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ABSTRACT

In recent decades educational researchers and theorists have shown increased interest in attributional and related cognitive theories of motivation. This interest has focused on academic achievement and, more recently, interpersonal and intrapersonal behaviors. The focus of this attribution theory study is on students' and teachers' perceptions of classroom problem behavior. This research examines the types of causal ascriptions made and the locus, stability, and controllability orientations of these ascriptions, the role of gender of teachers and students in regard to the locus, stability, and controllability dimensions, and the effect of gender of the perpetrator of the problem classroom behavior.

A videotape of children depicting 12 different problem types with a boy actor and girl actor for each problem type was shown to 20 teachers and 40 students, each of whom was asked to complete a separate questionnaire, based on Russell's Causal Dimension Scale, for each vignette after it was shown.

A multivariate analysis of variance yielded significant effects for role by gender, problem type, problem type by role, actor by role by problem type, and problem type by actor and problem type by actor by gender by role. On univariate analyses of variance, locus yielded significant effects for problem type, role by problem type, actor by problem type, and role by actor by problem type. Stability yielded significant effects for problem type, actor by problem type, role by problem type, actor by problem type, and role by actor by problem type.

The results indicate that teachers and students make attributions about problem classroom behaviors much the same way attributions are made about academic achievement. For controllability, role interacted with gender, which reflected female students' beliefs that problem behaviors are more controllable in contrast to the
beliefs of female teachers. Gender of the participant did not significantly influence attributions, but the gender of the actor played a significant role in the perceptions of the participants as did the attributions they made in regard to the problem types. This research indicates that attributions for problem classroom behavior made by teachers and students have important implications for effective classroom management and instruction.
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CHAPTER 1:

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

In the past few decades educational researchers and theorists have shown an increased level of interest in motivation and attribution theories (Ames & Ames, 1984; Brophy, 1985; Covington & Omelich, 1985; Weiner, 1984). This interest on the part of researchers has developed alongside teachers' concerns about lack of academic achievement in some students. These concerns of teachers are often cast in terms of students' motivation to pursue academic activities. Besides motivation and attributional factors in academic achievement situations, another major concern for teachers is disruptive behavior or misbehavior in the classroom (Yinger, 1980). This topic also has received more attention over the past several years (Alberto & Troutman, 1986; Cangelosi, 1988; Cangelosi et al., 1988; Charles, 1985; Curwin & Mendlor, 1980; Duke, 1979; Jones & Jones, 1986). Classroom management research over the past few decades has also included more specific research in instructional practices (Kounin, 1970; Martin, 1981) and cognitive-behavioral strategies (Groenewold & Der, 1987; Kendall & Braswell, 1985; Meichenbaum, 1977; Meichenbaum & Goodman, 1971) as well as other management strategies such as assertive discipline developed by Canter and Canter (1976) and teacher effectiveness training of Gordon (1974).

Some researchers have investigated disruptive behavior in the classroom by studying teachers' perceptions of student misbehavior (Brophy, 1985; Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981; Safran & Safran, 1985). The research on students' perceptions of disruptive behavior is scarce, however, some research has been conducted recently (Donnan & Pipes, 1985; Forsyth, Pope, & McMillan, 1985; Maas, Marecek, & Travers, 1978; Rohrkemper, 1985). What is noteworthy about these developing lines of research is the central role played by cognitive
factors in the theoretical accounts of children's classroom motivation in academic achievement as well as behavior management.

Weiner (1984) states that his attribution theory, a cognitive-motivation theory which has been one of the more generative theories of motivation in education over the last 10 to 15 years, needs further elaboration, refinement and empirical testing. It is the aim of this research to do so by studying problem classroom behavior in light of Weiner's attribution theory. The focus of the research outlined in this study is on the differences and similarities in the perceptions that students and teachers possess in regard to classroom problem behavior and the affect associated with this problem behavior. This dissertation describes the nature of attribution theory as posited by Weiner (1979, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1986), reviews some of the fields in which empirical research has been conducted, and presents the results of research on teachers' and students' attributions regarding students' classroom problem behavior.

While the vast majority of Weiner's work and other attribution research focuses on outcomes of academic achievement activities, it is theoretically conceivable to include outcomes of intrapersonal as well as interpersonal behaviors using Weiner's (1985) model. The intrapersonal behaviors could include behaviors such as failure syndrome, underachievement, perfectionism, and low achievement. The interpersonal behaviors could include verbal and/or physical aggressiveness and rejection. In this research I am interested in considering these classroom behaviors as outcomes and studying the causal ascriptions and affects associated with these behaviors. The interpersonal and intrapersonal behaviors considered for this research will be problematic in nature, by that I mean any classroom behavior which interferes with the teaching/learning process or classroom management.

To illustrate interpersonal behavior problems, consider the following vignette:

John and Billy are two boys in a grade 6 class. Billy tends to instigate and to involve himself in disruptive behavior
frequently. One day, as the class was preparing
for the next subject, Billy knocked John's books to the floor
as he walked past John's desk. John reacted by getting up out
of his desk, scolded Billy, who in turn hit John and a fight
ensued. Mr. Johnson, the teacher, stopped the fight and sent
both boys to see the principal. This was the first time for
John to see the principal for misbehavior while Billy had
been there many times before for various incidences of
misbehavior.

