine they are observers in the situation portrayed (and, of course, personal or direct involvement in a situation is likely to result in different feelings and judgments than if one is merely observing and this is, therefore, an important factor in any research into causal attributions). The following examples of research studies are provided to illustrate the case when participants were asked to imagine themselves being an actor in the scenarios (therefore, “personalised” scenarios).

- Caprara et al’s (op cit) study involves participants imagining that they are part of the scenario. (See Section 2.4.16 for scenario in Experiment 3)

- In Wyatt and Haskett’s (2001) study, students were asked to imagine they were in the scenario, e.g., “You’ve returned to school …”; “You’ve been hassling the student teacher all week …”; “You just got back a science test. You thought you had made a good grade on it ….”

A selection of studies is now provided to illustrate how scenarios might involve a participant imagining that s/he is observing a situation (therefore “depersonalised” scenarios).

- Weiner, Russell and Lerman (op cit) used the following scenario in Experiment 2, clearly a “depersonalised” scenario (i.e., the participant is not asked to imagine him or herself as part of the scenario):

  “A person just received a test back in a course that is very important to him or her. He or she has done very well and feels extremely surprised, astonished, and thankful. Why did this person believe that he or she did so well?” (Weiner, Russell and Lerman, op cit, p 1218)
The scenario used by Mavropoulou and Padeliadu (op cit) (see Section 3.2.3), in which participants are asked to rate factors (such as “brain damage”, “family problems”, etc) as causes of the behaviour problems portrayed, clearly depicts a “depersonalised” scenario, i.e., one in which the participant is not directly involved.

Use of Imagination in Scenarios

The previous research in this field frequently involves hypothetical situations and participants imaging that they are in a situation (see earlier discussion in this section as well as Weiner, 1980a and Appendices III and IV) and, therefore, this practice was followed. In the main study participants completing the questionnaire were specifically asked to try to imagine they were in the situation depicted, in order to encourage them to envisage that the situation was happening to themselves and, therefore, prompting them to reflect on their own feelings (see Appendix II).

Age of Participants

Having decided to use a scenario based on real-life experience, Year 8 students were targeted for the development of the questionnaire. As the students were being asked to recall incidents when they had been subject to negative behaviour from a teacher, it was considered that accessing students who had relatively recently joined secondary school might be seen as less threatening or intrusive to current teachers (as the scenarios given would not necessarily have taken place with their current teachers). As a Year 8 student had produced the scenario used in the questionnaire and, as Year 8 students from other schools in the borough had contributed to the further development of the questionnaire (via involvement in the pilot studies), it was considered appropriate to use a similar age group for the main study, but one which would not include the students who had contributed to the questionnaire design, i.e., Y9 students, thereby enabling the same schools to be approached to participate. However, due to initial delays in gaining consent to participate and, also, ensuring that the research could be accommodated within school routines and timetables, the research took place with the students in early Year 10. A decision was made to use secondary school students as the research necessitates students being able to reflect, predict and verbalise skills which are likely to be better developed in older students.
Use of Questionnaires

Questionnaires have been used extensively in this area of research, e.g., for example, see Bibou-Nakou et al (op cit) and Miller, Ferguson and Moore (op cit), as well as those provided in Appendices III and IV. Many questionnaires have used scenarios (as explained earlier in this section). Open-ended questions are also used (Kelsey et al, op cit; Peterson et al, op cit (see Appendix IV) as well as Likert scales (e.g., see Ho, op cit; Kelsey et al, op cit; MacGeorge, op cit). The format of the questionnaires provided in Appendices III and IV has close similarities to the questionnaire used in the research presented in this thesis.

Types of Questions: Open-ended, Multiple Choice and Scaling

Open-ended questions are used infrequently in this area of research. However, Kelsey et al (op cit) used an open-ended question asking for reasons why a teacher might engage in misbehaviours and Peterson et al (op cit) (see Appendix IV) also used this method of data collection. Although this type of question is uncommon in this area of research (potentially due to the implications for analysis), it was considered important for Question 1 to be “open-ended”, i.e., not to put a limit on the choice of response. The main reason for this is that no appropriate earlier studies were available which might support a selection of “causes” upon which multiple-choice questions could be based and it would, therefore, be erroneous to pre-empt (and thereby restrict) participant responses. However, conversely, in Question 2, potential emotional responses were provided to aid (but not restrict) participants’ consideration of their anticipated emotions. The aim was to encourage participants to reflect on their anticipated emotional response and to consider more “subtle” labels (rather than “angry” for example) which, it was hoped, might result in richer data.

Weiner et al (1978) compiled “dictionary lists” of possible emotional responses for academic success and failure, i.e. via searching through dictionaries for labels which might be “potential affective reactions to success and failure in an academic context”, Weiner et al, 1978, p 67).

The frequent use of Likert scales by Weiner (e.g., see Weiner, 1995; Appendix III) provides some standardisation in questioning and, also, provides for ease of analysis. As was the case with Question 3 (which accompanied the scenario, i.e., “Taking into account your response to Question 1, how responsible do you think the teacher is for his/her behaviour?”), rating scales were also considered to measure the extent of the
emotional responses given in Question 2. However, in this research, it was not the extent of the anticipated emotion that was sought but the category of emotion (e.g., “anger”, “sympathy”, etc.). Therefore, rating scales for all questions were not necessary to answer the research questions.

There are some criticisms of the methods of measurement used in attribution research. For example, Malle (2011) criticises the use of “simple rating scales” and states the following:

“If we examine instead the actual explanations people give for human behavior, there is more measurement work to do. These explanations have to be recorded, transcribed, segmented, classified into appropriate folk-conceptual categories, and analyzed as a multivariate set of explanatory tools. Such demands do not permit quick paper-and-pencil studies.” (Malle, 2011, p 335)

As discussed earlier, the questionnaire used in this research (see Appendix II) includes both (i) rating scales and (ii) open-ended questions, therefore having the benefit of being more likely to gain participants’ own feelings and thoughts (rather than to restrict these) but also to aid measurement of responses via the rating scales. Although the research includes some of the classification and approaches advocated by Malle (2011), it has the added benefit of being a “quick paper-and-pencil” study.

**Selection of Questionnaire Items and Items for Data Analysis**

The questionnaire items were selected to reflect Weiner’s theories (see Weiner, 1995; 2006 and 2010). It was necessary to include items enquiring about the (i) causes of behaviour, (ii) anticipated emotional responses and (iii) responsibility for the behaviour as these are important components of his theories (see Appendices I and II). The reason for including Question (iv) (asking about whether participants imagined the teacher in the scenario to be male or female) was to take the opportunity to see if the “negative” behaviour was considered to be more likely to depict a male or female teacher. Question (iv) was incorporated to see if there was any difference in the responses of boys and girls (due to earlier researchers finding some differences in the attributions of males and females, e.g., MacGeorge, op cit). In line with Weiner’s theories (see Section 2.4.2), “causes” were categorised according to whether these were “internal” or “external” and emotional responses were categorised according to whether they were “self-directed” or “other-directed” (see Section 2.4.11). Whether
causes were considered to be “internal” or “external” by the participants was sought due to the potential for blaming teachers for their behaviour (i.e., if “internal” causes were given), potentially resulting in damaging relationships between the students and teachers. Emotional responses were categorised as “self-directed” or “other-directed” in order to reflect on how the participants emotional responses might impact on their behaviour and, again, on their relationships with teachers. As can be seen in Section 3.1, all of the questions linked both to Weiner's theory and to the research questions.

**Provision of Potential Emotional Labels**

The emotions in Question 2 were provided to encourage participants to consider wider emotions than the obvious emotion (see see earlier section entitled, “Types of Questions: Open-ended, Multiple Choice and Scaling” for further explanation). All of these emotions were directly taken from Padesky and Greenberger (op cit) with the exception of both “sympathy” and “sorry”. The emotional labels adopted from Padesky and Greenberger (op cit), were originally designed to prompt clients engaged in therapy to correctly label moods and to distinguish between moods that they might experience during the day. These were included in the questionnaire as it was judged that they comprised a range of typical emotional responses and labels that might be familiar to students. As shown in Appendix I (Models 2, 5 and 6), “sympathy” was added as it is an important part of Weiner’s theory. However, “sorry” was added as it was considered to be a typical response that students might give in response to the scenario. Note that the emotions included in the questionnaire (Question 2) were presented in the same order they were given by Padesky and Greenberger (op cit).

As stated above, Weiner et al (1978) used “dictionary lists” of emotional labels as potential responses for participants, although the authors do admit that their method was “fraught with danger” (Weiner et al, 1978, p 70), including that an assumption had been made that participants would be able to convey feelings on to the person(s) within the scenarios provided and, also, that the method gave participants the opportunity to assign emotions that they had not experienced.
Similarities and Differences with Earlier Studies

As explained earlier in this section, the research presented in this thesis shares many similarities with earlier research in the area of attributions. For example, it includes:

- Scenarios (“personalised”) as incorporated into earlier research, e.g., that conducted by Caprara et al (op cit); Weiner and Kukla (op cit) and Wyatt and Haskett (op cit).

- A “negative” situation, as did Caprara et al (op cit), Weiner (1980a), Weiner, Graham and Stern (op cit).

- Questions based on a Likert scale, as used in Weiner (1995), for example.

- Participants being provided with a list of potential emotions to choose from (as in Weiner et al, 1979).

- Asking participants to imagine how they might respond if they were in the situation depicted in the scenario (in Weiner and Kukla, op cit, some participants were not only asked to imagine how they might respond in a situation but were also asked to imagine how they might feel, as was the case in Weiner, 1980a).

- A question about ratings of “responsibility”, as did Weiner in many of his later studies (e.g., see Weiner, 1995; see example in Appendix III).

As can been seen by the discussion in the Literature Review, although the research presented in this thesis shares similarities with many other studies, there are some differences including the following:

- It is relatively uncommon to use an open-ended question, although these have been used before (as explained earlier in this section, i.e., under the heading of Types of Questions: Open-ended, Multiple Choice and Scaling).

- The scenario used was adapted from a “real-life” situation when many scenarios in this area of research appear to be created by the authors.

- Some studies are based on real-life situations as explained in Section 2.5,
e.g., see Gable and Peterson (op cit) (who investigated children’s attributions or their own naturally-occurring minor injuries) and Wallach and Sela (op cit) (who considered causal attributions around domestic violence). However, within the area of behaviour difficulties in school, few studies appear to be based on real-life situations, with exceptions being McPherson and Young (op cit) and Miller (1995).

3.2.3 **Pilot Study (i)**

Pilot studies took place in order to identify potential difficulties in administration and/or analysis of the data. In particular, it was necessary to gauge how responses to Question 1 might be grouped and categorised as “internal” or “external” causes and how those to Question 2 could be categorised, including being categorised as either “self-directed” (as in “shame”) or “other-directed” (as in “anger”) (as in Weiner, 1980a).

The selected scenario (see scenario in Appendix II) was presented to a group of Y8 students (n = 22) in printed format but, also, this was talked through as a group, question by question, in order to support the students in grasping the requirements and completing the questions (as was the case in the main study). The students were, then, asked to complete the corresponding questions. Following a reflection on the Pilot Study, adaptations were made and these are explained as follows:

- The results showed that responses to Question 1 were not always easy to classify according to “internal” or “external” causes, largely due to students giving an emotion (e.g., “annoyed”) in response to Question 1 rather than a “cause” (e.g., a cause might be, “The teacher was under stress”). An addition was made to the instructions to avoid this (see additional instruction in bold in Question 1, Appendix II).

- It was reflected that students might find it difficult to respond to questions enquiring about “control” and “intention” and, therefore, the two questions enquiring about these were reduced to one question enquiring about “responsibility” (a term which seems to be commonly used in day-to-day discourse and which includes notions of both “control” and “intention”). This is in line with Weiner’s (2006) theory:
“In sum, although controllability and intention or intentionality are distinct, they share a role as determinants of responsibility judgements.” (Weiner, 2006, p 32)

3.2.4 Pilot Study (ii)

Following adaptations, the revised questionnaire was given to another group of Year 8 students (n = 24) in a different school. On this occasion, fewer students gave emotions as causes (Question 1, Appendix II). The majority of the questionnaires were completed appropriately and responses were considered able to be analysed. The questionnaire was, then, adopted for the main method of data collection.

3.3 PARTICIPANTS

3.3.1 Selection

Year 10 students from three secondary schools were invited to participate in the research (with chronological ages for Year 10 students ranging from 14y 0m – 14y 11m during the academic year). It was hoped that at least 100 Y10 students (a cross section, relating to gender, ability and additional needs), in each of three schools, would be able to participate (therefore, totalling over 300 students). Participants were required from different schools due to the large number of participants needed. However, similar schools, in terms of socio-economic status (“school deprivation index”) and GCSE examination passes at Key Stage 4 were sought. At the time of selection of schools, the data for the schools recruited were as follows:

Table 3: School Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Students in School</th>
<th>School Deprivation Index</th>
<th>GCSE passes at Grades A – C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School A</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School B</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School C</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of comparison, the range across all the schools in the local authority was as follows:

School deprivation index: 0.14 – 0.40
GCSE passes at Grades A-C: 29 – 69
3.3.2 Consent

Initially, senior members of staff (a special educational needs co-coordinator, an assistant headteacher and a headteacher) from select ed schools were approached in order for permission to access their students to be gained. Following this, it was anticipated that letters and other documentation would be sent to parents/carers asking for consent for their child/children to be involved. However, when this took place in the first school to participate, there was an extremely low rate of return. Following further contact with, and agreement from, the university, it was agreed that parental/carer consent would be assumed unless they responded to the letters sent to them and indicating they didn’t want their child/children to be involved. In line with school preferences, letters were sent via Royal Mail from one school and via the students in the other two schools, together with an invitation to check details on the school website (see Appendices VIII and IX for examples). As is the norm in the schools selected, these letters were followed up by text to all parents/carers (to alert them to the letter).

Students were asked to indicate on the front sheet of the questionnaire (Appendix VII) if they would like their responses to be included in the research. Those that indicated that they did not wish their responses to be used were not required to complete the questionnaires. Students were given the opportunity of withdrawing from the research at any time and these instructions and reassurances were given during administration (see Appendix VII). The names of students whose parents/carers had indicated that they did not want their child to be a participant were listed in order for checks to take place (i.e., to ensure that these questionnaires were not amongst those used in the analysis).

Completed questionnaires were collated by each administrator and returned for analysis. Parent/carer and participant consent were checked prior to data being inputted to ensure that this had been received from both parties.

3.3.3 Incentives

Following comments from school staff, i.e., suggesting that incentives would be helpful in encouraging students to participate, a decision was made to offer these. However, the third school did not feel that this was necessary and, therefore, these were not offered to their students. Students (from two of the schools) who completed the questionnaire and who gave their own consent to be involved in the research,
were offered a chance of winning a £10 voucher of their choice (e.g., for JJB Sports, WH Smith) via their names being included in a raffle. This method of motivating students was already in place in the schools in which vouchers were offered and was considered to be appropriate.

3.4 DATA COLLECTION

3.4.1 Administrators

Educational Psychology colleagues volunteered to provide support to administer the questionnaires and guide the students in completing these. Although it was hoped that the named EP for each of the schools would be involved in the administration, in practice, in order to be able to respond to the preferences of the schools who took part in the research (in terms of their preferred dates and times for collecting data), those colleagues who did not have prior diary commitments took part.

3.4.2 Requirements

Each participant was asked to complete one questionnaire (Appendix II) and front sheet (Appendix VII). Completion of the questionnaire took approximately ten minutes including the instructions given by each administrator (Appendix V). In order to avoid contamination of results (e.g., by participants discussing questionnaire content), data collection across the different class groups in individual schools took place on the same day and at the same time. This necessitated the support of colleagues in administering the instructions and overseeing completion of the questionnaires.

3.4.3 Questionnaire Completion

Following development of the questionnaire as described in 3.2.1, 3.2.3 and 3.2.4, Year 10 students were presented with a scenario which portrayed a situation in the classroom when a teacher directs negative behaviour towards them (see Appendix II and below). As it was not possible for myself, as the “Chief Investigator” to administer all questionnaires (or to be present when these were being completed), clear, written instructions were provided for colleagues who administered the questionnaires in order to promote standardisation of completion (Appendix V, VII). Note that a similar approach was adopted by Weiner, Graham, Stern and Lawson (op cit).
Despite proposing that completion of the questionnaires would take place in form time, where a cross-section of students was likely to be present, in practice, this took place in just one school as the remaining two schools found it more convenient for questionnaire completion to take place at other times during the school day, e.g., at the end of a lesson. However, the required cross-section of students was still gained and, as completion of the questionnaires (including instructions) took approximately ten minutes, minimal disruption to lessons was maintained.

Participants were presented with the following scenario and the subsequent questions (Appendix II):

Our class was having a lesson. We had been given a piece of work to do on our own. I was sitting at a desk behind a girl in my class who had dropped her pencil sharpener on the floor. There were little pieces of sharpening everywhere so I decided to help her pick them up. As I was picking them up the teacher shouted extremely loudly, saying, “What are you doing? You are supposed to be doing your work!” I politely said that I was just helping my friend but the teacher carried on shouting and gave me a detention for break time. I have never forgotten that day and I never will forget it!

Imagining that they are the student in the scenario, each of the participants was asked to indicate what they thought might be the cause of the teacher’s behaviour, what their anticipated emotional response would be and how responsible they thought the teacher was for his or her behaviour. Additionally, the students were asked whether they perceived the teacher to be male or female and, finally, the students were asked to indicate if they, themselves, were male or female.

3.4.4 Support

Support was available for students who were identified as having additional needs (e.g., in terms of reading and writing difficulties). No information was available about how many students required additional support although no administrators reported difficulties in completion of the questionnaire (see Appendix V for instructions to administrators).
3.5 **ANONYMITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY**

Names of students were required initially in order to ensure that any whose parents/carers had said they didn’t want their child/children to be involved, wouldn’t be involved. However, following this check, and data being inputted into SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solutions, Version 20, International Business Machines Corporation (IBM)), it was not necessary to retain names of students who participated and these were destroyed. Participants were identified by a number for the purposes of collating and analysing data and, therefore, students could be assured of anonymity. Direct quotes from some questionnaires were used (if permission had been given by students via Questionnaire front sheets (see Appendix VII) although, again, these remained anonymous.

Data were stored via manual files in the first instance and then on a personal computer.

Analysis of the data took place in a private study area and only myself, as the Chief Investigator, and my university supervisor had access to the data.

3.6 **ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Ethical considerations were made during the development and design of the research and any potential risks or concerns which were noted were addressed. In particular, the following were considered:

- Students gave responses to a scenario provided for them (rather than them giving information about their own experiences), thereby avoiding potentially sensitive information about their teachers being provided during the research.

- Parents/carers and students were provided with detailed information about the research and were informed that there was no obligation to participate (Appendix VIII, IX).

- Minimal disruption to lessons was sought by (i) suggesting questionnaires be completed during form time and (ii) ensuring that the questionnaire could be completed in a short amount of time.
• It was planned to administer the questionnaires during the second half of the summer term, thereby avoiding disruption to, or interference with, examinations. However, in practice, this took place in the following September (thereby also avoiding examinations).

• Support was available for students who were identified as having additional needs (e.g., in terms of reading and writing difficulties).

3.7 FEEDBACK OF RESULTS

Participants were informed that they would be able to access the results if requested, following completion of the research (see Appendix IX). Participating schools were offered feedback (i) informally, (ii) via report and/or (iii) via in-service training for school staff.

3.8 CRITIQUE OF METHODOLOGY

The following sections explain how issues with the methodology raise questions about the validity and reliability of the research.

3.8.1 Data Collection: Questionnaire Design

Use of Scenario

The scenario (Appendix II) was intended to portray a situation which a student in a classroom would consider to be “negative”. However, of course, it would be erroneous to assume that every student would do so. For example, a student who gained credibility amongst his or her peers via challenging teachers might find the situation portrayed to be positive as it might give an opportunity to add to his or her notoriety. In addition, although the scenario was gained via speaking to a group of students (see Section 3.2.2), it may be erroneous to consider that this is a typical situation, including for the Year 10 group who participated in the main study. Similarly, it would be inappropriate to conclude that Y10 students would respond in the same way to different scenarios. Using such a scenario with a group of students would have implications for the reliability of the method employed to gain student causal attributions. The construction of scenarios does not appear to have been critiqued by other researchers or theorists.
Development of Questionnaire

Y8 students were accessed to develop the questionnaire yet this was administered with Y10 students. It has been acknowledged that the scenario provided by a Y8 student may not portray a scenario typically encountered by Y10 students (see previous paragraph). However, it should also be acknowledged that, following the pilot study discussed in Section 3.2.3 (which involved Y8 students), changes were made to the questionnaire, partly due to potential difficulties for students in differentiating between “control” and “intention”. However, the skills of the different year groups (Y8 and Y10) may differ due to the potential effects of maturation, including in terms of executive functioning skills (such as those relating to reasoning and problem-solving, for example) and, therefore, Y10 students may not have needed such adaptations. In other words, if the pilot study had taken place with Y10 students, it may have been considered that they would be more able to grasp the difference between the terms “control” and “intention” whereas it was decided that this might be a difficulty for the Y8 students who did participate in the pilot study. As a consequence, the results of the research may have been limited in terms of the potential restriction of the view of the participants and, therefore, the quality of responses.

Use of “Personalised” vs “Depersonalised” Scenario

We might, of course, expect different emotional responses according to whether participants are the subject of a teacher’s anger (therefore “personalised”), or merely observers of the anger being directed to another peer (therefore “depersonalised”), e.g., with the former possibly resulting in more extreme emotions than, potentially, a more balanced attribution being gained if observing the situation from “a safe distance”. The results of studies which incorporate “personalised” scenarios cannot be compared with the results of studies which incorporate “depersonalised” scenarios. Again, this does not appear to be an aspect of attribution theory research which has been critiqued.

Use of Hypothetical Situations

The method adopted required students to use their imagination in both (i) putting themselves in the situation outlined in the scenarios and (ii) imagining how they might feel. Although earlier research has used hypothetical situations, their use can be problematic as there may be differences in the making of causal attributions (as well as assigning emotional responses, as discussed in the above paragraph) according to
whether the observer observes himself/herself in the situation (as was requested in
the research presented in this thesis) or whether the observer is observing somebody
else in the situation. However, of course, there would also be difficulties in using “real
life” situations in the research, partly due to issues around standardisation but, also, in
terms of access to participants and asking students about their actual interactions with
their teachers (together with the sensitivities around this). As explained in the
Literature Review (see Section 2.5), there are studies that have used real-life
situations and these can be appropriate, depending upon the aims of the research,
the research questions and the permission of all of those involved.

Use of Imagination

Asking research participants to imagine themselves within a situation can be
problematic for a number of reasons including that (i) some participants might find it
difficult to imagine themselves within a situation and (ii) if students are able to imagine
themselves within a given situation/scenario, their imagined responses may not
equate to how they would respond in reality. This would, of course, affect the validity
of the results.

Self-Report

There is a need to be cautious in gaining data via self-report for a number of reasons. For example, some participants may not be competent at labelling their own emotions,
e.g., due to limited: general ability, “emotional intelligence”, language skills, etc. We
might also consider that some respondents may report according to how they think
they ought to respond to a situation, rather how they would respond (e.g., to please
the examiner; to give the impression that s/he would respond in a more socially
acceptable way).

Limiting Participants’ Responses

The questionnaire used to gather data required limited responses at times, i.e., in
Questions 1 and 2 (see Appendix II) participants were asked to given the one major
cause of the teacher’s behaviour and the one main emotion s/he might feel. In
practice, it could be that participants might (for example) anticipate feeling more than
one emotion (such as “sympathy” and “anger”). However, the main cause of the
teacher behaviour and the strongest anticipated emotion were required in order to
both facilitate straightforward completion of the questionnaire for participants and to
aid data analysis, although it is acknowledged that reducing the data in this way has been criticised for being oversimplistic (Malle, 2011).

**Provision of Emotional Labels**

There are, of course, both advantages and disadvantages in providing emotional labels. An advantage might include that this would prompt students to more accurately label their anticipated emotion. For example, a student might initially consider that they would feel “angry” whereas, following reading through the provided list, s/he might decide that either “furious” or “irritated” would be a more accurate label. However, conversely, providing potential emotional labels might result in participants choosing an emotional label randomly or choosing one of those presented early in the list. (See Section 4.5 for further discussion, following analysis of the results.)

**3.8.2 Data Collection: Participants**

**Number of participants**

Despite cautions being raised about the methodology employed, the sample size (over 300 participants) increased the reliability of the results, particularly as the participants in the three schools involved provided broadly similar responses (see Appendix XV).

**Age of participants**

As the participants comprised Y10 students, the results can only be generalised within this broad age group and it would be inappropriate to conclude that younger or older students would have the same responses.

**3.8.3 Administration**

Despite administrators being provided with clear verbal and written instructions as well as the opportunity to discuss these (e.g., for clarification), as the Chief Investigator was not present for the administration of all questionnaires, it is not possible to be sure that these were all administered in exactly the same way (i.e., the level of explanation could have differed between administrators). As a consequence, this does lead to some question about the reliability of the method.
3.9 ANALYSIS

3.9.1 Research Group

Questions 1 and 2 were initially categorised according to thematic analysis by means of the guidelines from Braun and Clarke (2006) (see Appendix X). This was undertaken with the support of educational psychology colleagues via a research group.

The research group comprised five members of the Educational Psychology Service who volunteered to be involved and who met on two separate occasions, the first to discuss and debate the categorisation of “causes” (Research Question 1 – see Section 3.9.4) and the second to discuss and debate the categorisation of “emotions” (Research Question 2 – see Section 3.9.5). Due to the large number of responses and the time implications of asking the research group to categorise them, initial categorising took place by the Chief Investigator and these were forwarded to colleagues prior to meeting to discuss them. Colleagues who had volunteered to participate in coding attributions were provided with information to guide them (see Appendix XI).

Following discussions with the research group, alterations were made to both the names of the categories and the allocation of responses to these. These are discussed in Sections 3.9.4 and 3.9.5.

3.9.2 Available Data

Questionnaires were returned from 382 students. Of these, 323 indicated that they gave permission for their responses to be used in the research. Therefore, the data from the 59 students who did not give permission were excluded from the analysis. The number of participants from each of the three participating schools are: School A, 105; School B, 121; School C, 97 (with a total of 323). Across the three schools, 167 boys (51.7%) and 155 girls (48.0%) participated in the research. One student (0.3%) failed to indicate whether s/he was a boy or a girl.

3.9.3 Missing Data

Data are missing for various reasons (see Sections 3.9.4 and 3.9.5 for a discussion) e.g., due to:
(i) no response being given;
(ii) a response being spoiled;
(iii) the response given being a “literal interpretation”.

An example of a response being “spoiled” might be when, in answer to Questionnaire Question 1, a participant might have given an “emotion” rather than a “cause”, e.g., “They did that because they were angry”; “The teacher was in an angry mood”; “Frustrated”. Participants were specifically asked not to give emotions as responses (see Questionnaire – Appendix II). There was some debate about whether “stress” should be categorised as an emotion. However, if the dictionary definitions of “stress”, “anger” and “shame” are considered (Oxford Compact English Dictionary, 2000), this may add weight to the decision to categorise “stress” as an “external” cause, i.e., “stress” is defined as a state whereas both “anger” and “shame” are defined as feelings (see Section 4.2.1 for further discussion of the category of “stress”):

- “stress” “a state of mental, emotional or physical strain”
- “anger” “a strong feeling of annoyance, displeasure, or hostility”
- “shame” “a feeling of humiliation or distress caused by awareness of wrong or foolish behaviour”

Other responses classified as “spoiled” would be those giving more than one cause (and different causes), e.g., “She could be depressed and has a short temper or stressed or something has happened at home.” Participants were specifically asked to give one major cause for the teacher behaviour (see Appendix II). Similarly, in response to Questionnaire Question 1, thematic analysis revealed that some participants gave a literal interpretation, such as “He’s not doing as she said” or “The person who was helping was supposed to be doing her work” rather than “Problems at home” (for example). (Note that the category of “literal interpretation” refers to obvious causes, i.e., linked to the observed event, rather than to any underlying cause). “Missing” refers to data which was not present although, for the purposes of analysis via SPSS, “missing” data, “spoiled responses” and “literal interpretation” are all categorised as “missing” data. The number of responses classified as “missing data” is given below.
Question 1 ("Write down what you think might be the one major cause of the
teacher's behaviour")

Missing: n=2;
Spoiled: n=60;
Literal response: n=69.

Question 2 ("What might be the one main emotion/mood you feel, as a result of
the teacher's behaviour?")

Missing: n=1;
Spoiled: n=11.

Question 3 ("... how responsible do you think the teacher is for his/her
behaviour?")

Missing: n=2;
Spoiled: n=1.

Question 4 ("Indicate whether you imagined that the teacher in the scenario was
male or female")

Missing: n=1.

Question 5 ("Indicate whether you are a boy or a girl")

Missing: n=1.

3.9.4 Analysis of Responses to Question 1

Responses to Question 1 of the Questionnaire ("Write down what you think might be
the one major cause of the teacher's behaviour") (Appendix II) were categorised with
the support of the research group using Braun and Clarke’s (op cit) guidelines
(Appendix X). Phases 1 – 3 were completed by the Chief Investigator, with Phases 4
and 5 being completed with the research group. Thirteen categories had originally
been identified, as follows:
1. Stress relating to work (or home and work/bad day/bad news/impact of earlier event)
2. Stress linked to wider class/students
3. Non-specific stress
4. Home factors (including stress from home)
5. Illness
6. Misunderstanding
7. Dislike of student/class
8. Unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait)
9. Impeded from doing job
10. Behaviour of student/class (i.e., a cause directly related to the situation).
11. Spoiled response (e.g., more than one response).
12. Hard to categorise/unclear meaning
13. No response

Although thirteen categories had initially been compiled, following a discussion of these, some were combined or omitted from the analysis. For example, categories 11 and 12 were combined, both of which linked to errors in completion, i.e., with the former category involving “spoiled” responses (e.g., due to two dissimilar “causes” being given) and the latter category involving responses considered difficult to categorise for other reasons (such as the meaning of the responses being unclear) (see Appendix XII for examples). The combined category was labeled “spoiled responses” but was omitted from the analysis, as was the category of “no response”. Another category of responses was omitted from the analysis, i.e., category 10, as it was decided that these responses did not relate to a “cause” of the teacher behaviour, although they did tend to describe the event depicted in the scenario (e.g., “They were supposed to do their work” – respondent number 42; “Disruption in the class” – respondent number 117). As the research group decided that these responses reflected a literal understanding of the question (rather than a consideration of underlying “causes”), this category was labeled “Literal Interpretation”.

Following this, nine useable categories were identified from the data and Table 4 shows these together with the frequency of these responses). However, due to there being subtle differences between some of these categories (specifically, the four categories linked to “stress” or earlier stressors), the research group concluded that it would be more meaningful for these to be combined. This resulted in six discrete categories being identified (see Table 5).
Some debate took place in the research group about whether the large number of “spoiled responses” gained via Question 1 should be utilised, e.g., with the responses containing an emotion being incorporated. However, as “causes” rather than “emotions” had been required to answer a specific research question, together with there being a specific instruction not to give an emotion, this suggestion was rejected. Similarly, it was suggested that those responses which involved more than one “cause” should be utilised (e.g., “The student was out of his seat, the teacher had other problems”, i.e., provided by participant number 153). However, following some discussion, it was agreed that allowing more than one response for some respondents (when other respondents had, clearly, followed the instructions and just given one), would mean that those who gave more than one would have their views represented more than the others. As a consequence, it was agreed that these responses would not be included in the data analysis. It is important to note that the labels given for the categories of “causes” encompass a range of responses, e.g., see Appendix XII where the responses “they are depressed”, “tired” and “hormones” are categorised under the generic label of “illness”.

The research group discussed whether the overall categories of “causes” could be described as “internal” or “external” and decisions about these were made with ease.

3.9.5 Analysis of Responses to Question 2

Thematic analysis (again, by means of the guidelines from Braun and Clarke, op cit) was also used to categorise responses to Question 2 according to the emotional label assigned. Following discussions via the research group, 7 categories emerged from the data (see Appendices XIII and XIV).

Although some emotional labels were relatively easy to categorise together (e.g., “angry” and “mad”), it soon became apparent that, despite similarities, some labels suggested a different intensity of response (e.g., as in “enraged” and “irritated”). Despite this, for the purpose of analysis, emotional labels which referred to the same broad emotion were categorised together. However, the names of the categories were intended to take account of these differences, e.g., “Anger and related terms”, “upset and related terms”, etc. (see Appendix XIV for other names of categories).

Despite the instructions asking for just one emotion, a small number of respondents in the main study gave more than one. However, if these could be categorised together (i.e., “angry, irritated, frustrated”), then these were incorporated into the data, rather
than being discarded as “spoiled” responses. The research group discussed these issues and categories were agreed as shown in Appendix XIV.

It proved difficult to allocate some of the emotional responses to discrete categories and this generated a great deal of discussion within the research group. For example, the term “disgusted” was finally placed in the generic category of “anger and related terms”. Although the term “disgusted” does not imply the same emotion as “anger”, the research group decided that, as the term suggested a negative, “other-directed” emotion (as opposed to a “self-directed” emotion) and no other category depicted a negative, “other-directed” emotion, this did seem to be the most relevant category.

Similarly, the term “sorry” could be considered to have the same meaning as “upset”, depending upon the meaning for the respondent. However, it was concluded that “sorry” and “upset” would be categorised separately (i.e., with “sorry” being categorised under the umbrella category of “shame and related terms” and “upset” being categorised under the umbrella term of “upset and related terms”). As can be seen by the categories in Appendix XIV, “upset” was placed alongside emotions such as “depressed” and “sad”, whereas “sorry” was placed with emotions such as “guilty”. To clarify these decisions further, the research group agreed that Category 3 (“upset and related terms”) would contain emotions likely to result from blaming oneself and/or acknowledging one’s own role in the situation (hence feeling “depressed”, “upset” and “disappointed”). However, Category 4 (“shame and related terms”) was intended to relate to those emotions linked to relationships with others (including the effects of one’s own behaviour on others, social acceptance, etc), i.e., “humiliated”, “embarrassed”, “guilty” and “sorry”. Both of these categories were considered to be negative, “self-directed”. Although differentiation between Categories 3 and 4 is problematic, there is, arguably, a subtle difference between them which the research group felt was appropriate to distinguish.

Categorising emotional labels as “self-directed” or “other-directed” is an unfamiliar task and a discussion took place within the group about this distinction. Although there was subsequent agreement, it became apparent that it was impossible to categorise some emotional labels in this way with certainty as some could be either “self-directed” or “other-directed” depending upon the meaning for the respondent) as in “disgusted” and “angry”, for example) (see Section 4.5, third bullet point, for a discussion).
3.9.6 **Analysis of Responses to Questions 3, 4 and 5**

Responses to Question 3, 4 and 5 were analysed via gaining frequency distribution and Chi Square (see Chapter 4).
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

In order to aid the reader’s understanding, the aims of the research and the research questions are restated.

4.1 AIM OF RESEARCH AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The overall aim of the research is to explore Weiner's models of social motivation (see Appendix I) in relation to student-teacher interactions.

The research questions are as follows:

(i) What are the causal attributions that students make for the “negative” behaviour of teachers?

(ii) What are the emotions reported by students, following these causal attributions?

(iii) How responsible do students consider teachers are for this behaviour?

(iv) Do students perceive that male or female teachers are more likely to engage in negative behaviour?

(v) Is there a difference in attributions made by male and female students?

4.2 RESULTS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Please note that the data included in the results relate to data that are “valid” or “useable”, i.e., it does not include “missing” data. Please also note that due to them being more concise, the results of the research questions are discussed first, and the results of the aims of the research are discussed later, in Section 4.4.

4.2.1 Research Question 1: What are the causal attributions that students make for the “negative” behaviour of teachers?

Following thematic analysis (as explained in Section 3.9.4 and Appendix X), the categories given in Table 4 were found. Table 4 also indicates the frequency of responses for each of the categories and the percentage of participants who gave these responses (valid percent).
Table 4: All Causes Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress/bad day/bad news</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress due to wider class/student impact</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-specific stress</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home factors (including stress from home)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of student/class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impeded from doing job</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following further discussion via the research group, it was clear that the first four categories (“stress/bad day/bad news”; “stress due to wider class/student impact”; “non-specific stress” and “home factors (including stress from home)”) could all be categorised together as “stress”. A decision was made to combine these categories as there were clear similarities between them (e.g., some students responded with “stress”; “She might be stressed with things at home”; “Stressed after a long day at work”; “Family in hospital or died” all of which might imply earlier pressures and be more meaningful if classified together). Therefore, for the purposes of analysis, the category of “Stress” encompasses all of those “causes” which imply, or state, the influence of earlier factors (see Appendix XII for all responses). When these categories are combined, the frequency of responses and valid percentages are as shown in Table 5.
Table 5: Stress Combined Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of student/class</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impeded from doing job</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the method of categorisation adopted, the result of Research Question 1 is that the majority of participants attributed the cause of the teacher behaviour to “stress” (n = 137; 71.4%), with others attributing this to “illness” (n = 10; 5.2%), “misunderstanding” (n = 26; 13.5%), “dislike of student/class” (n = 4; 2.1%) , “unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait)” (n = 8; 4.2%) and “impeding from doing job” (n = 7; 3.6%) (see Table 5).

For the purpose of analysis, Causal Attributions were also categorised into two main categories, i.e., “Stress” and “Other”. As can be seen in Table 6 below, 71.4% (n = 137) of respondents attributed the teacher’s behaviour to “stress” whereas 28.6% (n = 55) attributed the behaviour to “other” factors. Valid percentages are also given in Table 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to this finding (i.e., that students largely attribute the cause of the teacher behaviour to “stress”), if “stress” is considered to be “external”, then the results would suggest that the participants made “external” causal attributions for the teacher behaviour. However, please refer to Sections 4.4.1 and 6.4.1 for a discussion of the difficulties in allocating causal attributions to “internal” and “external” causation and also to Section 6.4.1 for cautions in relation to allocating “causes” to discrete categories.

4.2.2 **Research Question 2: What are the emotions reported by students, following these causal attributions?**

Note that when discussing the results of Research Question 2, the terms “anger”, “scared”, “upset”, etc., refer to “anger and related responses”, “scared and related responses, “upset and related responses”, etc., as opposed to referring literally to the emotion given. See Section 3.9.5 for an explanation and Appendix XIV for the allocation of emotional labels to these categories.

The following table (Table 7) indicates how participants anticipated they would feel, following the teacher behaviour and the subsequent causal attributions about this. Despite the very small numbers of participants reporting potential feelings of “confused”, “happy” and “sympathetic”, these are included in Table 7 for the purpose of comparison, due to “sympathy” being an important component of Weiner’s theory (see Appendix I) and, also, due to “confused” and “happy” having the same number of responses as “sympathetic”.
Table 7: Anticipated Emotions Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of Research Question 2 is that the majority of participants anticipated that, following the teacher behaviour, the main emotion they would feel would be “anger” (n = 228; 73.1%). The remainder anticipated they would feel: “scared” (n = 22; 7.1%); “upset” (n = 17; 5.4%); “shame” (n = 39; 12.5%); “confused” (n = 2; .6%); “happy” (n = 2; .6%) or “sympathetic” (n = 2; .6%).

If “anger” (and “related terms” – see Appendix XIV) is considered to be an “other-directed” emotion, then the results would suggest that the participants anticipated feeling an “other-directed” emotion as a result of the teacher behaviour. However, it is important to note that there are considerable difficulties in implying meaning from the brief responses given by the participants in completion of the questionnaire and it would be erroneous to draw firm conclusions.

The main four categories containing the most frequent responses of “Anticipated Emotional Response” were categorised separately (i.e., see Appendix XIV, Categories 1 – 4). These four categories of anticipated emotions have been further categorised and analysed according to whether these are “self-directed” or “other-directed.” (see Table 8 and Appendix XIV).
Table 8: Four Main Emotions Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, the largest category of responses used in this analysis (74.4%) indicated that the participants anticipated that they would feel “anger” following the teacher behaviour. The second largest category of responses (12.8%) anticipated that they would feel “shame” following the teacher behaviour. As “anger” is considered to be a negative, “other-directed” emotion (unlike the others), 74.4% of participants anticipated they would feel a negative, “other-directed” emotion. As “shame”, “scared” and “upset” are categorised as negative, “self-directed” emotions, a total of 25.6% of participants anticipated they would feel a negative, “self-directed” emotion.

4.2.3 **Research Question 3: How responsible do students consider teachers are for their negative behaviour?**

The results of Research Question 3 indicate that the largest percentage of participants anticipated that, following the teacher behaviour, they would consider the teacher to be “totally responsible” for his/her behaviour, i.e., 29.7% (n = 95) (see Table 9). The smallest percentage of respondents, i.e., 15.9% (n = 51), considered the teacher to be “not responsible at all”; 25.9% (n = 83) considered the teacher to be “not responsible” and 28.4% (n = 91) considered the teacher would be “responsible” for his or her behaviour. Table 9 details the numbers and percentages of participants for each of the four levels of “responsibility.”
In order to assess whether there was a significant relationship between teacher behaviour and students' assessment of responsibility, the Chi Square test was used. A significant relationship was found in the observed frequencies for Research Question 3: “How responsible do students consider teachers are for their negative behaviour?” (Chi Square = 14.950, df = 3, p = 0.002). The pattern of responses suggests that there is a significant association between the teacher’s behaviour and levels of responsibility assigned, with there being a comparatively small percentage of participants considering that the teacher was “not responsible at all”.

4.2.4 **Research Question 4: Do students perceive that male or female teachers are more likely to engage in negative behaviour?**

Table 10 indicates the numbers of participants who had imagined the teacher was male or female (and those who didn’t imagine either).
The results of Research Question 4 are that 39.4% (n = 127) of participants imagined the teacher to be male, 47.2% (n = 152) imagined the teacher to be female and 13.4% (n = 43) didn’t imagine either.

Again, in order to assess whether there was a significant relationship between male and female students’ imagination of the teacher gender, the Chi Square test was used. Following this analysis, a significant relationship was found in the observed frequencies for Research Question 4: “Do students perceive that male or female teachers are more likely to engage in negative behaviour?” (Chi Square = 60.752, df = 2, p = < 0.001). When considering the pattern of responses, it is clear that a relatively small number of students did not imagine the teacher in the scenario to be male or female.

4.2.5 Research Question 5: Is there a difference in attributions made by male and female students?

In order to answer Research Question 5, “Is there a difference in attributions made by male and female students?”, crosstabulation was performed on the results for (i) Causal Attribution for Teacher Behaviour; (ii) Anticipated Emotional Response; (iii) Level of Responsibility; (iv) Male or Female Teacher and (v) Direction of Emotion: Self-directed or Other-Directed. The results are as follows:

Causal Attribution for Teacher Behaviour - Boys vs Girls

Table 11 shows the “count”, “expected count” and “percentages” relating to the Causal Attributions given for the teacher behaviour depicted in the scenario. Due to 7 cells having an expected count of less than 5, it was inappropriate to conduct a Chi Square test.
Table 11: Causal Attributions for Teacher Behaviour - Boys vs Girls
Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boy/Girl</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of student/class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impeded from doing job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to explore whether there was a relationship between the responses of boys and girls to the broad category of “stress” and the “other” causes, a further Chi Square analysis was used. This showed that there was no significant relationship between the responses of the boys and girls (Chi Square = 6.645, df = 1, p = .010) (see Table 12).
Table 12: Causal Attributions for Stress and Other – Boys vs Girls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boy/Girl</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Anticipated Emotional Response - Boys vs Girls**

Table 13 shows the “count”, “expected count” and “percentages” relating to the Anticipated Emotional Responses following the teacher behaviour depicted in the scenario. As 6 cells (42.9%) have an expected count less than 5, it was not possible to use a Chi Square test for boys and girls responses to the question, “What might be the one main emotion/mood you might feel, as a result of the teacher’s behaviour?”. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boy</th>
<th>Girl</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Expected Count</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>116.8</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>302.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four Main Emotions - Boys vs Girls

In order to explore whether there was a relationship between the responses of boys and girls to the four largest categories of “emotion”, a further Chi Square analysis was used. This showed that there was a significant relationship between the responses of the boys and girls (Chi Square = 18.746, df = 3, p = < 0.001) (see Table 14 below).

The counts and percentages in Table 14 show that more boys than girls anticipated feeling “angry”, whereas more girls than boys anticipated feeling “scared”, “upset” and “shame”.

Table 14: Four Main Emotions – Boys vs Girls Crosstabulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boy/Girl</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>110.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>149.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we consider “anger” to be a “negative”, “other-directed” emotion, it is clear that more boys than girls anticipated feeling such an emotion. However, if “scared”, “upset”, and “shame” are considered to be “negative”, “self-directed” emotions, it is clear that more
girls than boys anticipated feeling these emotions (see Section 2.4.11 for a discussion of “self-directed” and “other-directed” emotions).

**Direction of Emotion: Other-directed and Self-directed - Boys vs Girls**

The “count”, “expected count” and percentages relating to boys and girls responses to the question “What might be the one main emotion/mood you feel, as a result of the teacher’s behaviour?”, following these having been categorised into “self-directed negative”; “self-directed positive”; “other-directed negative” and “other-directed positive”, are given in Table 15 below. In this analysis, all the emotional labels shown in Table 13 were used. “Anger” was considered to be an “other-directed negative” emotion and “sympathetic” was considered to be a “other-directed positive” emotion. However, “scared”, “upset”, “shame” and “confused” were considered to be “self-directed negative” emotions and “happy” was categorised as a “self-directed positive” emotion (see Section 2.4.11 for further explanation).

4 cells (50.0%) have an expected count less than 5. Therefore, it is inappropriate to use a Chi Square test for boys and girls responses when these are categorised according to “self-directed negative”, “self-directed positive”, “other-directed negative” and “other-directed positive”.

However, a closer look at the frequencies in Table 15 indicates that there is a skew towards boys anticipating they would feel more an “other-directed negative” emotion (i.e., directed towards the teacher in the scenario) than would girls (with the count being 132 for boys and 95 for girls). Conversely, there is a skew towards girls anticipating they would feel more “self-directed negative” emotions (i.e., directed towards themselves) than would the boys (with the count being 56 for girls and 24 for boys).
Table 15: Direction of Emotion: Other-Directed and Self-Directed - Boys vs Girls Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boy/Girl</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Directed Positive</td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Directed Negative</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>116.8</td>
<td>110.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Directed Positive</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Directed Negative</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>151.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Direction of Emotion: Other-Directed Negative and Self-Directed Negative - Boys vs Girls

Due to the very small numbers of students who anticipated positively-directed emotions, a further analysis via Chi Square took place omitting these in order to explore whether there was a relationship between the responses of boys and girls to the categories of “other directed negative” emotions and “self directed negative” emotions. This showed that there was a significant relationship between the responses of the boys and girls (Chi Square = 18.754, df = 1, p = < 0.001) (see Table 16 below).

Table 16: Direction of Emotion: Other-Directed Negative and Self-Directed Negative – Boys vs Girls Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boy</th>
<th>Girl</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Directed Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>115.3</td>
<td>111.7</td>
<td>227.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Directed Negative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>151.0</td>
<td>307.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that, in addition to the differences between boys and girls responses in relation to the “other-directed negative” emotion of “anger”, more than twice as many girls as boys anticipated feeling a “self-directed negative”, emotion, i.e., 18.2% vs 7.8%.
Level of Responsibility - Boys vs Girls

Table 17 shows the “count”, “expected count” and “percentages” relating to boys and girls assigned Level of Responsibility, following the scenario.

### Table 17: Level of Responsibility - Boys vs Girls Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boy</th>
<th>Girl</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not responsible at all</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not responsible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totally responsible</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>166.0</td>
<td>154.0</td>
<td>320.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to explore whether there was a relationship between the responses of boys and girls in relation to the different levels of “responsibility”, a Chi Square analysis was used. This showed that there was no significant relationship between the responses of the boys and girls (Chi Square = 4.215, df = 3, p = 0.239).
Imagined Male or Female Teacher - Boys vs Girls

The “count”, “expected count” and “percentages” relating to boys and girls responses to the question, “Indicate whether you imagined that the teacher in the scenario was male or female” are given in Table 18.

Table 18: Imagined Male or Female Teacher - Boys vs Girls Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boy/Girl</th>
<th>Boy</th>
<th>Girl</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>127.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>152.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Didn't imagine either</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>167.0</td>
<td>155.0</td>
<td>322.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, in order to explore whether there was a relationship between boys and girls responses, a further analysis took place via Chi Square. No significant relationship was found in relation to this item Chi Square = .791, df = 2, p = 0.673).

In relation to Research Question 5, then, the following observations were made:

i. Although the numbers are small, more girls than boys thought that the teacher behaviour was due to “misunderstanding” (with respective counts of 17 and 9).

ii. More boys than girls anticipated that their emotional response would be “angry” (with respective counts of 132 and 95).
iii. More girls than boys anticipated that their emotional response would be the “negative”, “self-directed” emotion of “shame” (with respective counts of 29 and 10).

iv. More girls than boys anticipated they would feel the “negative”, “self-directed” emotion of “scared” (with respective counts of 13 and 9).

v. More girls than boys anticipated they would feel the “negative”, “self-directed” emotion of “upset” (with respective counts of 12 and 5)

vi. Comparatively few students indicated that the teacher was “not responsible at all” for his or her behaviour and this result was significant.

vii. Most students made a decision about whether they imagined the teacher was male or female and this result was also significant.

viii. There were some interesting observations in relation to the direction of the anticipated emotion (“self-directed” or “other-directed”), with more boys (n = 132) than girls (n = 95) anticipating that they would feel an “other-directed negative” emotion (such as “angry”). Conversely, more girls (n = 56) than boys (n = 24) anticipated that they would feel a “self-directed negative” emotion (with these calculations comprising the categories of “scared”, “upset” and “shame”).

4.3 A COMPARISON OF RESULTS FROM THE THREE PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS

Appendix XV compares the response for students from each of the three schools who participated, in relation to (i) causal attribution; (ii) anticipated emotional response; (iii) level of responsibility; (iv) imagined male or female teacher; (v) gender of participants and (vi) direction of emotions. An examination of these shows that there are relatively minor differences between responses across all three of the participating schools and this would indicate some reliability in the research.

4.4 SUMMARY

The overall aim of the research was to explore Weiner’s model(s) of social motivation (see Appendix I) to student-teacher interactions. The results of this research do not appear to fully support his models and the reasons are given below.
4.4.1 Internal vs External Causality

As discussed earlier (Section 2.11.1) there can be difficulties in deciding whether a cause can be classified as “internal” or “external”. In line with this, in the results of the research, there may be a conflict between deciding whether the main causal attribution for the cause of the teacher behaviour in the scenario (i.e., “stress”) can be classified as “internal” or “external” causation. Although this has been classified as “external” within the results (due to the explanation given in Section 4.2.1), it could be argued that “stress” is an “internal” factor. For example, although the “stress” might be caused by factors within the environment (therefore “external”), “stress” could be considered to be the “internal” state of the actor at the time of the behaviour. However, regardless of the cause being categorised according to “internal” or “external” factors, it is clear that the students who participated in the research mainly attributed the cause of the teacher’s negative behaviour to some influence beyond the immediate situation (as opposed to teacher temperament, for example).

4.4.2 Emotional Response following a Causal Attribution

As “stress” has been categorised as an “external” factor and “anger” was found to be the most frequently anticipated emotion by participants in the study, the results of the research do not appear to support the assertion within attribution theory, i.e., that an observer who attributes the negative behaviour of another to “external” factors (in this case, “stress” caused by influences within the environment) will experience feelings of “sympathy” (or, at least, “no anger”) (e.g., see Appendix I, Models 1 and 2).

4.4.3 Attributions of Responsibility

There was a relatively even split between participants who assigned “responsibility” (i.e., “responsible”/“totally responsible”) or “no responsibility” (“not responsible”/“not responsible at all”) which presents as unusual when compared with the large proportion of “stress” and “anger” categories. We might also question why participants might allocate a level of “responsibility” to the teacher in the scenario when an (arguably) “external” causal attribution was given (i.e., “stress”). These queries lead to doubts about how this question was understood and responded to. There may be some confusion in the responses and results due to some participants (potentially) making a decision about “responsibility” based on the initial cause of the behaviour (i.e., “stress”) and deciding that the teacher was “not responsible” for this but other participants (potentially) making the judgement of “responsibility” based on
the teacher’s subsequent behaviour (i.e., shouting at the student). In other words, some students may have decided that the teacher was “responsible” for choosing to respond to their stress in this way. In addition, it seems reasonable to consider that students might feel that the teacher in the scenario had some responsibility for “external events”. For example, it might be considered that s/he has some responsibility for some events which might cause “stress” such as for his or her financial problems but probably not for a family member being ill and in hospital. These particular results are, therefore, inconclusive.

4.5 REFLECTION ON RESULTS

The Critique of Methodology (Section 3.8), together with aspects of the analysis (see Section 3.9), demonstrate that there are a number of factors which are problematic in drawing conclusions. These include the following:

- We might expect different results if the participants were asked to observe the situation depicted in the scenario, as opposed to being a participant within it, particularly in respect of any potential emotional responses.

- Despite the research group agreeing on the classification of both (i) causes and (ii) anticipated emotional responses, it is possible that another research group would decide on a different method of categorisation.

- Difficulties are evident in categorising some responses with any certainty. For example, although it is assumed that respondents who reported they would feel “angry” following the teacher behaviour were feeling “angry” towards the teacher, in theory it is possible that at least some respondents intended to state that they would have this feeling towards themselves. In this case, the “anger” would be a “negative”, “self-directed” emotion. Similarly, in the case of the label “disgusted”, although this has been categorised as a “negative”, “other-directed” emotion, in theory, the student may have felt disgusted with himself or herself, in which case, “disgusted” would be categorised as a “negative”, “self-directed” emotion.

- It could be argued that providing participants with potential emotional responses to consider (see Appendix II, Question 2), whilst aiming to provide more accurate labeling of emotions, might inadvertently have led to less accurate labeling, e.g., via participants choosing an emotion which appeared in the list – and appeared early in the list – rather than considering their own
likely reaction. However, a closer examination of the responses demonstrated that this did not appear to be the case, with few participants (whose responses could be used in the data analysis) choosing the following emotional labels which, together with “angry”, appeared early in the list provided: “depressed” (solely\(^1\) circled by three participants), “anxious” (not circled by any participants), “ashamed” (solely circled by four participants) and “frightened” (solely circled by three participants). Conversely, the label “frustrated”, which appears more than half way down the list provided, was indicated solely by a circle by 39 participants. The participants did appear to prefer to select emotional labels from the list provided, with 237 of the 312 responses (which were able to be included in the data analysis) being chosen from the list, 52 being provided by participants (although most of these were already in the list) and 23 choosing to do both. There are, clearly, pros and cons to providing examples of responses and requiring participants to choose their own. This has been discussed in Sections 3.2.2. (“Types of Questions: Open-ended, Multiple Choice and Scaling”), 5.1.1 (third bullet point) and 6.3.2.

- The results of the research indicated that there may have been some lack of understanding of the questions (particularly that which asked about levels of “responsibility”). See Section 4.4.3 for an explanation.

- Some differences between boys and girls were noted in relation to the direction of the anticipated “negative” emotion.

Due to the number of reservations about the methodology adopted, a re-design of the method of data collection took place. This is explained in Chapter 5.

\(^1\) “Solely” refers to participants circling the response whilst not circling others.
CHAPTER 5: FOLLOW-UP STUDY

5.1 REDESIGN OF DATA COLLECTION

As a result of methodological limitations (see Sections 3.8 and 4.5), the data collection was redesigned. A follow-up study then took place which included a focus group discussion in order to gain the participants’ experience of completing the questionnaire including, for example, how easily they understood the questions.

5.1.1 Revised Questionnaire

The original questionnaire was revised to take account of the earlier weaknesses with the data collection and the subsequent difficulties in analysing and interpreting the results (see Appendix II for original questionnaire and Appendix XVI for revised questionnaire). Section 4.5 outlines these and revisions are explained as follows:

* As it was considered that the students were more likely to anticipate feelings of “anger” if they imagined that they were the student described in the questionnaire, the scenario was adapted in order to ask participants to imagine that they were observing the situation, as opposed to being the subject of the teacher’s behaviour.

* The order of Questions 1 and 2 was changed as it was thought this might be a more rational way of asking the questions (i.e., due to respondents being likely to feel an emotion before reflecting on the “cause” of the behaviour).

* Examples of potential emotional responses were omitted from Question 2 as it was thought that this might inadvertently influence students’ choice of response.

* The original Question 4 was omitted as the results of this in the main research were not noteworthy (i.e., with 20.2% of boys and 19.3% of girls imagining that the teacher in the scenario was male and 23.9% of boys and 23.3% of girls imagining that the teacher in the scenario was female – see Table 18).

* Due to suspected confusion about understanding (see Section 4.3.3), questions asking about responsibility for (i) the cause of the behaviour and (ii) the actual behaviour engaged in were included.
5.1.2 Revised Aim and Research Questions

The aim of the research and the research questions are similar to those of the main research, although an additional question (now question number iv in the questionnaire) was included to take account of potential confusion experienced with the earlier research questions. These are as follows:

Aim

To explore Weiner's (e.g., 1995; 2006; 2010) models of social motivation in relation to student-teacher interactions.

Research Questions

i. What are the causal attributions that students make for the “negative” behaviour of teachers?

ii. What are the emotions reported by students, following these causal attributions?

iii. How responsible do students consider teachers are for this behaviour?

iv. How responsible do students consider teachers are for the cause of this behaviour?

v. Is there a difference in the responses of male and female students?

5.2 FOLLOW-UP STUDY: METHODOLOGY

The redesigned questionnaire was piloted with eight students (i.e., Y10 students who had not been previously involved in the research). This was followed with a focus group discussion in order to gain students’ experience of completing the questionnaire including how easily they understood the questions. The aim of the focus group study is as follows:

“To gain student perceptions of completing a scenario-based questionnaire in relation to student causal attributions for teachers’ behaviour in school”.
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5.2.1 Information for Parents/Carers and Participants

Due to the recording of the focus group discussion, it was important to include this in information given to both parents/carers and students (see revised Information to Parents/Carers in Appendix XVII, revised Information to Students also in Appendix XVII and revised Front Sheet to questionnaire in Appendix XVI).

5.2.2 Participants

A school was asked to identify a group of Year 10 students who might be both willing and able to contribute to the follow-up study which would include completion of the revised questionnaire. Following a group of students being identified by school staff, an arrangement was made to go into the school to speak with the group. The purpose of this was to discuss issues such as the aims of the research and the requirements of participants and, of course, to secure interest from volunteers. Following volunteers being gained, information was then posted to their parents/carers via school (see Appendix XVII). Note that, as was the case in the main research, parents/carers were asked to contact the researcher if they did not want their child to participate. However, informed consent from the students was requested on two occasions – firstly during the initial discussion of the research in school and, secondly, (and more formally) via the front sheet of the questionnaire (see Appendix XVI), as was the case in the main body of research.

Between 8 – 10 participants were sought from a Y10 group (the same year group who participated in the main research, although comprising students who had not been involved in the earlier research). Eleven students volunteered although, on the day of the research, just eight were in school and able to participate (six boys and two girls).

5.2.3 Ethical Issues

Ethical issues were covered via the main research (see Section 3.6) and agreement from the Ethics Committee. The only significant addition was the recording made of the focus group discussion which was necessary in order for the discussion to be transcribed (and this was subsequently approved by the Ethics Committee). Following the transcription (see Appendix XVIII), the recording of the discussion was no longer needed and was deleted. As stated above, consent from the participants to record the discussion was requested via the front sheet of the questionnaire and the
parents/carers were informed via the Information to Parents/Carers (see Appendices XVI and XVII).

5.2.4 Data Collection

Setting

School staff reserved a room which would enable the follow-up study, including the focus group discussion, to take place undisturbed, i.e., a small board room (usually intended for staff discussions and meetings). A number of other steps were taken in order to help make the setting comfortable for the students and to promote their participation, i.e., blinds were drawn to reduce distractions, water was provided for the students to drink as well as sweets to eat, all placed within easy reach.

Questionnaire Completion

As was the case in the main research, participants were asked to complete the questionnaire as well as the front sheet (Appendix XVI), with both being read through by the Chief Investigator to aid understanding and to confirm agreement to participate.

Focus Group

As stated earlier, following completion of the questionnaire, a focus group discussion took place with the aim being to gain students’ experience of completing the questionnaire.

Focus groups normally follow a specific format, i.e.:

- an introduction
- a ‘warm up’
- the main focus group discussion
- a brief ‘cool off’ and
- closure in the form of thanking participants

There are pros and cons to gaining data via focus group discussion and Robson (2011) explains the process involved, together with some of the advantages and disadvantages of this method of data collection. For example, he suggests that two advantages are that it enables students who have reading and writing difficulties to
contribute but, also, that the group discussion enables more extreme views to be “weeded out” by other members of the group. However, Robson (op cit) states that, despite the advantages of focus groups, there are significant disadvantages (which, he states, is also the case with the use of data collection via questionnaires). For example, he recognises that the group dynamics do influence the contributions of different participants including via the dominance of some members and, as a consequence, the views provided during the group discussion may not be representative of all members. As a result of the difficulties explained, Robson (op cit) emphasises that the expertise of the group facilitator is very important in enabling the success of the focus group discussion. He suggests that it is important for the facilitator to listen more than to speak, to avoid any leading or biased questions and to phrase questions in such a way that participants are unlikely to find these threatening. Following his discussion of the pros and cons of focus groups, Robson (op cit) adds that, as a result of their shortcomings, focus groups are “… commonly used in conjunction with other methods…” (p 296). These methods would include the use of questionnaires.

The focus group undertaken in the research presented in this thesis comprised eight Year 10 students, selected by their teachers as being students who were likely to be willing to contribute. The focus of the discussion was on students’ understanding of the questions in the questionnaire and the ease with which they completed this. It was semi-structured and some flexibility was hoped for, depending upon participant responses. However, in order to support the facilitator, pre-set prompts had been compiled (see Appendix XIX). The focus group followed the standard format given above although, due to the participants all knowing each other already, the “warm up” was brief. The focus group involved both open questions (as in “How easy was it to complete the questionnaire?”; “How could I have made that simpler?”) and some closed questions (as in “Did you want to give more than one emotion?” and asking for a “show of hands”). Probes/prompts were also used to encourage participants to expand on their responses (as in prompting for confirmation and/or clarification such as “So it is not very typical” and “Worded it differently?”) (see Appendix XVIII for transcription).

5.2.5 Reflections on Participation

Students participated well in the questionnaire completion, performing this task quietly and not appearing to share responses with their peers. Following this, the focus group discussion took place. Two of the participants were particularly willing to
participate in the discussion, with the others tending to make comments following their
lead. Due to a small number of students being more vocal than the others, there were
times when a “show of hands” was requested in order to indicate agreement (or
otherwise) on particular points (i.e., to clarify how many students understood the
questions, particularly those differentiating between the “causes” of behaviour and the
actual behaviour engaged in by the teacher). Other than the small number of
participants who engaged particularly well, it proved difficult to gain views from the
group. This may have been due to a number of reasons including that participants
were reticent to give their views in the presence of their peers, concerned that they
might give “wrong” answers, inhibited by the formal setting of a school board room as
well as due to the limited experience of the facilitator in managing focus groups, etc.
In general, although useful information was gained from the focus group, due to the
reluctant participation of some group members, the focus group discussion was quite
short and lacked some depth (see Appendix XVII for transcription).

5.2.6 Analysis

Formal thematic analysis, e.g., via the Braun and Clarke (op cit) method adopted for
the main study (see Appendix X) would be appropriate for categorising responses to
the open-ended questions involved in the revised questionnaire. However, due to the
small number of participants required for the follow-up study and the brevity of the
focus group discussion itself (potentially partly resulting from the very specific aims of
the focus group discussion), a relatively small data set was generated and a full,
formal analysis via this method was not necessary.

As can be seen from the results given in Appendix XX, the responses gained could be
grouped according to the categories used in the main study (see Appendices XII and
XIV). However, as explained in Sections 3.9.4 and 3.9.5, it is acknowledged that
categorising of “causes” and “anticipated emotions” is problematic.

5.2.7 Results of Questionnaire

The numbers of participants giving particular responses are provided below to
compare the responses with the qualitative findings via the focus group discussion.
Question 1: “What might be the one main emotion/feeling you have as a result of the teacher’s behaviour?”

Responses were collated as follows:

- Confused (n = 4);
- Angry (n = 3);
- Petrified (n = 1)

Question 2: “Write down what you think might be the one major cause of the teacher’s behaviour”

Responses were categorised as follows:

- “Problems outside school” / “stress (family issues)” / “personal problems”, etc. (n = 4)
- Earlier stress (e.g., “he’s having a bad day/frustrated”; “something might of bothered the teacher before the class”) (n = 2)
- Misunderstanding (“not seeing all of what happened with the students”) (n = 1)
- Spoiled and literal response (i.e., “anger towards the child for ignoring instructions”) (n = 1)

Question 3: “Taking into account your response to Question 2, how responsible do you think the teacher is for the cause of his/her behaviour?”

Responses are as follows:

- Responsible (n = 6)
- Totally responsible (n = 1)
- Not responsible (n = 1)
Question 4: “How responsible do you think the teacher is for the behaviour that s/he engaged in?”

Responses are as follows:

- Responsible (n = 5)
- Totally responsible (n = 2)
- Not responsible (n = 1)

### 5.2.8 Main Points from Focus Group Discussion

A transcript of the focus group discussion is given in Appendix XVII and details of the students’ questionnaire responses are given in Appendix XX. The main points raised by the focus group discussion suggested the following:

- Although the students tended to agree with the first contributor to the discussion, i.e., that the scenario was untypical, they then reported other “real life” scenarios which they thought would be more common but which did appear to be of a similar ilk (e.g., “If somebody stood up or was talking and not meant to be or something.”). However, regardless of this comparison, it appears that the scenario provided in the questionnaire may not reflect common situations for these Y10 students and, therefore, may not be the most appropriate scenario to include in the research.

- Most of the students in the focus group said they would be content to put just one anticipated emotion (rather than two or more) and, therefore, if a similar questionnaire format was retained for future research, this questionnaire item may not need to change.

- The students did seem to feel that the “cause” of the teacher behaviour was something beyond the immediate situation, i.e., linked to earlier stressors or influences (i.e., as can be seen via the response to Question 2 of the questionnaire, six of the students linked this to earlier stressors – see Appendix XX).

- All students thought that the questionnaire was “simple” or “easy” to complete. Despite this, it seemed that most of the students had some difficulties with the question asking about responsibility for the cause of the behaviour, apparently linking this with the actual behaviour (evidenced by their different responses in the questionnaire and focus group discussion, i.e., with seven of the eight students
indicating on the questionnaire that they thought the teacher was “responsible” or “totally responsible” for the cause of his or her behaviour but all students indicating via a show of hands in the focus group that they didn’t allocate responsibility for the cause of the behaviour).

- Although students thought the question asking about the cause of the behaviour was understandable, they thought it could be worded differently.

5.2.9 Reflections on Follow-up Study

Reflections on Aim of Focus Group

The aim of the focus group study was: “To gain student perceptions of completing a scenario-based questionnaire in relation to student causal attributions for teachers’ “negative” behaviour in school”.

The discussion in Section 5.2.8 demonstrates that the students did not, necessarily, believe the scenario provided was typical of a scenario they might experience in school and, although they reported finding the questionnaire “easy” to complete, the differences between the questionnaire completion and the content of the focus group discussion suggest that there was, in fact, some confusion in the students’ understanding of the questions.

Reflections on Questionnaire Responses

Although the aim of the focus group study was to gain student perceptions of completing the questionnaire, it is interesting to reflect on the questionnaire responses. These are discussed below in relation to each of the questionnaire items.

The one main emotion/feeling students might anticipate as a result of the teacher’s behaviour

Both “angry” and “confused” were the main responses given. It should be noted that it is likely that students would anticipate different emotional responses in the follow-up study (as opposed to the main study) as the student himself/herself in the study was intended to be an observer in the scenario. As a consequence, this may explain the difference in anticipated emotions, e.g., it is less likely that an observer (as in the follow-up study) would feel “anger” following the teacher behaviour, than would the individual being shouted at (i.e., in the main study). Similarly, more “confusion” might
be likely if the student was an observer rather than the target of the teacher’s behaviour, i.e., s/he isn’t in the situation so may be more likely to try to reflect and make sense of it rather than to feel the more immediate emotion of “anger”, “shame”, etc. (See Section. 7.2.2 for a further discussion of the “confusion” response.)

**The one major cause of the teacher’s behaviour**

Most of the follow-up questionnaire responses referred to earlier stressors, as was the case in the main study (see Appendix XX).

**How responsible students consider the teacher to be for the cause of his/her behaviour**

Overall, the participants in the follow-up study allocated a level of “responsibility” for the “cause”, with the majority of participants identifying the teacher as having a level of “responsibility” and just one participant indicating s/he believed the teacher was “not responsible” (but see discussion in Section 5.2.8).

**How responsible students consider the teacher is for the behaviour that s/he engaged in**

Participants largely believed that the teacher in the scenario had a level of “responsibility” for his or her behaviour with just one participant believing that the teacher was “not responsible” (although, via a show of hands in the focus group discussion, all students indicated that they thought the teacher was responsible for his or her behaviour).

**5.2.10 Summary of Follow-up Study**

The outcomes of the follow-up study (including the focus group discussion) demonstrate that, despite the revised questionnaire, difficulties in accurately gaining some aspects of the students’ attributions continued, i.e., particularly in relation to differentiating between responsibility for the cause of the teacher behaviour and the actual behaviour that s/he engaged in. However, it also emerged that students may not necessarily consider the scenario adopted to be typical of a situation that they might experience in school. Despite this, it appears that there were some aspects of the questionnaire which were successful, e.g., the question asking about the “cause”
of the teacher behaviour, as was the question asking about the students’ anticipated emotional response.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

6.1 OUTLINE OF CHAPTER

This chapter reflects on the aim and results of the research (both the main study and the follow-up study), as well as the method adopted and the data analysis. In addition, the results are discussed in relation to attribution theory in general and Weiner’s theories models in particular (e.g., see Appendix I). The results are discussed in relation to other psychological theories of human behaviour.

6.2 REFLECTION ON AIM AND RESULTS OF RESEARCH

The aim of the research was to explore Weiner’s (e.g., 1995; 2006; 2010) models (see Appendix I) of social motivation in relation to student-teacher interactions. This aim has been met although issues with the methodology adopted (and the methodologies typically utilised in this area of research) are acknowledged and highlighted. As stated in Section 5.1.1, the revised questionnaire was intended to improve on the data collection and the aim of the subsequent focus group was to establish the suitability of the revised questionnaire and to gain participants’ experience of completing this via a focus group discussion. The differences between the questionnaire used in the main study and that used in the follow-up study have been explained in Section 5.1.1. This includes that there were important differences between the methodologies adopted, largely around (i) the main study involving a “personalised” scenario and the follow-up study involving a “depersonalised” scenario (refer to Section 3.2.2 for an explanation of these terms) and (ii) the follow-up study questionnaire incorporating questions on attributions of “responsibility” for both the cause of the teacher behaviour as well as the actual behaviour s/he engaged in (with just the latter being included in the main study). Despite these differences, it is possible to reflect on the outcomes of each and these are discussed below. However, whilst discussing these results, it is important to acknowledge the difficulties that have emerged in gaining valid data via this method of research as well as the very small number of participants in the follow-up study which, of course, makes generalisation of these results inappropriate.

The results of the Research Questions are now given, with both the main research and the follow-up study being included. Although the main purpose of the follow-up study was to gain an understanding of how participants interpreted the questions, tentative comments are made on their responses in the questionnaire.
6.2.1 Research Question 1: What are the causal attributions that students make for the “negative” behaviour of teachers?

According to the method of data analysis adopted in the main study, 71.5% of respondents attributed the cause of the teacher behaviour to “stress” (for the purposes of this research, defined as a cause considered to have originated prior to the immediate situation depicted in the scenario – see Section 4.2.1) (see Tables 4 and 5). A similar result emerged via the follow-up study, i.e., with most of the respondents attributing the “cause” of the behaviour broadly to “stress” or earlier factors (see Appendix XX). The second and third largest categories of responses in the main study linked to causes which are also unlikely to result in “blame”, i.e., “misunderstanding” (13.5%) and “illness” (5.2%) (see Table 4). In conclusion, in both the main study and the follow-up study, the participants largely considered the teacher behaviour to be due to causes which are unlikely to result in blame (i.e., mainly “stress” and “misunderstanding”). If “stress”, as defined for the purposes of this research, is considered to be an “external” cause, then we can conclude that the participants attributed “external” causes for the teacher behaviour in the scenario (see Section 6.4.1 for a discussion of categorisation).

Although “stress” (as defined in 4.2.1 and discussed in Section 4.4.1) has been categorised as “external”, it could be argued that “stress” can relate to personal, “internal” characteristics, as illustrated by the following comments which might be made about another person: “S/he is easily stressed”; “S/he is a very anxious person”; “S/he finds it difficult to manage pressure”, etc. In these cases, it would be reasonable to conclude that the impact of pressures is dependent upon personal, “internal” characteristics or personality. Of course, this might impact on the level of “responsibility” attributed by respondents. For example, students might believe that, despite “external” pressures, teachers have a responsibility to manage these stressors rather to allow them to impact on how they behave towards their students and that, if they do not, this may be through choice or lack of sufficient effort (see Section 6.2.3 for further explanation).

Despite the cautions necessary in interpreting these results (due to the methodological issues raised in 3.8 and 4.5), we may suggest that these results are at odds with established principles and models of attribution theory. This is discussed in Sections 6.6.1 and 6.6.4.
6.2.2 Research Question 2: What are the emotions reported by students, following these causal attributions?

Due to the scenarios in the main study and the follow-up study involving an important difference (i.e., a “personalised” scenario vs a “depersonalised” scenario), we might expect the anticipated emotional responses to be different, i.e., due to the different impact of the teacher behaviour on the student depicted in the scenario. As stated earlier, although the small numbers involved in the follow-up study result in meaningful comparison being problematic, it is interesting to reflect upon the difference in responses (however, it is important to note that, when a category is being discussed, the terms “anger”, “scared”, “upset” and “shame” are used as a short-form for the full title of the category, e.g., “anger and related terms”, “scared and related terms”, etc. - see Appendix XIV for full title of categories).

Despite most participants in the main study (73.1%) anticipating they would feel “angry” following the teacher behaviour (arguably likely to be considered a “negative”, “other-directed” emotion) (see Table 7), fewer than half of the students in the follow-up study anticipated experiencing this emotion (and, as indicated in Appendix XX, half of the participants anticipated feeling “confused”). As stated earlier, we might not expect observers of a scenario (in which another person is the subject to “negative” behaviour) to feel the same emotion as somebody who is the target of the “negative” behaviour and these results suggest that this may be the case. However, it may be that the students reported feeling “confused” due to there being insufficient information to make decisions about their anticipated emotions.

6.2.3 Research Question 3: How responsible do students consider teachers are for their “negative” behaviour?

The majority of students in the main study considered that the teacher in the scenario had a level of “responsibility” for his/her behaviour, i.e., with 58.1% of students reporting that they would hold the teacher either “responsible” or “totally responsible” and 41.8% of students reporting that they would hold the teacher either “not responsible at all” or “not responsible” (see Table 9). Similarly, the majority of students in the follow-up study allocated a level of “responsibility” to the teacher for his/her behaviour (see Appendix XX).

When reflecting on these results, it appears that, despite the majority of students attributing the “cause” of the teacher behaviour to an (arguably) “external” cause,
overall they would allocate a level of “responsibility” to the teacher for the behaviour s/he engaged in. As attributing “responsibility” for an “external” cause is contrary to attribution theory, this does not appear to confirm models of attribution (see Appendix I). However, as discussed in Section 5.2.8 (fourth bullet point), the focus group study highlighted difficulties understanding the questions enquiring about “responsibility” and this may have had an impact.

It should be noted that, as discussed in Sections 4.4.3 and 6.2.1, it is possible that participants would allocate a level of “responsibility” for an “external” cause if it was felt that the teacher had some “responsibility” and/or “controllability” for this and/or that teachers ought to be able to control their responses. For example, as discussed in Section 4.4.3, it might be that the students believe that a teacher has a level of “responsibility” for “stress” from “external” circumstances (such as financial pressures). In addition, it could be that students believe that the teacher’s ability and/or choice to manage “stress” includes a level of “responsibility”. To illustrate this, a teacher may be tired (and, therefore, be having difficulties in managing the demands of the working day) as s/he arrived home late the night before due to a parents’ evening. Despite the teacher’s irritable and impatient behaviour towards his or her students and this (arguably) being due to “external” stressors, the students may believe that the teacher has a “responsibility” to behave in a fair and professional manner towards them.

6.2.4 Research Question 4: Do students perceive that male or female teachers are more likely to engage in “negative” behaviour?

In the main study, the largest percentage of students, i.e., 47.2%, imagined the teacher to be “female”, with 39.4% imagined the teacher to be “male”. However, this question was not included in the follow-up study (see Section 5.1.1. for a further explanation of this omission).

6.2.5 Research Question 5: Is there a difference in attributions made by male and female students?

Based on the results gained in the main study, there was some suggestion that boys might feel a more “negative”, “other-directed” emotion than girls and that girls might feel a more “negative”, “self-directed” emotion than boys (see Section 4.2.5). Of course, due to the small number of participants involved in the follow-up study, it was
not possible or appropriate to make any formal analysis of differences between boys and girls responses.

6.2.6  **Additional Question: Follow-up Study**

As stated in Section 4.4.3, due to the apparent confusion experienced with the questionnaire provided in the main study, the following additional question was included in the follow-up study to differentiate between this and the question asking about “responsibility” for the actual behaviour engaged in by the teacher in the scenario:

> “Taking into account your response to Question 2, how responsible do you think the teacher is for the cause of his/her behaviour?”

The participants in the follow-up study questionnaire responded in a very similar way to both questions (i.e., the questions enquiring about the cause of the behaviour and the actual behaviour engaged in), with the majority of the participants reporting a level of “responsibility” for both. However, following the focus group discussion, it became apparent that the participants did not, in fact, believe that the teacher in the scenario was responsible for the “cause” of the behaviour. This appears to confirm that there was some confusion in participants’ understanding of the questions and that, despite the revisions to the questionnaire, the students continued to misunderstand the questions which differentiated between responsibility for the cause of the behavior and the actual behaviour.

6.3 **REFLECTIONS ON DATA COLLECTION**

Although the method of data collection closely followed that commonly used in this area of research, a number of issues relating to reliability and validity have become apparent. These have been referred to in Sections 3.8, 4.4.3 and 4.5. However, the main issues are now emphasised.

6.3.1  **Use of Scenarios**

The scenarios frequently used in this area of research differ due to them involving “personalised” or “depersonalised” scenarios (see Section 3.2.2 for an explanation). Both have been used in the research presented in this thesis and, as might be anticipated, the outcomes of the follow-up study suggest that using these different
types of scenario are likely to affect the outcomes. In addition to this observation, we might question whether the students would have a similar response if a scenario including further differences was presented. For example, we might expect different outcomes if a scenario suggested a teacher's more inherent and deliberate intention to behave in a "negative" way and, also, if this suggested a more intrinsic, unpleasant personal trait. Similarly, we might question the relevance to the participants of the scenarios provided in this area of research (note that, during the focus group discussion it was suggested that the scenario was untypical, i.e., not likely to be experienced in school by the students in this year group). In reality, the interactions which take place between people (including teachers and students), and the scenarios portraying these, can differ greatly including in terms of whether they portray “positive” or “negative” interactions, “personalised” or “depersonalised” situations and the level of impact they have on the individual involved. As a consequence, the scenarios used in this area of research are unlikely to be comparable and, therefore, are likely to generate different results. In addition to these points, scenarios rarely depict the many subtle factors in interactions including earlier interactions with people, facial expression and body language. As well as the effects on the results of using different scenarios, asking participants to imagine themselves in, or observing, a scenario, may not reflect reality, i.e., we cannot be sure that students responded according to how they would in reality, or how they thought they ought to respond.

6.3.2 Gaining Anticipated Emotional Responses

The provision of emotional labels in the main study was not based on empirical evidence and this is a weakness in the main study. Although it was not evidenced in the results, it would be reasonable to suggest that these may have influenced the choices of participants which would affect the validity of the results. The option of using open-ended questions (as in the follow-up study) is an alternative but these would also have limitations, e.g., these would rely on the ability of participants to label their own emotions effectively and subtle labels may not be considered (such as “angry” vs “irritated”).

6.3.3 Understanding of Questions

Although the questions accompanying the scenario in the main study were explicit in their requirements (see Appendix II) and these were read to participants at the time they were completed, some difficulties were apparent in how students responded to
some items. This became more evident, and was confirmed, in the follow-up study. For example, due to the possibility (or likelihood) that students in the main study were unfamiliar with being asked for the “cause” of a behaviour (rather than the “reason”), many responses were unable to be used in the data analysis (due to, for example, respondents giving an emotion or a literal understanding, again, as explained in Section 3.9.4). In addition, as explained earlier, the results of the follow-up study confirmed that participants experienced some confusion with questions asking about “responsibility” for the cause of the teacher behaviour as well as the actual teacher behaviour engaged in by the teacher (see Section 6.2.6 for a discussion).

6.3.4 Focus Group Discussion

Due to the reservations about the questionnaires used in the research presented in this thesis, the focus group discussion was intended to gain an understanding of students’ experience of completing the questionnaire. However, as discussed in some detail in Section 5.2.4, data collection via focus group discussion also has pitfalls including, for example, success being dependent upon the skills of the facilitator as well as the characteristics of the group itself (e.g., with the potential for the more assertive or overbearing personalities to dominate). Such cautions should be recognised when drawing conclusions based on focus group discussions.

6.3.5 Participant Factors

There are a number of other factors which might have impacted upon satisfactory completion of the questionnaire involved in both the main study and the subsequent follow-up study. As a cross-section of students was invited to participate in the main study (i.e., including those with additional needs), it is likely that participants had varying levels of competence which might impact on the ability to reflect upon their own experiences and emotions and to reflect upon the behaviour of others. There may also be differences according to the earlier experiences of participants in school (e.g., some participants may have had a history of being treated harshly by teachers). However, accessing a large number of students has the benefit of lessening the impact of idiosyncratic influences.

The potential effect of social influences upon questionnaire completion should also be considered, in both the research presented in this thesis and in this area of research in general. For example, there may be differences in the causal attributions reported if the attribution is reported privately (as in questionnaire completion) or whether this is
discussed with others, as in a focus group discussion (therefore involving the potential influence of social desirability/acceptance).

6.3.6 **Administration of Questionnaires**

Weiner, Graham, Stern and Lawson (op cit) used prescribed instructions for administration, as was the case in the research presented in this thesis. Although, in theory, this should enable standardisation of instructions, in practice it was not possible for the Chief Investigator to be present for all the sessions in schools when participants completed the questionnaires in the main study and, therefore, this does leave some question relating to the standardisation of instructions in practice (and the potential for administrators to unwittingly elaborate and modify instructions, thereby affecting efforts towards standardisation).

6.3.7 **Spoiled Responses**

As is explained in Chapter 3, a large number of responses in the main study were categorised as "spoiled" due to reasons such as respondents providing more than one cause, when just one was asked for (e.g., “She could be depressed and has a short temper or stressed or something has happened at home” – participant number 11). Similarly, some participants gave an emotion as a “cause” (e.g., “She was angry” – participant number 277), when they were specifically asked to avoid this (see Appendix II). However, it is clear that other researchers have found similar difficulties (e.g., Weiner (1980a) found that, in experiment 2, some respondents gave an “action” for a response rather than the required emotion).

6.4 **REFLECTIONS ON DATA ANALYSIS**

The reservations raised about the method of data collection employed clearly impact on the confidence we might have in the outcomes of the data analysis which influences the validity of the results. However, some queries about the data analysis itself have also been noted and these are now discussed.

6.4.1 **Causality: Categorisation**

As discussed in Section 3.9.4, there were some dilemmas in categorising the “causes” provided by participants into generic groups, including that the subjective meaning of the “causes” given by each respondent could not be grasped via a one-word answer
and, therefore, decisions needed to be made about the most likely meaning under the circumstances (i.e., the scenario presented). This highlighted the possibility that categorisation of responses will vary according to the idiosyncratic decisions made by different groups of coders.

As well as categorising responses into “causes”, attempts were made to categorise categories into “internal” and “external” causes. However, as explained earlier, when carrying out studies relating to attribution theory, there can be difficulties in deciding whether a person’s observed behaviour is due to an “internal” or “external” cause. For example, and as stated earlier (Sections 4.4.1 and 6.2.1), it is possible for “stress” to be considered an “internal” rather than an “external” factor, in that it is something within the person. However, in the context of the scenario used in the research, the research group made a decision to classify this as “external” as common parlance suggests that “stress” is a condition which is influenced by external pressures and many responses indicated the influence of “external” factors (e.g., “They had a stressful day”; “Stress – personal life, too much work”; “Stress – bad class”) (see Appendix X). Naming the category as “stress” may be misleading as, of course, the participant responses provided wider information which resulted in them being categorised as “external” causes (see examples in previous sentence).

6.4.2 Emotional Responses: Categorisation

As was the case for categorising “causes”, although a decision was made to categorise together emotional labels which might be considered similar, this also proved to be problematic. For example, following the research group discussion, the term “disgusted” was finally placed in the generic category of “anger and related terms” (see Section 4.5 for an explanation). There were similar difficulties in allocating the term “sorry” into a generic category (again, see Section 3.9.5 for an explanation).

In addition to these difficulties, it became apparent that it was unsatisfactory to categorise more obviously similar emotional labels together. For example, the more general emotional label of “anger” was chosen to take account of other, linked emotions such as “irritated”, “mad” and “annoyed” (see Appendix XIV). Of course, although it may be acceptable to categorise all such emotions under the more generic term “anger”, it is clear that “irritated” and “annoyed” might be viewed as less intense than “anger”. However, these differences have not been captured via the data analysis and this may be an area to be considered in future research.
It is acknowledged that the titles used to describe the emotional labels in each category are likely to be misleading, particularly when shortened (as in “anger”, which refers to the category of “anger and related terms”). However, these broadly reflect the category titles and, as the numbers of students who gave some of the emotional labels are quite small, it could be argued that these “debatable” emotional labels do not significantly alter the credence of the individual categories. For example, the most contentious labels are given below, with the relevant numbers of participants who gave these emotional labels:

“disgusted”  Ten single responses (with an additional response being given together with “mad”, “angry” and “frustrated” – see respondent no. 211, Appendix XIII) (with a total of 228 responses in the category).

“sorry”  One single response (with a total of 39 responses in the category).

6.5 RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY: SUMMARY

This discussion of the data collection employed in both the main study and the follow-up study, together with the data analysis, has highlighted a number of issues in relation to the reliability and validity of the research presented in this thesis and in relation to this area of research in general. Although a large number of respondents in the main research concurred with some aspects (i.e., “causes” of the teacher behaviour in the scenarios), queries around participants’ understanding of the questions presented and the categorisation of responses leads to there being a lack of confidence in some aspects of the results.

6.6 REFLECTIONS ON ATTRIBUTION THEORY

6.6.1 Internal vs External Causality

The dimension of “internal” vs “external” causality has been criticised for a number of reasons including that some causal labels could be viewed as either “internal” or “external”. However, this issue has been discussed in Sections 2.11, 4.4.1 and 6.4.1 including in relation to the results of the research presented in this thesis.
6.6.2 Controllable vs Uncontrollable

The dimension of “controllable” vs “uncontrollable” causality does appear to be useful in theories of causal attribution and this is linked with attributions of “responsibility” (see Section 2.4.13). However, it has not been possible to confirm this in the results, largely due to the lack of clarity around whether respondents were attributing levels of “responsibility” to the initial cause of the teacher’s behaviour (e.g., “stress”) or due to his or her subsequent behaviour (shouting at the student). The scenario provided in the following paragraph might help to clarify this point.

Consider the case when a father comes home from work and is, then, angry with his son due to learning that he slammed the front door in temper and smashed the glass. If the father went to the boy’s room, shouted at him and informed him that he would have to pay for the damage, the boy might feel upset but possibly believe that his father’s behaviour was warranted, i.e., the father was responsible for shouting but the boy might have thought that he deserved this. However, alternatively, the father might have come home from work, found that his son had slammed the front door in temper and smashed the glass. The father may then have driven to his son’s school and marched him out of the After School Football Club, before shouting at him and giving him the same sanction. As a consequence, his son might feel humiliated and angry. In this case, as in the case in the scenario presented in this research, there could be a significant difference in emotional response according to wider factors (such as public humiliation). This, therefore, would be in line with Weiner, Graham and Chandler’s (op cit) work, that level of “controllability” would play a part in emotional response. In other words, the father had “control” over how he would respond and, therefore, “responsibility”. However, we might also consider that the personal or social outcome had an influence on the emotional response. In the case of the boy who smashed the glass in the door, the personal or social impact for him would influence his emotional response (see 6.6.8 for a further discussion of personal impact).

Of course, it is possible to include a questionnaire item on “controllability” (e.g., “How much control do you believe the teacher had on his or her behaviour?”). However, as explained in 2.4.13, this is subsumed into the more general label of “responsibility”. In addition, including an item on “controllability” would not avoid the apparent difficulty in identifying whether participants are attributing “responsibility” or “controllability” to the initial cause of the teacher behaviour, or his or her subsequent behavioural response to the cause.
6.6.3 **Anger and Sympathy**

We can potentially criticise Weiner’s model(s) (see Appendix I) due to these specifying the emotions “sympathy” or “anger” as this may hinder other (possibly more accurate) labels being applied. For example, if we consider Weiner’s model (2006, p 139, also presented in Appendix I), it is clear that he suggests that, following a transgression and attributions about causality, controllability and responsibility, a person is likely to feel “anger, no sympathy” or “no anger, sympathy”.

However, due to participants (in the research presented in this thesis) being able to label their own anticipated emotional response, a wider range of emotions was provided including “scared” and “shame” (see Appendix XIII for list of emotions given by participants in the main study) which might more closely reflect a participant’s emotions rather than limiting these to “anger” and “sympathy”. This suggests the advantage of adding richer data to the results and warrants further investigation.

6.6.4 **Causal Sequences**

Although the results of the research presented in this thesis appear to contradict aspects of attribution theory, a closer inspection of these suggest that this may be due to the sequences of making attributions being more complex (as suggested by Weiner, 2006 – see Section 2.4.16, page 66) with there being more than one causal attribution involved. To illustrate this point, although the results of the research suggest that the teacher’s “stress” is identified as a “cause” (an “external” cause) of his or her behaviour, it is possible that the choice of the teacher to respond as he or she did could also be described as a “cause” (e.g., “S/he is a nasty person”, i.e., an “internal” cause). This observation suggests that Weiner’s models (see Appendix I), whilst relevant in some circumstances, may be too simplistic to capture other causal sequences involved in interactions.

6.6.5 **Variations in Emotional Responses**

Following on from the discussion in Section 6.6.4 above, we might consider that there could be more than one emotional response in attributional sequences. For example, in relation to the results provided in this thesis, it could be suggested that, following “stress” being considered to be the underlying “cause” of the teacher behaviour, then a level of “sympathy” might be felt. However, due to other factors (such as, for example, the subsequent behavioural response of the teacher, the “responsibility”
allocated to this and the “personal impact”), a different and stronger emotion might result, such as “anger”.

We might also reflect that, depending upon the extent of the “personal impact” of the response, the initial or later emotion might remain the strongest and, then, be reported. For example, in the case of one of our family members being knocked down by a speeding motorist, we might feel “anger”. However, if we subsequently found out that the driver was speeding in order to visit his dying mother in hospital, we might also feel an element of “sympathy”. Despite this, our “anger” might remain the strongest emotion. Again, the social context and impact on the observer become paramount.

6.6.6 Use of Scenarios

Weiner (e.g., 1995) has frequently used scenarios in his research and, as discussed in Section 6.3.1, there are inherent problems in making firm conclusions following their use and of course there are implications for the generalisation of any results. An area of attribution theory which does not appear to have been addressed by Weiner or other researchers/theorists is the differences which are likely when “personalised” or “depersonalised” situations are incorporated into scenarios.

6.6.7 Differentiating between Outcome-Dependent/Independent vs Attribution-Dependent/Independent Emotions

In a number of his publications, Weiner (e.g., 1995) differentiates between “responsibility” and “blame”, with a person potentially being “responsible” for an event or outcome but not being held “blameworthy” (see Sections 2.4.13 – 2.4.16 for a discussion). In the case of the results presented in this thesis, we might consider that the teacher did not have “responsibility” for the initial “cause” of his or her behaviour (e.g., “stress”) and, therefore, would not be assigned “blame” or be allocated a “negative” emotion (which would be classified as an “attribution-dependent” emotion). However, s/he might have been considered to be both “resident” and “blameworthy” for his or her subsequent behaviour towards the student and, then, a “negative” emotion might result (classified as an “outcome-dependent” emotion).

In relation to the results of this research, we might consider that the “anger” (and other “negative” emotions reported by the participants) is dependent upon the “outcome” (i.e., the teacher shouted at the student) rather than the initial causal attribution (i.e.,
the teacher behaved in such a way due to “stress”). The “anger” would, then, be classed as “outcome-dependent” rather than “attribution-dependent”. The differentiation between “outcome-dependent/independent” and “attribution-dependent/independent” emotions appears to be relevant and may be a helpful consideration in revisiting the models presented by Weiner (e.g., see Appendix I, Model 3 and Section 6.6.5), i.e., by differentiating between emotional responses for “attributions” and “outcomes”.

6.6.8 Personal Impact

Relevance for the Observer

It seems logical to consider that the response to observing another’s behaviour (including the feelings felt by the observer) might relate to the personal impact it might have on the observer. For example, if an observer walks past a drunk person on the street, they might feel “disgust”. However, if the drunk person happens to be the observer’s father who claims to have stopped drinking, the resultant emotion might be “anger”. This is suggested by Heider (1944, p 367), i.e., that the meaning of an event to the observer makes a difference to how s/he will respond. The “free will” of an actor in his/her actions has been considered (e.g., see Weiner, 2006, p 39), as have “mitigating circumstances” on the part of the actor. However, the personal impact on the observer does not appear to have been emphasised in the theories discussed, although there are times when Weiner touches on the “consequences for the self” in his discussions (see Weiner, 2006, p 63).

We might use the metaphor of the courtroom again. If (i) a person behaves in an unacceptable way (i.e., breaks into a shop to steal money) and, in court, it is found that s/he did this to be able to feed his or her family (they lived on the street and were starving), the shopkeeper may feel a level of “sympathy”. Despite the behaviour of the thief resulting from “internal” and “controllable” causes, s/he carried out the act and, is therefore, “responsible”. However, a level of “sympathy” might be felt, or at least a lower level of “anger”, as a result of the “mitigating circumstances”. On the other hand, if (ii) the thief had targeted the same shop every month for the past six months and, as a consequence, the shopkeeper did not now have any insurance to cover the loss, despite the “mitigating circumstances”, the shopkeeper may well feel “anger” towards the thief. The judge might have given a more lenient sentence in scenario (i) than in scenario (ii). Therefore, although the action might be the same, the wider circumstances would have an impact on the judge’s decision but, also, on
the emotion of the person who has been wronged. Weiner (1995) agrees that the level of “blame” assigned might depend upon the outcomes of an action, rather than the action itself: “…outcome magnitude plausibly influences blame ....” (p 14). However, again, this does not appear to be an area which has been emphasised in his models.

In the case of the main research presented in this thesis, we might believe that, having attributed the “negative” behaviour of the teacher to “stress” (arguably, an “external” and “uncontrollable” cause) the observer might feel “sympathy” for the teacher. However, if the observer is the subject of the teacher’s “anger”, it would be unreasonable (and unrealistic) to assume that he or she would still feel “sympathy”. Similarly, although the follow-up study utilised a “depersonalised” scenario, with the participants in the research being observers of the teacher behaviour, rather than being subject to it, we might expect there to be a more considered response. However, despite this, the participants did not anticipate feeling “sympathy” for the teacher (as would be expected via Attribution Theory – see Appendix I), although responses suggested less blame than did those of the main study, e.g., due to most of the students not anticipating feeling a “negative”, “other-directed” emotion such as “anger” (see Appendix XX).

Impact on Self-Concept and Self-Esteem

Weiner, Graham, Stern and Lawson (op cit) discuss how the self-concept of a student can be affected according to the teacher’s response to him or her (e.g., with a teacher’s surprised response to a student’s academic success potentially leading to the student believing that the teacher didn’t really expect him or her to succeed, therefore possibly having a negative effect on self-concept). However, although Weiner, Graham, Stern and Lawson’s (op cit) work focussed upon the achievement domain, it is logical to infer that a teacher’s response to a student in other situations might have a similar effect (i.e., a positive or negative effect on self-concept). We might, then, reflect on the self-concept and self-esteem of the student in the scenario in the main study who was (i) shouted at by his or her teacher and (ii) had this event witnessed by his or her peers. It would also be realistic to assume that, when making causal attributions, the social situation would have an impact on the response to the behaviour of another. For example, if we consider the scenario presented in Section 6.6.2, the son (who broke the glass in the door by slamming it in temper) is more likely to feel “humiliated” if he is reprimanded in the presence of his teacher and peers than he is in the privacy of his bedroom.
Balance of Power

In reflecting on the results of the research, in addition to the factors already considered, including the relevance for the observer and the potential impact on the recipient of the teacher's behaviour (e.g., in terms of lowered self-esteem, embarrassment, etc.), we might also consider the balance of power between the teacher and student. For example, the student may be aware of the balance of power between him/her and the teacher, and the potential for this to be abused (therefore also affecting his or her emotional response).

6.6.9 Contribution of Other Attribution Theorists

Intention

The results of this research do appear to support the proposals of the earlier theorists. For example, Heider (1958) stated that: “... intention is the central factor in personal causality ....” (p 112). He also emphasised the role of “personal responsibility” which, again, may be evident in the decision-making of the participants in the research presented in this thesis. Although the applied levels of “responsibility”/“no responsibility” in the results of the research presented in this thesis were unclear, potentially due to confusion on the part of the participants (see Section 4.4.3 for further information), it is likely that a high level of “responsibility” would be assigned to the teacher in the scenario as a consequence of him or her “having some responsibility due to having an intention for the event to happen” (Heider, 1958) (i.e., intending to shout at the student in the scenario and realising that this might have a negative effect on him or her). As discussed previously, an observer may decide upon an actor’s “responsibility” for the “cause” of the behaviour but, also, for the subsequent behaviour of the actor (see Section 5.2.8, fourth bullet point). An actor may not be “responsible” for the “cause” of the behaviour but he or she may be considered “responsible” for his or her actions. This would, also, be in line with Jones and Davis’s (op cit) “chosen” and “non chosen” actions (see Section 2.3.2).

Causal Schemata

It is possible that the participants in the research made use of the “causal schemata” proposed by Kelley (1971a), i.e., despite limited information being available, the participants made assumptions based on earlier knowledge and experience of what
would make an adult behave in such a way (i.e., if an adult becomes angry about an innocuous event, s/he must be under stress).

**Error and Bias**

The Fundamental Attribution Error (or Correspondence Bias) (Heider, 1958) has not been upheld by the results of the research (see Section 2.3.4). This particular error (or bias) relates to an observer overemphasising the “internal” causes of behaviour of others and underemphasising “external” causes. However, whilst acknowledging the difficulties in interpreting the results of the research, these suggest that the participants overwhelmingly attributed “external” causes to the teacher’s behaviour (e.g., “stress”), with minimal attributions being classified as “internal”, e.g., “Not a nice teacher” (participant no 135); “ Easily aggravated” (participant no 151). The Actor-Observer Difference (Jones and Nisbett, op cit), referring to inherent traits being attributed to those observed, also did not appear to be upheld. However, the Self-Serving Bias may have been present. For example, we might conclude that the participants attributed the teacher’s behaviour to factors which were not related to themselves and their behaviour in the classroom, thereby absolving themselves of any responsibility for the teacher’s response.

**6.7 REFLECTIONS ON INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS**

Clearly, a large number of students in the main study anticipated feeling “angry” as a result of the teacher behaviour. However, if we reflect on other theoretical models of human behaviour, other explanations may be considered (see Section 2.10 for a discussion). For example, if we accepted a psychodynamic approach, we might believe that responding with “anger” linked to earlier, unjustified experiences from adults and that the teacher in the scenario subconsciously reminded the student of these (therefore s/he was feeling angry about earlier experiences). Alternatively, if we adopted a humanistic perspective, we might suggest that the student in the scenario had their feelings of “safety” and “belonging” threatened by the teacher behaviour (i.e., referring to relatively basic needs), therefore reacting negatively. However, if we took a biological perspective, we might suggest that the “basic threat system” had been activated and that, as a consequence, any mediating thought processes were bypassed. Of course, studies involving “depersonalised” scenarios, therefore involving less direct personal threat, may result in different outcomes. This discussion of alternative theories demonstrates how applying a specific psychological perspective can lead to different explanations of human behaviour. However, it also demonstrates
the difficulties in identifying causal attributions when other influences might be operating.

6.8 SUMMARY AND KEY POINTS

Conducting and reflecting upon the research presented in this thesis has (i) raised a number of concerns about the process of gaining accurate and replicable results in this area of research in general and (ii) potentially brought into question the relevance of some elements of attribution theory (see Section 6.6). However, despite this, a number of areas of interest have arisen. These include the differentiation of “responsibility” for the “cause” of a behaviour as well as for the behaviour itself, the relevance of features such as “attribution-dependent/independent” emotions and “outcome-dependent/independent” emotions and the impact on the individual. Although the numbers are small (and whilst acknowledging some of the reservations about accurate categorisation), some interesting observations have arisen around gender differences in the “self-directed” and “other-directed” emotional responses anticipated as a consequence of the teacher behaviour (see Sections 4.2.2 and 4.2.5). For example, boys were more likely to anticipate a “negative”, “other-directed” emotion and girls were more likely to anticipate a “negative”, “self-directed” emotion. This result has some similarity to that of MacGeorge (op cit) who found gender differences, with boys in help-giving situations being more likely to allocate blame and feel “anger” and girls in help-giving situations being more likely to feel “empathy” and “sympathy” towards others.

Whilst acknowledging the difficulties in drawing firm conclusions due to the issues around the methodology employed in this research, the results suggest that, based on the methodology employed, students allocate the (arguably) “external” cause of “stress” to “negative” teacher behaviour, they differentiate between “responsibility” for the “cause” of the behaviour and the behaviour itself and, when there is some personal involvement or impact, they tend to anticipate feeling “anger”. However, when a scenario is involved which involves little, if any, personal impact for the student, their emotional responses may differ.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

7.1 SUMMARY OF RESEARCH

The research presented in this thesis has investigated causal attributions in student-teacher interactions, particularly in relation to the work of Bernard Weiner. Although it has also added to knowledge and understanding in relation to attribution theory, it has highlighted a number of difficulties in undertaking valid and reliable research in this area of enquiry.

The results demonstrate that, based on the methodology adopted, Year 10 students are likely to attribute “external” causes to “negative” teacher behavior when this is directed to themselves. However, despite this, there is an indication that students allocate “responsibility” to the teacher for his or her subsequent behaviour. In other words, although students might believe that the teacher may be suffering from some form of “stress” due to earlier events, they nevertheless attribute “responsibility” for his or her resulting behaviour. This appears to suggest that, despite the pressures they may be under, the students expect the teachers to demonstrate some self-control and/or fairness in relation to their behavioural responses. Alternatively, as suggested in 4.4.3, it may be that students attribute “responsibility” for some “external” events, such as having financial difficulties. The results have also highlighted potential differences in the responses of male and female students, together with implications for possible “acting out” behaviour, self-concept and self-esteem. As discussed below, it may be that there are other features in sequences of causal attributions.

7.2 CONTRIBUTION TO THEORY

7.2.1 Causality

As discussed in some detail in Section 6.6, the overall results of this research do not appear to fully support the assertions of attribution theory in general and Weiner’s models (see Appendix I) in particular. However, there may be some debate about what is considered to be the “cause” in attribution theory. For example, in the case of the scenarios depicted in the research presented in both the main study and the follow-up study, it could be argued that the “cause” of the teacher behaviour was “the teacher takes his/her bad mood out on his/her students” or “the teacher is an unpleasant person/a bully”, etc. In this case, the results of the research would adhere to attribution theory in general and Weiner’s theories and models in particular (see
Appendix I). However, of course, according to the results of both parts of this research (the main study and the follow-up study), the participants did not identify such factors as “causes”.

There is also debate about allocating causes to “internal” or “external” factors (as discussed in Section 6.4.1) and it might be appropriate to conclude that the results confirm the tensions in deciding whether causes can simply be distinguished between “internal” vs “external” causality.

The results of the research may provide additional steps in the sequences within Weiner’s models (see Appendix I) to date and may add to the complexity that Weiner (B. Weiner, personal communication, July 29, 2012) suggested that he was withdrawing from.

7.2.2 Emotional Responses

Attribution theory in general, and Weiner’s theories in particular, suggest that, following a negative event carried out by an actor, the cause of which is considered to be “external” (e.g., “stress”), the observer would be likely to feel “sympathy” (or, at least, “no anger”) (see Appendix I). However, this did not appear to be evident in the results presented in this thesis, regardless of whether a “personalised” or “depersonalised” scenario was used. As respondents did not report feeling “sympathy” or other “positive”, “other-directed” emotions, the results of the research did not, then, seem to support the theory. However, it should be noted that four respondents in the follow-up study reported feelings of “confusion”. It is not clear whether this linked to them feeling confused about why the teacher behaved as s/he did, or whether the confusion reported was due to their being insufficient information within the scenario to make a decision about their potential feelings.

7.2.3 Responsibility

The results of the main study indicated that, although students attributed an “external” cause for the teacher behaviour (mainly “stress”), they anticipated they would have an (arguably) negative, “other-directed” emotion (including “anger”). However, as stated earlier, the lack of clarity about whether “responsibility” is being assigned to the “cause” of the behaviour (“stress”) or the teacher’s subsequent response (“shouting at the student”), result in a discussion of level of “responsibility” being inconclusive. In
other words, it may be that individuals make causal attributions for both the (i) cause of a behaviour/event as well as (ii) the “responsibility” for the response. This difference between responsibility for “causes” and the actual behaviour engaged in may be an area for future research to consider. In relation to this, and as suggested in Section 6.6.8 (under “Balance of Power”), there is a power imbalance between students and teachers and this might have an effect on the emotional responses of the students towards his or her teachers, i.e., students may believe that teachers have a responsibility to behave appropriately towards their students and to manage any external stressors (as discussed in Section 6.2.3). More subtle influences such as these may not be evident in scenarios used in this area of research.

In summary, the results of the research suggest that the models presented by Weiner (e.g., see Appendix I) may not adequately or fully explain interactions between students and teachers. Whilst acknowledging the concerns about the methodology adopted in the research, together with queries about aspects of the analysis, the results suggest that other factors may influence student responses to teacher behaviour, i.e., the influence of both (i) “responsibility” for behaviour and (ii) “impact” on the observer or subject of the teacher behaviour.

7.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY PRACTICE

7.3.1 Self Reflection

Weiner (2006) suggests that, other than providing “knowledge and understanding”:

“It is difficult to find any practical value in theories of motivation or social psychology.” (p 160)

However, I would argue that gaining knowledge and understanding is practical when applied to relevant situations. For example, having a theory about why an acquaintance or colleague behaves in the way s/he does may help us to better manage our responses to him or her. Similarly, gaining insight into our own feelings and behaviour may be valuable in terms of both enhancing our mental health and informing our choices in the future. During episodes of negative emotion and behaviour towards others, re-assessing our attributions and considering that these may, possibly, be erroneous, can be helpful to ourselves and to those with whom we live and work. As applied psychologists, it is important for EPs to be able to have a
grasp of psychological theories, to reflect on their own behaviour and that of others and, of course, to apply these skills as necessary.

7.3.2 **Supporting Schools**

The results of the research suggest that the role of causal attributions is significant to interactions within schools. In particular, the impact of negative teacher behaviour on students is noteworthy, as this appears to suggest harmful outcomes for students in terms of either negative, “other-directed” emotions (such as “anger”) or negative, “self-directed” emotions (such as “shame”). It is suggested that both of these categories of emotion are damaging in terms of the relationships between students and teachers (with “anger” potentially being linked to disruptive/acting-out behaviours in school and “shame” likely being linked to lowered self-esteem for students and possible disengagement with school staff). We might also consider the potential wider impact upon lowered student attainment. However, in addition to the negative effects upon students (and student-teacher relationships), the potential stress which teachers might suffer as a result of difficult student behaviour is, clearly, an area which might benefit from a reflection on a teacher’s causal attributions. To be precise, improved personal mental health might result from a greater knowledge of one’s own causal attributions and how these affect one’s own emotions and behaviour, e.g., if a teacher believes that the poor behaviour in his/her class is due to students’ family circumstances, rather than due to his or her own ineffective behaviour management, his or her subsequent negative emotions are less likely to be self-directed. As Weiner (1995) confirms: “Sharing this theory allows humans to understand and regulate not only their own behavior but also the behavior of others” (p 23).

In his discussion of the applications of attribution theory, Weiner (2006) notes benefits to the EP via stating that “…concern with explanations for success and failure by pupils and their teachers and parents provided avenues for attribution expanse.” (p 192-3). In practice, EPs apply psychology to wider areas than academic learning and it is clear that attribution theory applies to social interaction in a range of relevant areas, e.g., in relationships between staff and students; parents and students; and staff and parents. The principles of attribution theory can be applied to social “problem solving” in a broad sense, due to its application to relationships and interactions. There are, then, implications for school policies and interventions as well as teacher support. More specifically, In-service training for schools might be helpful in demonstrating:
• how teacher behaviour might be perceived by students (and how this might impact upon students);

• how teachers themselves make errors in perceiving or interpreting the behaviour of others, including their students (and the impact on the teachers themselves);

• the effects of causal attributions in (for example) conflict situations with parents/carers, i.e., considering the potential attributions of parents/carers might enable more positive communications to take place;

• how the role of causal attributions may interfere with communications between different professionals groups; and

• how the role of causal attributions (and error/bias in making attributions) could be incorporated into social skills training for students.

We might consider how we could encourage those with whom we work to reflect on the causal attributions that they make. Although this might be best achieved via an In-service training programme based around the models and research presented in this thesis, this might also be encouraged on an informal basis via our discussions with others. Similarities might be observed via therapeutic approaches and interventions including the “Socratic questioning” of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy. According to Nelson-Jones (2001), questions “help clients ..... become aware of what their thoughts are; examine them for cognitive distortions; substitute more balanced thoughts; and make plans to develop new thought patterns.” (Nelson-Jones, op cit, p 348). Questions characteristically used within the therapeutic process (and which may help in a reconsideration of causal attributions) are as follows:

• “Where is the evidence for this interpretation?”
• “Is another interpretation possible?”
• “Are there other ways of perceiving the situation?”
• “Is there any proof that my interpretation is correct?”
• “How is thinking in this way affecting me?”

An important aspect of the process would, of course, be to reflect upon our own attributions and how this affects our own behaviour and emotions but, also, to reflect upon the possible causal attributions of others (who may be behaving according to their own, potentially erroneous attributions).
### IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

#### Methodology

The methods adopted in future research may be greatly enhanced by:

- Using a range of scenarios including both “personalised” and “depersonalised” scenarios. Scenarios should also address a variety of social situations including those involving power imbalances and social/peer influences. The relevance of scenarios might be enhanced by gaining a number of examples from participants’ own experience (as in the research presented in this thesis) then asking a sample of participants to select which of these were likely to be typical. This would help to avoid the situation raised by the focus group discussion when participants commented that the scenario presented was untypical.

- Incorporating multiple-choice questions based on the results of a pilot study might avoid the large number of “spoiled” responses which were found in the main study in relation to the question enquiring about “causes” (Research Question 2). A multiple-choice question asking about anticipated emotional responses might be gained in a similar way. However, due to the infinite number of possible scenarios and the different attributions and responses which might be stimulated by these, data for multiple-choice questions would need to be gained for each scenario used.

- As explicit discussions of causal attributions in schools appear to be rare, it may be helpful to ensure that participants have a grasp of the questions given in questionnaires. This might be achieved by a pilot study or via teaching in the process of causal attributions (see below for a discussion).

Future research might also:

- Investigate the potential extensions to Weiner’s models (see Appendix I) which were raised in the research presented in this thesis, e.g., causal attributions for both the cause of behaviour and the actual behaviour depicted as well as the “personal impact” of the behaviour.
• Investigate the differences between males and females in relation to “self-directed” and “other-directed” “negative” emotional responses.

• Incorporate measures of the intensity of emotions reported.

• Utilise more imaginative, motivating and authentic methods of presentation (e.g., visual stimuli such as cartoons; role-play; and video representation of the scenario).

Prior training in the making of causal attributions might help avoid participants (i) giving emotions rather than causes and (ii) giving a literal explanation for the teacher behaviour in the scenario. Training might also help students differentiate between responsibly for (i) the “cause” of behaviour and (ii) the actual behaviour engaged in. However, such preparation would alert participants to the role of attributions in decision-making about the behaviour of others and, of course, would involve an element of teaching (or intervention) which, it could be argued, would interfere with accurate data collection (i.e., causal attributions would be gained following intervention rather than as they would normally occur). In other words, having knowledge of how emotions are affected by interpretations of situations and how interpretations may be erroneous for various reasons (e.g., limited information; the need to protect one’s own self-esteem) might result in participants becoming more reflective and/or balanced in decision-making. As a consequence, any such prior teaching or intervention would avoid the researcher gaining the typical, or unencumbered causal attributions of a research participant.

It is apparent, from these suggestions, that there are many ways of gaining causal attributions in research and there will be pros and cons to these. It is, of course, important to acknowledge the limitations of each approach and to be cautious in concluding that the results are generalisable. The research presented in this thesis has highlighted the limitations of both data collection by questionnaire and by focus group discussion as well as the need to be aware that results gained via the use of a scenario may not be replicated by other scenarios. However, of course, this would also be the case when real-life situations are being used, when one situation cannot necessarily be considered comparable with another.
7.4.2 Wider Populations

The research presented in this thesis has focussed upon the causal attributions made for teacher behaviour (likely to be viewed as “negative”) by a cross-section of Year 10 students in a mainstream school. However, in order to confirm, deny and/or extend the results (and whilst acknowledging the methodological issues), other groups of participants could be used in future research. The Literature Review (Chapter 2) included a discussion of the impact of causal attributions on behaviour in a range of contexts including in relation to loneliness, depression and conflict (see Sections 2.4.12 and 2.5.2) and it has been argued that benefits may be found following attributional retraining. Specific groups of students may be considered potentially vulnerable for several reasons (e.g., due to the impact of their earlier experiences, their difficulties in managing within mainstream settings and wider social and emotional difficulties) and are suggested for future research in order to consider (i) how causal attributions may differ between different groups, (ii) the impact of teacher behaviour on different groups and (iii) the relevance of attributional retraining. These groups of students might include those who are Looked After Children (LAC), those who have been excluded from school and/or attend Pupil Referral Units (PRUs) and those who present with social and emotional difficulties related to friendships, low mood, etc.

7.4.3 Interventions to Challenge Causal Attributions

Further research into changes, following interventions to challenge causal attributions, might be beneficial (including the changes in emotions and behaviour). This is relevant to adults as well as students, e.g., teachers, parents and staff who support children and young people, as well as those from wider professional groups such as those from Social Care and the Health Service (e.g., Clinical Psychology) (see example in Section 1.1). It is argued that having a greater understanding of one’s own causal attributions, and how these affect emotions and behaviour, would benefit interactions when working with others.

7.5 SUMMARY

Attribution theory and, in particular, Weiner’s development of ideas, culminating in his model of Social Motivation and Social Justice (Weiner, 2006) has contributed much to an understanding of human behaviour and decision-making. However, the results of
the research presented in this thesis suggest that factors not currently emphasised in models might be relevant (see Section 7.2).

The results of this research, as is attribution theory in general, is relevant to human behaviour and decision-making in a wide range of contexts and is, therefore, relevant to many disciplines and professions. However, more specifically, knowledge of causal attributions and their effects could benefit relationships between the following groups in schools:

- students and teachers
- teachers and teachers
- parents/carers and teachers
- parents/carers and students

7.6 PERSONAL REFLECTIONS

Conducting research into the causal attributions that students make for teacher behaviour has provided me with the opportunity of reviewing earlier research in some depth and considering its present relevance. This has been beneficial both professionally and personally as applications to a wide range of situations have been highlighted together with the powerful impact of causal attributions on emotions and behaviour, the differences in causal attributions according to the standpoint of different people and the need to be aware of cultural differences. Having knowledge of both our own causal attributions, and those of others, clearly has significant implications for our personal and professional relationships and for how we might respond to differences of opinion and more significant conflict situations. However, in addition to this increased knowledge, undertaking this research has emphasised the strengths and weaknesses of different methodological approaches and statistical analyses, the importance of adopting a replicable research method and the need to be cautious in generalising results.

In addition to the personal benefits, whilst conducting this research I have had the opportunity of incorporating the role of causal attributions in a practical way during my work including via training for both parents/carers and Early Years teachers. For example, the different behavioural responses of parents/carers towards children with ADHD (Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder), dependent upon the causal attributions made for the cause of the behaviour, has been incorporated into a
multiagency training day on ADHD. Drawing on earlier research (e.g., Johnston and Ohan, op cit), during the training it was demonstrated that (i) attributing the cause of the active/impulsive behaviour to the choice of the child might result in a more negative response from the parent/carer than would (ii) attributing the cause of the active/impulsive behaviour to a medical need. Similarly, during recent training for Early Years providers (in which the benefits of building positive relationships with parents/carers and colleagues was the aim of the training), it was demonstrated to professionals how attributing parent/carer behaviour to (i) being uncaring about his or her child would result in different emotional and behavioural responses than would attributing the parent/carer behaviour to (ii) him or her being under stress. On both of these occasions discussions around causal attributions were unfamiliar to attendees but considered to be very helpful. More recently, I was able to advise a colleague on how she might gain and challenge the causal attributions of a student in relation to academic success and failure (which was successfully achieved via using the Spheres of Control (Paulhus, op cit)).

It is clear from this study that causal attributions are both motivational and functional. In other words, we are likely to be motivated (or de-motivated) by the causal attributions we make about ourselves and others. In addition, these causal attributions have a function in that they influence behavioural responses. Although research into causal attributions has spanned a number of decades, it currently appears to remain largely excluded from discussions within the educational arena, yet its relevance and influence are significant. It is hoped that this, and future research, will highlight the valuable contribution of attribution theory to understanding interpersonal communications and relationships in schools in particular and interpersonal communications and relationships in general.
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APPENDIX I

Models of Causal Attribution
(Weiner, 1995; 2006; 2010)


In his discussion of aggression (retaliatory or reactive aggression, rather than proactive), Weiner (1995) suggests that the same rules or “laws” apply to this as to others sequences of human behaviour, i.e.:

Event (personal harm) $\implies$ Attributional search $\implies$ Personal agency, controllable causality, no mitigating circumstances $\implies$ Inference of responsibility $\implies$ Anger $\implies$ Tendency to retaliate

And:

Event (personal harm) $\implies$ Attributional search $\implies$ No personal agency, uncontrollable causality, or mitigating circumstances $\implies$ Inference of nonresponsibility $\implies$ No anger $\implies$ No tendency to retaliate

(Weiner, 1995, p 187)


Weiner (2006), in his discussion of punishment after a transgression, continued to depict his theory in this way:

Transgression $\iff$ perceived cause $\iff$ cause is controllable $\iff$ person is responsible $\iff$ anger, no sympathy $\iff$ retributive goal is primary

And:

Transgression $\iff$ perceived cause $\iff$ cause is uncontrollable $\iff$ person is not responsible $\iff$ no anger, sympathy $\iff$ utilitarian goal is primary

(Weiner, 2006, p 139)

More recently, Weiner (2010) gives the following depiction of an attribution search in interpersonal behaviour which, he suggests, applies to a range of social situations:

\[
\text{Outcome} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Cause} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Causal control} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Responsibility} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Affect} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Action}
\]

(Weiner, 2010, p 371)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 4 (i)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Cause/type</th>
<th>Responsibility Antecedent</th>
<th>Behavioral Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement Failure</td>
<td>Lack of effort</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stigmatizing condition</td>
<td>Behavioural/ Mental</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Condemnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for help</td>
<td>Drinking/Lack of effort</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with request</td>
<td>Reward/ Referent Power</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Retaliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive act of another</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intentional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 4 (ii)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Cause/type</th>
<th>Responsibility Antecedent</th>
<th>Behavioral Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achievement Failure</td>
<td>Lack of aptitude</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>Withold Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stigmatizing condition</td>
<td>Somatic</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>No Condemnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Need for help</td>
<td>Illness/ Low ability</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance with request</td>
<td>Punishment/ Legitimate power</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>Help</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggressive act of another</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unintentional</td>
<td>No retaliation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Weiner, 2006, p 34)

#### Model 5 (i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Cause/type</th>
<th>Responsibility Antecedent</th>
<th>Behavioral Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Failure</td>
<td>Lack of effort</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatizing condition</td>
<td>Behavioural/mental</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Condemnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for help</td>
<td>Drinking/Lack of effort</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with request</td>
<td>Reward/Referent Power</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Retaliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive act of another</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intentional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Model 5 (ii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Cause/type</th>
<th>Responsibility Antecedent</th>
<th>Behavioral Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Failure</td>
<td>Lack of aptitude</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>Withhold Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatizing condition</td>
<td>Somatic</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>No Condemnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for help</td>
<td>Illness/Low ability</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>Not Responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with request</td>
<td>Punishment/Legitimate power</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>Sympathy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Weiner, 2006, p 39)

Model 6 (i)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Cause/type</th>
<th>Responsibility antecedent</th>
<th>Behavioral Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to achieve</td>
<td>Lack of effort</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatizing condition</td>
<td>Behavioural/mental type</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Condemnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for help</td>
<td>Drinking, lack of effort</td>
<td>Causal controllability</td>
<td>Neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive act of another</td>
<td>Intentionality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retaliation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 6 (ii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Cause/type</th>
<th>Responsibility antecedent</th>
<th>Behavioral Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to achieve</td>
<td>Lack of aptitude</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>Withholding of reprimand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stigmatizing condition</td>
<td>Somatic</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>No condemnation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for help</td>
<td>Illness/ Low ability</td>
<td>Causal uncontrollability</td>
<td>No responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive act of another</td>
<td>Unintentionality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Weiner, 1995, p 260)
APPENDIX II

Scenario

Instructions: I am going to read the following story. Try hard to imagine that this happened to you and how you might have felt.

Our class was having a lesson. We had been given a piece of work to do on our own. I was sitting at a desk behind a girl in my class who had dropped her pencil sharpener on the floor. There were little pieces of sharpening everywhere so I decided to help her pick them up. As I was picking them up the teacher shouted extremely loudly, saying, “What are you doing? You are supposed to be doing your work!” I politely said that I was just helping my friend but the teacher carried on shouting and gave me a detention for break time. I have never forgotten that day and I never will forget it!

Instructions: Now I will read the following questions one by one whilst you answer them. I don’t want you to talk to anybody about the answers or to discuss them. Just write what you think is the best answer for you.

1. Write down what you think might be the one major cause of the teacher’s behaviour: ____________________________

   (If you wrote a feeling or emotion for your answer to question 1, please add what you think is the cause of the feeling or emotion.)

2. What might be the one main emotion/mood you feel, as a result of the teacher’s behaviour? You may choose your own or circle one of the examples below.

   ________________

   depressed anxious angry guilty ashamed

   sad embarrassed excited frightened irritated

   insecure proud mad panicky frustrated

   nervous disgusted hurt cheerful disappointed

   enraged scared happy loving humiliating

   sorry sympathetic

3. Taking into account your response to Question 1, how responsible do you think the teacher is for his/her behaviour? Tick your choice.

   not responsible not totally
4. Indicate whether you imagined that the teacher in the scenario was male or female (circle your choice):

male  female  I didn’t imagine either

5. Indicate whether you are a boy or a girl (circle correct response):  boy  girl
### APPENDIX III

**Example of Weiner's (1995) Data Collection**

#### Determinants of Aggressive Retaliation

A number of students at a local school drive to an empty lot one evening to have a stone throwing context. During the course of the competition, it becomes evident that one of them is the best thrower, and a second student becomes increasingly frustrated about this. In his frustration, this second person throws the rock as hard as possible at the target, but it goes astray, accidentally hitting the car of the first student, breaking a window. There is no doubt that this was accidental. Please answer the following questions.

1. Did the second (losing) student intend to break the window of the first (winning) student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   *Definitely not* | *Definitely yes*

2. How responsible would you hold the student for this damage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   *Not at all* | *Totally*

3. If you were this first student, how angry would you be at the second student because of the damage done to the window?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   *Not at all* | *Very*

4. If you were this first student, how much sympathy would you feel toward the second student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   *Not at all* | *A great deal*

5. If you were this first student, would you retaliate with some aggressive act, such as throwing a stone at the second person’s car, or engaging in some other action?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   *Definitely not* | *Definitely yes*
APPENDIX IV

The Attributional Style Questionnaire (Peterson, Semmel, von Baeyer, Abramson, Metalsky and Seligman, 1982)

You have been looking for a job unsuccessfully for some time.

Write down the one major cause ………………………………………………………

1. Is the cause of your unsuccessful job search due to something about you or to something about other people or circumstances? (circle one number).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally due to other people or circumstances</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally due to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In the future when looking for a job, will this cause again be present (circle one number).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will never again be present</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will always be present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Is the cause something that just influences looking for a job or does it also influence other areas of your life? (circle one number).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influences just this particular situation</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influences all situations in my life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How important would this situation be if it happened to you (circle one number).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V

Instructions to Administrators

- Please ensure you have a list of students who might need additional support in accessing the questionnaire and front sheet – and ensure these are supported either via yourself or another adult within the classroom.

- Please ensure that you have a list of the parents/carers who have given permission for their child to be involved. This information can be given to those students who are unsure.

- When students are attentive, explain that those whose parents/carers have given permission for them to be involved in the research will be given questionnaires (plus a front sheet) to complete.

- Give the students the following instructions:

  "Look at the front sheet and I will read it through. You can complete the question as we come to it. Don't start to begin the questionnaire on the next page until we are all ready. We will go through this together. First of all, write your name where it says, “Student Name.”"

- Read through the front sheet and ensure that students complete the questions as you come to each of them.

- After students have completed the front sheet:

  "Now turn over and I will read through the questionnaire. At each question, you can raise your hand to ask a question if you are not sure what to do."

- When the students have completed the questionnaires, remind them that their parents were given information about how to gain a summary of the results of the research when this is completed. Gather in the questionnaires and thank the students for their co-operation.

**PLEASE MAKE A NOTE OF ANY EVENTS WHICH MIGHT HAVE HINDERED ACCURATE COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES. THANK YOU.**
APPENDIX VI

Year 8 Scenarios

Note: All scenarios are reproduced exactly as written by students (and, therefore, include both spelling and grammatical errors).

Scenario 1

In primary school the teacher that comes in our class every Thursday to teach us Geography gave out a test. I was sat on a desk behind a girl in my class who had dropped her pencil sharpener on the floor. There was little pieces of sharpenings everywhere so I decided to help her pick them up. As I was picking them up the teacher shouted extremely loud. She said “What are you doing, your supposed to be doing a test.” I told her that I was just politely helping my friend but she carried on shouting and gave me a detention for break time. I felt so confused and upset. I was only helping my friend. I have never forgotten that day and I will never forget it!

Scenario 2

At period 3, one afternoon, me and my friend had walked into class from break, we was being silly, messing about, play fighting over yesterday's football games. The Teacher had sent us out, but I wasn’t surprised because I knew I did wrong. After being sent out, another Teacher saw us. The Teacher asked us why we was outside class, I told her that we was messing. Then the teacher who sent us out come outside. The other Teacher shouted at me! but I realised later, she, picked me out of me and my friend. My sister was doing a GCSE exam in The teachers room who was Telling me off, That teacher mentioned my sister to me. I felt embarrassed and scared what my sister would say if she found out, I began to blush, and looked as if I was going to cry look. I felt embarrassed in front of my friend, and both teachers.

Scenario 3

It wasn’t a lesson where we could sit where we wanted too, there was a seating plan but it just happened to be that I was sat next to my best friend. The two lads at the end of the row where being distruptive and mis-behaving all lesson, and she kept me and my friend back as well as them. Even though we never did anything wrong.

Scenario 4

On day when I was in reception at my old school I was playing in the house with my friends, I was the tallist person in my class so I had to go in the highest bit of the house. On of the boys was in the house and I didn't know and I step on his foot, I said sorry but he ran of and told the teacher. She said I was mean to do that and that I had to sit on the naughty seat. All my class was looking at me.

Scenario 5

With a Group – Been kept behind for not doing anything other people are doing something it was just the table I was sat on

Scenario 6

One day at school one of my teachers was out the class everyone was chucking things round the classroom and something hit me I think it was a piece of paper so I picked this paper of the floor and thrown it back but miss walked in and saw everyone
throwing things but because miss really didn’t like me. I was picked out over all the class.

Scenario 7

My music teacher was reading out the levels we were expected to get at the end of the year, she told me that the only way I would get a high level is if I took afterschool brass instrument lessons. I felt like I was being blackmaled.
APPENDIX VII

Front Sheet to Questionnaire

RESEARCH: MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY

Student Name: ________________________________

- Research is being undertaken into how students interpret (understand) the behaviour of teachers and how this behaviour affects their feelings. It is hoped that the results might give us new information on (for example) how teacher and student behaviour might affect others in school. The results of the research will be included in a thesis (which is like a long essay) which will then be submitted to the University of Manchester.

- Your parents/carers have been given information about this and have been asked to let us know if they don’t want you to take part. If they have said they don’t want you to take part, your responses won’t be used in the research.

- You do not need to take part if you don’t want to. We need your permission to use your responses in the research. Those that do give their permission, and whose responses are used in the research, will have their names put into a raffle to win a £10 voucher of their choice.

- Your responses will remain completely confidential and will not be shared with anybody else other than the researcher.

- Some of your answers might be very useful and we would like your permission to quote these (if necessary) in the thesis. Of course, all your answers will be confidential and anonymous. There will be no way of knowing how you answered the questions once all the information is put together.

- We are interested to know what you think and, therefore, it is very important that you give your own answers to each question. Do not discuss your answers with anybody else (until your questionnaire has been collected) and do not let anybody sitting near to you see your answers.

- We would like you to confirm that you are giving your permission to take part in the research. Please put your initials in the box if you are happy for your responses to be used in the research. ☐

- Please initial this box ONLY if you agree that your answers may be quoted in the thesis (these will remain anonymous). ☐

Thank you.
Dear Parent/Carer

Research Study

Your child is being invited to take part in a research study as part of a doctoral thesis. The research aims to investigate the interpretations that students make for teacher behaviour that they perceive to be negative, together with students’ emotional responses to this behaviour. Before you decide whether or not you would like your child to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Details (including an Information Sheet for students) can be accessed via XXXXXXXXXXXXX but, briefly, this involves students completing a very short questionnaire (consisting of five simple questions, read through by an adult). Please take time to read the information carefully and share this with your child.

If you do not want your child to participate, please contact me (or leave a message) on the number stated above.

Thank you.

Julie Basnett
Chartered Educational Psychologist
Opportunity to Participate in Research Study:
Parent/Carer Information Sheet

A random selection of Year 10 students is being invited to take part in a research study as part of a doctoral thesis (parents/carers of selected students will have received a letter about this). Before you decide whether or not you would like your child to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss this with your child. The research is being undertaken to consider how students interpret the behaviour of teachers and how this affects their feelings. It is hoped that the results might add to the knowledge base on positive management of students in schools (including via informing communications and interactions between teachers and students).

Who will conduct the research?
Julie Basnett (Educational Psychologist with XXXXXXXXXXXX)

Title of the research
“The causal attributions* that secondary aged students make for the perceived negative behaviour of teachers”

*Note: Causal attributions/attributions are defined as the interpretations that we make about the causes of the behaviour of others (and ourselves).

What is the aim of the research?

The main aims of the research are to discover:

- The causal attributions that students make for the perceived negative behaviour of teachers.
- The emotions reported by students, following these causal attributions.
- How responsible students consider teachers are for this negative behaviour.

However, please note that a scenario will be presented to each student (as opposed to your child being asked to provide any information about a real-life incident).

Why has your child been chosen?
A random selection of Year 10 students has been selected for participation in the research.
What would your child be asked to do if he/she took part?

Your child would be asked to complete a simple questionnaire (containing five questions, three of which involve circling or ticking the chosen response and the remaining two requiring writing a few words), following being presented with a scenario by the administrator. This should take approximately ten minutes and will take place during school time. The administrator is likely to be either me or a member of school staff. The instructions and questions will be read through step by step to guide children. It is anticipated that this will take place on 9th November.

What happens to the data collected?

The data will be incorporated into a doctoral thesis which will, then, be submitted to the University of Manchester. This might include anonymous quotes taken from the completed questionnaires (if student permission is granted).

How is confidentiality maintained?

Questionnaires will be returned to me when completed. Data will be stored on a personal computer (password protected) in order for analysis to take place and for data to be incorporated into the thesis. However, following this, no identifying data will be recorded on any computer equipment. Identifying data (e.g., names, recorded on the front sheets of questionnaires and signed consent) will no longer be needed and will be destroyed. Children will be identified by a number for the purposes of collating/analysing data. (Please note that names of children will be necessary, in the first instance, to ensure that only those whose parents/carers have not objected to their involvement will have their responses used in the data analysis.)

What happens if my child does not want to take part or changes his/her mind?

There is no obligation to participate at all and your child may withdraw from the research at any time, including on the day that the research takes place. However, when data is ready to be analysed, it will not be possible to identify individual children and, then, it will not be possible for this to be withdrawn.

To avoid potential feelings of discrimination (and as recommended by the University), all Year 10 students in a class group may be handed questionnaires to complete although only those who give informed consent to participate (and whose parents/carers have not objected) will have their responses included in the data analysis.

Will my child be paid for participating in the research?

No. However, if school agree, students who complete the questionnaires and who give their own consent (and whose parents/carers have not objected) will be offered a chance of winning a £10 voucher of their choice (e.g., JJB Sports, W H Smith) via their names being included in a raffle. This is likely to take place later in the term.

Where will the research be conducted?

In school.

Will the outcomes of the research be published?

There is a possibility that the results of the research will be published in relevant journals and/or incorporated into reports (e.g., to be given to participating schools).
The results of the research may, also, be included in presentations (e.g., to participating schools and to other professionals). However, no school or student will be identified.

When the research is completed, the results will be provided to the year group via school. This is likely to take place during the Summer Term or Autumn Term 2012. However, as other schools are participating, no school or student will be identifiable.

**Criminal Records Check (CRB)**

As my employment (Educational Psychologist with XXXXXXXX Children and Young People’s Service) involves me working with children and young people on a frequent basis, the relevant Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks have been undertaken and the confirmation of this is held with my employer.

**What if something goes wrong?**

If you have a concern about any aspect of this study, you should ask to speak to me (see below for contact details) and I will do my best to answer your questions. If I am unable to resolve your concern, or you wish to make a complaint regarding this study, please contact a University Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator on 0161 275 7583 or 0161 275 8093 or by email to research-governance@manchester.ac.uk.

**Who has reviewed the study?**

This study has been reviewed by the University of Manchester Senate Ethics Committee One which has given this study a favourable opinion.

**Contact for further information and results of research**

Julie Basnett  (Educational Psychology Service) (XXXXXXXXXXX)
You (together with some other members of Year 10) are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether or not you would like to take part it is important for you to understand why this is being done and what you will be asked to do.

**Aims of the research**

The research will look at how you interpret (or understand) the behaviour of teachers in school and how this affects your feelings. This is an opportunity to give your view. It is hoped that the results might give us new information on (for example) how teacher and student behaviour might affect others in school. The results of the research will be included in a thesis (which is like a very long essay) which will then be submitted to the University of Manchester.

**Who is taking part**

A selection of Year 10 students have been invited to take part.

**What you will be asked to do**

The research is due to take place in November during school time. This will involve you completing a simple questionnaire containing five questions. Three of the questions involve circling or ticking a response. The other two questions just need you to write a few words. If you are not sure what a question means, you can raise your hand to ask for help. This should take about ten minutes.

**Permission from you and your parents/carers**

Some of your answers might be very useful and I will be asking your permission to quote these (if necessary) in the thesis. Of course, all your answers will be confidential and I will take away your completed questionnaires. There will be no way of knowing how you answered the questions once all the information is put together as names of students will not be kept.

You do not need to take part if you don’t want to. You might be given a questionnaire to look at – and fill in if you want – with the rest of your class but this won’t be used in the research if your permission hasn’t been given.

**What happens if I change my mind?**

It is okay if you change your mind and decide that you no longer want to take part. However, once papers containing your names have been destroyed it will no longer be possible to identify which is your questionnaire and I won’t be able to remove your answers from my results.

**What happens after the questionnaires have been filled in**

If you complete the questionnaire and give your consent to be involved in the research (and your parents/carers don’t object) you will be offered a chance of winning a £10 voucher of your choice (e.g., JJB Sports, W H Smith) by your name being included in a raffle (if school agrees). This is likely to take place later in the Autumn term.
When the research is completed, the results will be provided to the year group via school. This is likely to take place during the Summer Term or Autumn Term 2012.

What if something goes wrong?

If you have any concerns about the research, you should ask to speak to me and I will do my best to answer your questions. If I am unable to help, please speak to your parents/carers who have information about who to contact.

Who has reviewed the study?

This study has been reviewed by a group of people at the University of Manchester who sit on a committee called an Ethics Committee. It is their job to make sure that people who take part in research aren’t harmed in any way. They gave permission for this study to go ahead.

Thank you for reading this information.

J Basnett
Educational Psychologist
APPENDIX X

Braun and Clarke (2006)

Braun and Clarke (2006) outline six phases of thematic analysis, as follows:

**Phase 1**
- Becoming familiar with the data

  Phase 1 involves going through the data a number of times, noticing and seeking any common patterns and contemplating initial codes.

**Phase 2**
- Establishing preliminary codes

  Following Phase 1, a system takes place of deciding upon potential codes in order to arrange the data into meaningful groups.

**Phase 3**
- Examining the data for themes

  Following the initial coding of data, these are then amalgamated into themes as appropriate.

**Phase 4**
- Reviewing themes

  Phase 4 involves reviewing earlier steps and ensuring that the themes established reflect the codes established earlier as well as the data set as a whole.

**Phase 5**
- Defining and labelling themes

  Following ongoing review of the initial coding, themes are characterised and labelled.

**Phase 6**
- Generating the report

  Phase 6 includes the incorporation of helpful examples and linking the analysis to the research questions and the literature.
APPENDIX XI

Prompts for Research Group Discussion

Background Information

- Explanation of Attribution Theory
- Aims of research
- Methodology
- Discussion of “internal” and “external” causation
- Initial thoughts on categorisation of (i) causes and (ii) emotional responses

Task 1: Categorisation of Causes

Task for research group:

i. Consider the categories of causes which have been used:

1. Stress relating to work (or home and work/bad day/bad news/impact of earlier event)
2. Stress linked to wider class/students
3. Non-specific stress
4. Home factors (including stress at home)
5. Illness
6. Misunderstanding
7. Dislike of pupil/class
8. Unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait)
9. Impeded from doing job
10. Behaviour of student/class (i.e., a cause directly related to the situation).
11. Spoiled response (e.g., more than one response).
12. Hard to categorise/unclear meaning
13. No response

ii. Could these categories be improved/changed? Or does the group agree with them?

iii. Can categories be combined?

In particular:

- Would you put “dislike of class” and “inherent trait” together?
- Would you combine the categories linked to earlier stressors/circumstances?
- Would you exclude No 10 from the analysis as the responses are very literal (rather than referring to an underlying “cause”)?
- Would you consider these categories of “causes” are “internal” or “external” to the teacher?
Task 2: Categorisation of Emotional Responses

Task for research group:

i. Consider the list of “emotions” which have been provided.

ii. Consider the initial categories of “emotions” which have been used.

iii. Are these accurate?

iv. Should these be categorised differently?

v. Would these be categorised as “self-directed” emotions or “other-directed” emotions?
APPENDIX XII

Categorising Attributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribution Given/Student Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Note:

- Students’ responses have been directly transferred from response forms;
- “emotions” are not accepted as causes;
- if an emotion is given but this is clarified by a cause, the latter was accepted;
- although just one cause was required/specified, if more than one was given and this signified similar causes, this was included in data;
- the number following the attribution is the number of the participant
Stress (including stress relating to work – or more than one cause given, i.e., home and work/bad day/bad news/impact of earlier event)

1. Stressed after a long day at work 1
2. She could have had a stressful day and had a misunderstanding with another pupil or member of staff 4
3. She might have been having a bad day 5
4. Stress from troubles at home or work 10
5. Stress by other pupils or something that is domestic 12
6. She might of heard bad news 24
7. They had a stressful day 48
8. Stress – home/work 49
9. Had a bad day (stress) 54
10. Something might of happened to the teacher 58
11. She was having a bad day 62
12. Teacher might have had an accident in the morning 68
13. She would have had a bad day 69
14. For a reason on the way to school might of upset the teacher 70
15. Teachers in a bad mood, someone else has annoyed them 119
16. Having a bad day 126
17. Bad life 128
18. Their having a bad day 129
19. Stress from work 130
20. Angry from something before 132
21. They might have been angry at something else 138
22. Other people annoying them 143
23. Stress, might have had a bad day 149
24. She might have wanted to release some unrelated anger 154
25. Because they have had a bad day 155
26. Stress – because they have had a bad lesson before or they have so much to
27. Stress – personal life, too much work 158
28. Might be just having a bad day 172
29. In a mood because off work 213
30. Stressed because of long hours 224
31. They might of not been having a good day 238
32. Stress – from all the work and stuff 244
33. Angry because someone might of upset her beforehand 259
34. She has had a bad day so she may be angry 263
35. Having a bad day so the teacher takes it out on the girl 278
36. They might have had a hard time in school 300
37. Stress at home or bad lesson before 306
38. Stress – home problems – overworked 314
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Because other pupils where behaving badly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The pupil might not be doing their work as well as helping the other pupil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Another pupil annoyed them before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Kids behaviour (other classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Others may have already disrupted the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Other pupils might have stressed the teacher out before this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>He is annoyed from a previous lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Impatient with that particular class because the class is uncooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>They were moody from a previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>People in class would have been out of their seats as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Bad mood because the last class wasn’t good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Stress – class disruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Angry – annoyed with class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>The teacher may have experienced behaviour problems with that student in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Stress, naughty class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Stress – bad class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Stress from students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Stress off other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Annoyed from lesson before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Stress. The cause would be they have been shouting all day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Other students behaviour, messing around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>She might of told her sit down several times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>He’s fed up because the class are all misbehaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Frustrated with other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Bad behaviour from last lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Bad behaviour pupils (different lessons)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Bad behaviour from a different lesson  288

28. They might have had a bad pupil in previous class  301
Non-Specific Stress (defined as “a state of mental or emotional strain or tension resulting from adverse or demanding circumstances”)

1. Built up stress 18
2. She was stressed 28
3. Because she was stressed 30
4. Stress 50
5. Stressed is what he would feel 53
6. Stress 56
7. Stress 72
8. Stress 100
9. Stress 101
10. They are stressed 103
11. Stress 105
12. Stressed 203
13. Stressful 209
14. Stress 212
15. Stress 218
16. Stress 223
17. Stress 225
18. Stress 274
19. Stressed 275
20. Stressed 276
21. His stressed 291
22. Stress 295
23. Stress 307
24. Stress 308
25. Stressed out 318
26. Stress 321
27. Stress 323
Home (including stress at home)

1. They may have had an argument at home  3
2. Stress at home may be through an argument or family crisis  7
3. Problems at home  9
4. She could have had a bad day at home or might have had an argument  14
5. She might be stressed with things at home  15
6. She might have problems at home and something might of gone on whats upset her  16
7. Maybe the teacher had an argument at home with her husband or child  17
8. Something happened at home to make her angry  29
9. Fell out with family/boyfriend  32
10. Stressed, home problems  51
11. Something happened like an argument that morning  57
12. Might have had a argument with family in that morning  60
13. Something could of happened to the teacher that morning  61
14. He may have had a argument that morning  64
15. Got divorced  65
16. The teacher had a bad day at home  67
17. Something may have happened to the teacher during that day to influence the behaviour, for example, a car crash or family crisis  71
18. Family in hospital or died  77
19. Something might of happened at home  93
20. Stress from home  102
21. She could have been angry with someone at home and took it out on a pupil  125
22. Personal life  133
23. Problems in life outside of school  134
24. Stress, home/personal issues  146
25. The teacher may be angry or depressed about something else going on in their lives  162
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Trouble at home 165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Problems at home 178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Social problems outside the workplace 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>May be problems at home for them 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Stress at home 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Bad mood, something happened at home 246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Bad news before coming to school 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Upset. Family problems 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Something bad has happened at home and he is upset and angry and there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taking there anger out on us 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Money problems 273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Family problems 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Frustrated because of things at home 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Problems at home 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Problems at home or stress 293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Home/family problems 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Home situation 311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Stress/domestic problems 312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Stress, personal issues 313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>She could be stressed at home 322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Illness**

1. Didn’t feel well 41
2. They are depressed 95
3. Tired 104
4. In a bad mood due to tiredness 123
5. Period 161
6. Being tired from the day 168
7. Depressed 217
8. She was depressed or upset to a maxed position. Something might of happened to make her/him depressed 261
9. Hormones 298
10. Tired 302

**Misunderstanding**

1. He didn’t know what the child was doing 55
2. 1 cause is that teachers may not trust the pupils enough and did not understand what they were doing 87
3. Looks like they are messing about 91
4. Might of thought they was copying each other 92
5. Teacher thinks they were messing around 94
6. Because they think its you who has done it 98
7. Misunderstanding, because they didn’t listen to the pupil 157
8. The teacher may not have seen what was happening 173
9. He might have thought they were talking or comparing answers 174
10. Her helping the girl and thinking there telling each other answers 175
11. Thought I was cheating 177
12. The teacher might have thought they was sharing answers 182
13. Because he might of thought they was not obeying his orders 188
14. Other children might be messing about and thinking that he was doing the
15. Thought they was messing around 201
16. Didn’t know what was going on 202
17. He/she thought that he was talking to the girl not helping 204
18. Confusion 226
19. The teacher might of thought that they were talking and was making up excuses 227
20. Angry, might of thought they were messing round 249
21. Anger and not knowing what was happening 251
22. Didn’t know what they were doing. When she found it she still shouted 265
23. Because the teacher was quite misunderstanding 267
24. Misunderstanding 284
25. Misunderstanding/assuming something without knowing what’s really going on 317
26. They misunderstood the situation or not seen what happened 319
### Dislike of Pupil/Class

1. He doesn’t like the person  85  
2. Doesn’t like that class  96  
3. Doesn’t like the pupil 229  
4. Just dislikes the pupil  230  

### Unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait)

1. They’ve got anger issues  2  
2. Most teachers are just stubborn  66  
3. Not a nice teacher  135  
4. Easily aggravated  151  
5. Psycho  239  
6. Horrible teacher  240  
7. A nasty teacher – angry  241  
8. Not very understanding – never listen  245  

### Impeded from doing job

1. She was angry because the girl was supposed to do her work it may have been important  38  
2. It wanted the child to do well with their work  111  
3. Might of thought the work was important  169  
4. Frustrated because he’s not in control  281  
5. Stressed because she wants her to do well  290  
6. Trying to do their job properly  309  
7. The teacher is trying to do their job  310  

### Literal interpretation of question (i.e., directly related to the situation)
1. Because the girl was not concentrating on her work when she is supposed to be.

2. He’s not doing as she said.

3. The person who was helping was supposed to be doing her work.

4. Because the pupil wasn’t doing the work he/she was told.

5. The girl should be doing her work.

6. Because the kid never asked permission to help.

7. Because they were meant to be doing their work.

8. Because the girl got out of her seat when she did not ask.

9. Because she said she wanted you to do your work.

10. Because the pupils didn’t do what she wanted her to do.

11. Because her friend started helping her.

12. Because the didn’t ask.

13. Angry because there were sharpenings all over the floor.

14. She shouted loudly because she had asked them to do work.

15. The child was supposed to do her work.

16. They was suppose to do the work.

17. They were supposed to do their work.

18. Irritated by the child misbehaving.

19. That’s the classrooms a mess and its there fault so they should clean it up.

20. The work needs to be done.

21. Because they wasn’t doing their work.

22. We were not working.

23. Because they weren’t working and making noises.

24. She was supposed to be doing work.

25. Not doing work.


27. She was out of her seat without permission.

28. Because she was supposed to do her work.
29. Getting distracted 109

30. The fact that I was out of my place 110

31. Got out of his seat without asking 113

32. Two students out of their seat 116

33. Disruption in the class 117

34. She didn’t want anyone else to get distracted 124

35. That they wasn’t doing their work 136

36. Because you wasn’t doing work and was out of your seat 137

37. Disturbing the class and not working 139

38. Pupil not doing work 140

39. Never asked to pick it up 141

40. Disrupted the class 164

41. Getting out of their seat 170

42. Got out of seat without asking 171

43. Annoyed because supposed to be working 176

44. Out of your seat meant to be doing work 179

45. You was helping a girl help pick stuff up (pervert behaviour) he could be trying to look up the girls skirt 181

46. Because they wasn’t doing the work 187

47. Because you are out of your chair 190

48. I am naughty sometimes and I didn’t ask 193

49. Angry, because she isn’t doing as he told her to do 197

50. Stopped working 198

51. She said no talking and carry on with your work and they didn’t listen, so she got annoyed 199

52. Got out of his/her seat without permission 205

53. Disgusted because she should have been working 206

54. Get out of seat 208

55. Interrupting in lessons 214

56. Interrupting in lesson 219
57. The teacher might of wanted the pupil to finish off work  
58. People not doing their work  
59. Angry (child didn't ask)  
60. People no listening  
61. Distracting the lesson  
62. Bad behaviour  
63. The person who dropped it, angry  
64. She shouting at a girl that had done nothing wrong  
65. Because he was never doing work  
66. He shouldn't be out of his seat  
67. Because he should be doing his work and shouldn't leave his seat  
68. Students  
69. Stressed because the child were meant to be doing their work
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>She could be depressed and has a short temper or stressed or something has happened at home 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Angry because she didn’t know what the pupil was doing at first but then went over the top 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>They did that because they were angry 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wanted you to get on with work/stress at home 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>He was in a mood so he took it out on others 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Because they wasn’t doing their work, an accident might of occurred at home from the teacher 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>She might have been in a bad mood 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Because she looked at someone else work 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Because she looked at someones work 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The teacher was in an angry mood 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Problems at home or because the kid never asked to help 89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Being annoyed 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Frustration because something might have happened 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>He could be depressed or angry at something 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Could be impatience 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Bad mood 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Bad mood 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Stressed – frustration 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>They might be feeling angry 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>(Illegible answer) 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>He was annoyed 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>She may want to take anger out on someone 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>The teacher was in a bad mood 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The student was out of his seat, the teacher had other problems 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The jump to conclusions and judge too quickly (hormones) 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The teacher may have been angry because he wasn’t doing his work or she</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. She is angry
28. Bad
29. Bad
30. Angry
31. As pupils were disobeying the teacher's orders and the teacher over-reacted
32. Shouting and detention – thought they were messing
33. Annoyed or bored
34. Angry
35. Shouting got angry, might just be annoyed
36. Angry at student
37. Stress head, stupid
38. Graffiti
39. Money
40. Angry, shouting for nothing
41. Anger management
42. Boredom
43. Hurt
44. She was in a mode
45. Somert to do
46. She was in a bad mood
47. Anger
48. In a mood
49. She was angry
50. Frustration, bad day, up early, important work
51. Angry but did not listen
52. Angry
53. Angry
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>What students they have and they might have been on their period 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Frustrated 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Woke up on the wrong side of the bed 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Angry 303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Angry 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Disappointed 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Went a bit over the top 315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No response</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no response)</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no response)</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX XIII

#### List of Emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student No.</th>
<th>Question 2 “Emotional Response”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Enraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Enraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Ashamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Ashamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Intimidated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Enraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Angry; frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Stressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Ashamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Shocked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Sad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Sorry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111.</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138.</td>
<td>Ashamed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140.</td>
<td>Scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146.</td>
<td>Enraged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148.</td>
<td>Stressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149.</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211.</td>
<td>Mad, angry, disgusted, frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213.</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214.</td>
<td>Guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217.</td>
<td>Frightened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218.</td>
<td>Scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219.</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221.</td>
<td>Scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230.</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232.</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233.</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244.</td>
<td>Insecure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245.</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246.</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247.</td>
<td>Guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248.</td>
<td>Nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249.</td>
<td>Guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253.</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254.</td>
<td>Panicky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255.</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256.</td>
<td>Angry and loving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257.</td>
<td>Angry and irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259.</td>
<td>Disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260.</td>
<td>Fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264.</td>
<td>Disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267.</td>
<td>Angry, irritated, frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274.</td>
<td>Embarrassed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275.</td>
<td>Irritated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280.</td>
<td>Disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281.</td>
<td>Disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283.</td>
<td>Mad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286.</td>
<td>Disgusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287.</td>
<td>Hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289.</td>
<td>Hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290.</td>
<td>Angry, embarrassed, irritated, frustrated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292.</td>
<td>Angry; depressed; angry; embarrassed; mad; hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293.</td>
<td>Angry and sad; anxious; sad; mad; hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294.</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295.</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297.</td>
<td>Enraged; humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298.</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305.</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311.</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316.</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317.</td>
<td>Confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318.</td>
<td>Humiliated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319.</td>
<td>Anger; angry; irritated; mad; frustrated; nervous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Confused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Frustrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>Angry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XIV

Categorising of Emotions

**Category 1 - anger and related terms (“other-directed”): total number = 228**

Angry
Annoyed
Irritated
Enraged
Mad
Frustrated
Disgusted
Aggressive

**Category 2 – scared and related terms (“self-directed”): total number = 22**

Frightened
Scared
Intimidated
Nervous
Panicky
Stressed
Insecure
Shocked
Anxious

**Category 3 – upset and related terms (“self-directed”): total number = 17**

Depressed
Sad
Hurt
Upset
Disappointed

**Category 4 – shame and related terms (“self-directed”): total number = 39**

Humiliated
Ashamed
Guilty
Sorry
Embarrassed

**Category 5: total number = 2**

Confused

**Category 6: total number = 2**

Happy

**Category 7: total number = 2**

Sympathetic
## APPENDIX XV

### Frequencies for Separate Schools

#### Causal Attributions: Stress Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>School A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>School B</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Illness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>Misunderstanding</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike of student/class</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Impeded from doing job</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impeded from doing job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **School C** | | | Frequency | Valid Percent |
| Stress | 43 | 67.2 | | |
| Illness | 3 | 4.7 | | |
| Misunderstanding | 8 | 12.5 | | |
| Dislike of student/class | 2 | 3.1 | | |
| Unpleasant person/teacher (inherent trait) | 4 | 6.3 | | |
| Impeded from doing job | 4 | 6.3 | | |
| Total | 64 | 100.0 | | |
| Missing | 33 | | | |
| **Total** | | | 97 | |
Anticipated Emotional Response

### School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Shame</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Shame</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confused</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Level of Responsibility

### School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not responsible at all</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not responsible</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally responsible</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not responsible at all</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not responsible</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally responsible</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not responsible at all</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not responsible</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally responsible</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Imagined Gender of Teacher

### School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't imagine either</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't imagine either</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't imagine either</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Gender of Participants

### School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Direction of Emotions

#### School A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer Directed Negative</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed Negative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td><strong>105</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### School B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer Directed Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Directed Negative</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed Negative</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### School C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outer Directed Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outer Directed Negative</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed Positive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed Negative</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>89</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missing</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>97</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX XVI

Revised Front Sheet and Questionnaire

Front Sheet to Questionnaire
RESEARCH: MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY

Student Name: ________________________________

- Research is being undertaken into how students interpret (understand) the behaviour of teachers and how this behaviour affects their feelings. It is hoped that the results might give us new information on (for example) how teacher and student behaviour might affect others in school. The results of the research will be included in a thesis (which is like a long essay) which will then be submitted to the University of Manchester.

- Your parents/carers have been given information about this and have been asked to let me know if they don’t want you to take part. If they have said they don’t want you to take part, your responses won’t be used in the research.

- You do not need to take part if you don’t want to. We need your permission to use your responses in the research. If you don’t give your permission, your responses won’t be used.

- After you have completed the questionnaire, we will have a group discussion about how easy you found it to complete, etc. We will need to record the discussion so that your comments can be analysed later.

- Your responses will remain completely confidential and will not be shared with anybody else other than the researcher and the University.

- Some of your answers might be very useful and we would like your permission to quote these (if necessary) in the thesis. Of course, all your answers will be confidential and anonymous. There will be no way of knowing how you answered the questions once all the information is put together.

- We are interested to know what you think and, therefore, it is very important that you give your own answers to each question. Do not discuss your answers with anybody else (until your questionnaire has been collected) and do not let anybody sitting near to you see your answers.

- We would like you to confirm that you are giving your permission to take part in the research. Please put your initials in the box if you are happy for your responses to be used in the research.

- Please initial this box ONLY if you agree that your answers may be quoted in the thesis (these will remain anonymous).

Thank you.
**Scenario**

Instructions:  *I am going to read the following story. Try hard to imagine that this happened in your class and how you might have felt.*

Our class was having a lesson. We had been given a piece of work to do on our own. A boy was sitting at a desk behind a girl (“in my class” omitted) who had dropped her pencil sharpener on the floor. There were little pieces of sharpening everywhere so the boy decided to help her pick them up. As he was picking them up, the teacher shouted extremely loudly, saying, “*What are you doing? You are supposed to be doing your work!*” The boy who was helping politely said that he was just helping his friend but the teacher carried on shouting and gave him a detention for break time. (“I have never forgotten that day and I never will forget it!” omitted)

Instructions:  *Now I will read the following questions one by one whilst you answer them. I don’t want you to talk to anybody about the answers or to discuss them. Just write what you think is the best answer for you.*

1. What might be the *one* main emotion/feeling you have as a result of the teacher’s behaviour?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Write down what you think might be the *one* major cause of the teacher’s behaviour: ………………………………………………………………………………………………..

   *(If you wrote a feeling or emotion for your answer to question 1, please add what you think is the *cause* of the feeling or emotion.)*

3. Taking into account your response to Question 1, how responsible do you think the teacher is for *the cause* of his/her behaviour? Tick your choice.

   - not responsible
   - not responsible
   - responsible
   - totally responsible

   □ [ ] [ ] [ ]

4. How responsible do you think the teacher is for *the behaviour* that s/he engaged in? Tick your choice.

   - not responsible
   - not responsible
   - responsible
   - totally responsible

   □ [ ] [ ] [ ]
5. Indicate whether you are a boy or a girl (circle correct responses):  **boy**  **girl**
Dear Parent/Carer

Research Study

Your child has volunteered to take part in a research study as part of a doctoral thesis. The research aims to investigate the interpretations that students make for teacher behaviour and how this affects their feelings. Each student will be given a questionnaire that portrays a scenario depicting an interaction between a student and a teacher. The students are then asked to respond to five questions about the scenario and to contribute to a small group discussion. Before you decide whether or not you would like your child to participate, it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Details (including an Information Sheet for students) are attached. Please take time to read the information carefully and share this with your child.

If you do not want your child to participate, please contact me (or leave a message) on the number stated above.

Thank you.

Julie Basnett
Chartered Educational Psychologist
Information to Parents/Carers

Opportunity to Participate in Research Study:
Parent/Carer Information Sheet

A selection of Year 10 students has been invited to take part in a research study as part of a doctoral thesis. The research is being undertaken to consider how students interpret the behaviour of teachers and how this affects their feelings. It is hoped that the results might add to the knowledge base on positive management of students in schools (including via informing communications and interactions between teachers and students).

Who will conduct the research?

Julie Basnett (Educational Psychologist with St Helens Council)

Title of the research

“*The causal attributions* that students make for teaching behaviour: An exploratory study*”.

*Note: Causal attributions/attributions are defined as the interpretations that we make about the causes of the behaviour of others (and ourselves).

What is the aim of the research?

The main aims of the research are to discover:

- The causal attributions that students make for the behaviour of teachers.
- The emotions reported by students, following these causal attributions.
- How responsible students consider teachers are for the behaviour portrayed.

However, please note that a scenario will be presented to each student (as opposed to your child being asked to provide any information about a real-life incident).

Why has your child been chosen?

The school was asked to identify students who are likely to be able to reflect on their thoughts and feelings and, also, contribute to a discussion about these.

What would your child be asked to do if he/she took part?

Your child would be asked to complete a simple questionnaire (containing five questions, three of which involve circling or ticking the chosen response and the remaining two requiring writing a few words), following being presented with a scenario by the administrator. This should take approximately ten minutes and will
take place during school time. The administrator will be myself. The instructions and questions will be read through step by step to guide students. Following this, the students will take part in a brief focus group discussion in order to gain information about their thoughts on completing the questionnaire (e.g., to check their understanding of the questions). In total, I would expect the whole session to take no longer than thirty minutes. It is anticipated that this will take place in July and during a time of the school day which is unlikely to interrupt the education of your child. Please note that the discussion which takes place during the focus group will be recorded in order for the students' comments to be transcribed for future analysis. However, students will not be identified and school staff will not have access to the recording or transcription.

**What happens to the data collected?**

The data will be incorporated into a doctoral thesis which will, then, be submitted to the University of Manchester. This might include anonymous quotes taken from the completed questionnaires (if student permission is granted).

**How is confidentiality maintained?**

Questionnaires will be returned to me when completed. Data will be stored on a personal computer (password protected) in order for analysis to take place and for data to be incorporated into the thesis. However, following this, no identifying data will be recorded on any computer equipment. Identifying data (e.g., names, recorded on the front sheets of questionnaires and signed consent) will no longer be needed and will be destroyed. Students will be identified by a number for the purposes of collating/analysing data. (Please note that names will be necessary, in the first instance, to ensure that only those whose parents/carers have not objected to their involvement will have their responses used in the data analysis.)

**What happens if my child does not want to take part or changes his/her mind?**

There is no obligation to participate at all and your child may withdraw from the research at any time, including on the day that the research takes place. However, when data is ready to be analysed, it will not be possible to identify individual children and, then, it will not be possible for this to be withdrawn.

**Will my child be paid for participating in the research?**

Unfortunately not.

**Where will the research be conducted?**

In school.

**Will the outcomes of the research be published?**

There is a possibility that the results of the research will be published in relevant journals and/or incorporated into reports (e.g., to be given to participating schools). The results of the research may, also, be included in presentations (e.g., to participating schools and to other professionals). However, no school or student will be identified.

When the research is completed, the results will be provided to the year group via school.
Criminal Records Check (CRB)

As my employment (Educational Psychologist with XXXXXXX Children and Young People's Service) involves me working with children and young people on a frequent basis, the relevant Criminal Records Bureau (CRB) checks have been undertaken and the confirmation of this is held with my employer.

What if something goes wrong?

If you have a concern about any aspect of this study, you should ask to speak to me (see below for contact details) and I will do my best to answer your questions. If I am unable to resolve your concern, or you wish to make a complaint regarding this study, please contact a University Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator on 0161 275 7583 or 0161 275 8093 or by email to research-governance@manchester.ac.uk.

Who has reviewed the study?

This study has been reviewed by the University of Manchester Senate Ethics Committee One which has given this study a favourable opinion.

Contact for further information and results of research

Julie Basnett (Educational Psychology Service) (XXXXXXXXXX)
Student Information Sheet

You (together with some other members of Year 10) are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether or not you would like to take part it is important for you to understand why this is being done and what you will be asked to do.

Aim of the research

The research will look at how you interpret (or understand) the behaviour of teachers in school and how this affects your feelings. This is an opportunity to give your view. It is hoped that the results might give us new information on (for example) how teacher and student behaviour might affect others in school. The results of the research will be included in a thesis (which is like a very long essay) which will then be submitted to the University of Manchester.

Who is taking part

A selection of Year 10 students have been invited to take part.

What you will be asked to do

The research is due to take place in July during school time. This will involve you completing a simple questionnaire containing five questions. Three of the questions involve circling or ticking a response. The other two questions just need you to write a few words. I will read through the questions and you can complete them as we go along. If you are not sure what a question means, you can raise your hand to ask for help. This should take about ten minutes.

You will then be asked to take part in a brief focus group discussion. This will involve you giving your thoughts on completing the questionnaire. However, it is a discussion group and, if you feel that you are not able to make any comments, this is fine.

Permission from you and your parents/carers

Some of your answers might be very useful and I will be asking your permission to quote these (if necessary) in the thesis. Of course, all your answers will be confidential and I will take away your completed questionnaires. There will be no way of knowing how you answered the questions once all the information is put together as names of students will not be kept.

Don't forget that you do not need to take part if you don't want to.

What happens if I change my mind?

It is okay if you change your mind and decide that you no longer want to take part. However, once papers containing your names have been destroyed it will no longer be possible to identify which is your questionnaire and I won't be able to remove your answers from my results.

What happens after the questionnaires have been filled in

When the research is completed, the results will be provided to the year group via school.
What if something goes wrong?

If you have any concerns about the research, you should ask to speak to me and I will do my best to answer your questions. If I am unable to help, please speak to your parents/carers who have information about who to contact.

Who has reviewed the study?

This study has been reviewed by a group of people at the University of Manchester who sit on a committee called an Ethics Committee. It is their job to make sure that people who take part in research aren’t harmed in any way. They gave permission for this study to go ahead.

Thank you for reading this information.

J Basnett
Educational Psychologist
APPENDIX XVIII

Focus Group Transcription

The focus group consisted of eight Y10 students (5 male, 3 female). However, the responses of individual students are not identifiable via the transcript. For ease of reading, the facilitator's comments are presented in bold. The focus group discussion took place following the questionnaire completion and, therefore, reinforcement of the aim of the research, the requirements of the focus group, etc., had all been relayed prior to the discussion which follows.

Note: F = Facilitator; S = Student

F I have got four pieces of recording equipment just in case one doesn't work or some of them are not very effective. This is the best so I am hoping it is going to pick up all your voices. Okay.....

The first question I wanted to ask is – can you remember the scenario about the girl dropping the pencil sharpenings and the teacher shouting really loudly at the boy who went to pick them up, giving him detention, and so on? How typical do you think that is? Does something like that happen in school?

S Not that extreme. Not over a pencil sharpener.

F No. So it is not very typical.

S No.

F Okay. Anybody else?

S It can happen over like other stuff.

S Yes.

F Can you tell me what other stuff?

S Like somebody standing up to go and help someone or something.

F Right. So something similar, then. Has that happened?

S Yes but not something as little as that. Like (name) said, if somebody stood up or was talking and not meant to be or something. But not over like a pencil or pencil sharpener.

F Is that not similar then?

S No. I wouldn't say so.

F Okay. What does anybody else think? Do you get shouted at? Or have other students got shouted at for something?

S Like if someone comes over to help you and been shouted at and that.
F Really? So, again, it's something when you are trying to be helpful but you get yelled at for it. What about you girls? Do you think that's the sort of thing that might happen?

S Yes but not like over something like that.

F Not like a pencil sharpener.

S Yes.

F Okay. So it's not that typical?

S No.

S Not really.

S No.

S (Indistinct comment)

F So. Next question. How easy was it to complete the questionnaire?

S Simple.

S Really easy.

S Pretty easy.

F Simple?

S Simple.

S Easy.

S Really easy.

S Easy.

S Really easy.

F Really easy? Easy to understand?

S Yes.

S Yes.

S It's understandable.

F That's great. Let's just ask about the questions, then. The first question asked you how you might feel as a result of the teacher's behaviour. And we asked for just one feeling. Was it easy to give one feeling? Or did you want to give more than one?

S I wanted to put two.

F Did you?
S  Yes.
F  What did you want to put?
S  Angry as well.
F  As well as ...?
S  Scared.
F  Scared?
S  Because when like they are shouting at you sometimes, if they are shouting at you, you feel embarrassed as well.
F  Yes. But in this scenario you were observing somebody else weren’t you.
S  Yes.
F  Would you still feel scared then?
S  Yes.
F  Yes. Okay.
S  Confused.
F  Yes. Did you want to give more than one emotion?
S  No.
S  No
S  No
F  Most people okay with one?
S  Yes.
S  Confused was all right.
F  Confused. Okay.

The second question asked what you thought might be the one major cause of the teacher’s behaviour. Was it easy to think of a cause?
S  Yes.
S  Yes.
S  Yes.
S  (In general: Yes)
F  Was it? Does anybody want to tell me what they put – just to see?
I put problems at home.

I put family problems.

That's great. I was hoping you would give those sorts of answers because I think when the students did the questionnaire in the first place, and I asked what was the cause of the teacher's behaviour, they would say they were angry but I was looking for ..... stepping further back - and looking for what the background/ underlying cause was. That is the sort of thing I was looking for. What did you boys put?

Personal problems.

Yes.

Did you? Do you want to tell me what you put or not? No. Okay.

Same.

Something the same. Okay.

So that question wasn’t confusing in any way?

No.

No

No

Brilliant. The third question asks how responsible you think the teacher is for the cause of the behaviour. So - how responsible for the cause - of the behaviour. Was that easy to understand?

Yes

Yes

Yes

(In general: Yes)

So do you think I was asking for how responsible they were for the personal problems?

It’s their fault for the way they act.

For the way they acted?

For the way they reacted, that’s their fault. It is not really their fault if they have got family problems. But they shouldn’t take it out on the kids.

(Indistinct student comment)

Okay. But there were two different questions weren’t there? One question said how responsible do you think they are for the cause of the
behaviour and the other one asked for how responsible do you think they are for the behaviour – so, they are two different things. So did you get those a bit confused, do you think?

S No.

S No.

S (In general: No)

F So just put your hand up so I can get an idea. Who thinks that they understood I was asking how responsible you thought the teacher was for the underlying cause of the behaviour. Who thinks they understood that? Did you?

S Yes

F Yes? Okay - everybody?

F And I think the last question – how responsible do you think they are for the behaviour they engaged in. That was the shouting. How responsible do you think they were for the shouting?

S Their own fault.

S Yes. Responsible.

S Responsible.

S Responsible.

F Okay. Obviously, I haven’t looked at all your answers yet. Was there a difference in how you answered for the teacher’s responsibility for the cause – underlying cause of the behaviour - and responsibility for the actual behaviour? Did you give them different levels of responsibility?

S No.

S No.

S No because they both link together, don’t they?

F They do link together. Yes. But did you say you thought the teacher wasn’t responsible for the cause – for the problems at home?

S Yes. They would have been responsible for taking it out on the kids but she’s not – or he’s not - responsible for, like, the problems she had at home or if they have got family issues or ....

F Okay.

S That’s not their fault, is it? But it’s their fault for taking it out on the kid.

F Right. So who thinks the cause of the behaviour, on the whole, wasn’t the teacher’s fault? The underlying cause? Put your hand up so I can get an idea. The cause wasn’t the teachers fault. Is your hand up?
Yes.

(Following counting): All of you. All - not responsible for the cause.

And how many of you thought that they were responsible for the behaviour that they engaged in – as in the shouting?

(all students put up hand)

Yes. That's okay.

So do you think there was anything that could have been done to improve the questionnaire? I'm getting the feeling that some of you were a bit confused (which maybe isn't surprising) about the underlying cause of the behaviour. Was that a bit confusing – that question?

Yes. It could have been made a little bit clearer.

Yes.

Yes.

Just put your hand up if you think you got a bit confused about the cause.

(all students put up hand)

That's fine. That's helpful then.

So what I was trying to do with the questionnaire, was to find out how responsible students feel teachers are for their behaviour. And I was trying to split up the underlying cause of the behaviour, if students just thought the teacher was being a bit difficult or nasty – taking things out on the student – or whether it was due to something else. I was trying to split up those two things. So, with that in mind, do you think the questionnaire did that or do you think it is still a bit too confusing?

No. It's all right.

Yes. It's better, like, you give your own opinion of what you thought happened.

Yes.

So who is saying they think it was a bit confusing?

(No hands)

You don't think it was confusing?

No. Just a little bit. It could have been a little more bit simpler and them questions about the cause of it, but apart from that it was all right.

How could I have made that simpler?

Maybe made it a bit more clearer – the question that you were you were trying to ask.
F Worded it differently?

S Yes. That’s all. But it wasn’t... anything we couldn’t get because we have all written the same, really.

F So you got it but it was that you had to think about it?

S Yes.

F Okay.

If this research was being done again, do you think there is a better way of going about it? Because what we are trying to do is understand what students think about teachers’ behaviour and how it makes them feel. Can you think of any other way of doing the research or do you think it has been simple? Or do you think there is a better way of doing it?

S I’d say that was the best way.

S It’s the best way.

S Yes.

F Okay. Anybody got any other comments?

S No.

S No.

S No.

(In general: No)

F Okay. Thank you for your contributions and for helping me with the research. Does anybody want to finish off the sweets before we finish?

S We’ve had enough.

(Some conversation continued but focus group task completed at this point.)
APPENDIX XIX

Prompts for Focus Group

The following prompts will be asked used to generate the participants’ thoughts about completing the questionnaire. The first question is largely to introduce the students to the tasks and to encourage them to contribute.

1. How typical is the scenario in the questionnaire? Have you experienced anything similar? When?

2. The first question asked you about how you might feel as a result of the teacher’s behaviour. Was it easy to think of one main emotion/feeling? Or did you want to write more than one?

3. The second question asks what you think might be the one major cause of the teacher’s behaviour. Was it easy to think of a cause for the behaviour? Did you find this question confusing in any way?

4. The third question asks how responsible you think the teacher is for the cause of the behaviour and the fourth question asks how responsible you think the teacher is for the actual behaviour that he or she engaged in. Was it easy or difficult to separate responsibility for the cause and responsibility for the behaviour?

5. Do you think there is anything that could be done to improve the questionnaire?
APPENDIX XX

Results: Follow-up Study

Questionnaire

The results of each question are given as follows and separated into the responses of (i) boys and (ii) girls (note that written responses are transcribed literally):

Question 1: “What might be the one main emotion/feeling you have as a result of the teacher’s behaviour?”

Boys:

“confused”
“petrified”
“anger”
“angry”
“anger”
“confusion”

Girls:

“confusion”
“confused”

Question 2: “Write down what you think might be the one major cause of the teacher’s behaviour”

Boys:

“Stress (family issues)”
“Not seeing all of what happened with the students”
“Problems at home”
“He’s having a bad day/frustrated”
“Personal problems”
“Problems outside of school”
Girls:

“Something might of bothered the teacher before the class”
“Anger towards the child for ignoring instructions”

Question 3: “Taking into account your response to Question 2, how responsible do you think the teacher is for the cause of his/her behaviour?”

Boys:

Responsible
Responsible
Responsible
Responsible
Responsible
Totally responsible

Girls:

Not responsible
Responsible

Question 4: “How responsible do you think the teacher is for the behaviour that s/he engaged in?”

Boys:

Responsible
Responsible
Responsible
Responsible
Totally responsible
Totally responsible

Girls:

Responsible
Not responsible