In this vignette the focus is placed on Billy's behavior. Billy may attribute his involvement in the
fight to a lack of ability and effort in coping with his environment, inadequate development of
coping strategies or perhaps due to emotional concerns. Consequently, Billy may feel
hopeless and angry and exhibit low self-esteem. There may well be other emotions
experienced by Billy as well as other causal ascriptions. Student observers may attribute Billy's
fighting behavior to bad luck, lack of ability for self-control, or low academic ability, whereas
teachers may attribute the fighting behavior to lack of effort for self-control, poor environment,
lack of strategies for coping with the environment, or low academic achievement.

To illustrate intrapersonal behavior problems, consider the following vignette:

Mary is a grade 5 student who has never repeated a grade as yet. She
does have a great deal of difficulty learning the material presented to
her. She frequently receives low grades on her assignments and
negative comments from her teacher. Mary receives learning
assistance three times per week. Today, the teacher has taught a lesson
in adding mixed fractions and has assigned the class to do 15 questions
for practice. Mary stares at the page in the textbook and mutters to
herself, "This stuff looks really hard. Why does this work always have
to be so hard. Why do I always get poor grades. I feel like a dummy, a
stupid kid. I've never been able to learn stuff quickly. I wish I was
smarter!"

In this vignette Mary is displaying a failure syndrome with very low self-esteem. Mary may at-
tribute her academic difficulty to lack of ability, lack of understanding of the teacher, or task dif-
ficulty and may experience low self-esteem, frustration, anger, and a sense of helplessness.
Other students may attribute Mary's academic difficulty to lack of ability, bad luck, or lack of
effort while Mary's teacher may attribute her difficulties to lack of effort, lack of ability, or
negative attitude. This kind of problem behavior has interfered and will continue to interfere
with Mary's learning process and progress in that she will accomplish very little because of this
attitude about her self and her very negative affect.

Differences between the perceptions of these and similar classroom problems of
student observers and teachers are likely to be present since teachers generally possess
more background information about students which provides them with more information on
which to base their causal ascriptions. Studying students' and teachers' perceptions of
ascriptions of disruptive behavior in the classroom may have enormous implications for
effective and efficient instruction since classroom management has been studied in relation to
classroom instruction (Kounin, 1970; Martin, 1981). Perhaps if teachers' and students'
perceptions of the causes of classroom problem behaviors could be viewed from the same
perspective, then the amount of time spent on classroom management by the teacher might
be greatly reduced.

Overview of the Dissertation

The dissertation begins with a review of the earlier research in attribution theory. The
vast majority of this research was conducted in achievement situations, more specifically,
studying the causal attributions of success and failure. The theory was subsequently also researched in other situations such as interpersonal relations and judgements of help-giving. The literature review in chapter 2 also includes a description of research conducted on problem behavior in classroom management issues and concerns.

Chapter 3 describes the methodology employed in conducting the investigation. It describes the general procedures, composition of the sample, dependent and independent variables, and statistical design. Since this research includes the use of a video for a stimulus, much of the chapter deals with a description of the production of the video depicting various classroom problem behaviors. This chapter also describes the instrument used in the collection of the data as well as the coding and scoring procedures.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the research. The chapter discusses the research findings as they relate to the questions which were posed in chapter 2. The statistical procedures are again discussed in light of the questions posited for research. The chapter ends with a general summary of the findings.

Chapter 5 presents two supplementary studies which were conducted in order to corroborate the vignettes and problem types used in the video. The first supplementary study consists of a validation or classification study of the video vignettes while the second consists of a multidimensional scaling study to investigate the differentiability of the problem types. Since I used descriptions of problem student types as a basis for the video, this chapter also describes the statistical procedure used in determining the degree of mutual exclusiveness of the problem types. Also included in this chapter is a description of a classification or validation study of the problem types used in this research.

The sixth and last chapter discusses the results described in chapters 4 and 5 as they relate to the broader theoretical issues in attribution theory as well as considering classroom
management theories, strategies and techniques from an attributional perspective. This chapter also includes some considerations and questions for further research in this area.
CHAPTER 2
ATTRIBUTION THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Attribution Theory

The Dimensions and Causal Ascriptions of Attribution Theory

One of the fundamental goals of attribution theory is the search for people's perceptions of the causes of behavior. The question of causes has been studied in different areas of human behavior, such as academic achievement (Ames, 1978; Schunk, 1981; Wolf & Savickas, 1985), interpersonal relations (Doherty, 1981, Folkes, 1982; Kelley, 1971), and student problem behavior in the classroom (Brophy, 1985; Maas & Marecek, 1978, Rohrkemper, 1985). Much of attribution research has been conducted in the area of academic achievement, that is, the causal ascriptions for success and failure in school and university settings. In the school setting attribution theory attempts to answer specific questions such as, "Why did I fail that math test?", or "Why did John do better on the science exam than me?" These questions of causal ascription deal with academic oriented issues and much research has been conducted in this area (Ames, 1978; Clifford, 1984; Covington & Omelich, 1985; Frieze & Snyder, 1980; Schunk, 1981). However the school setting also involves various other concerns such as interpersonal relations and classroom behavior. In these situations students might ask questions such as, "Why does Mary get along so well with others and I don't?", "Why does it seem like I'm always in trouble?", or, "Why can't I make friends easily?" Investigations into causal ascriptions were conducted in order to answer these and other questions.

Generally, causal ascriptions concerning academic achievement are made when an outcome is unexpected (Weiner, 1979). If a student expects to obtain a high grade on an exam in an academic setting but receives a failing grade, that student will ascribe the failure to some source such as lack of effort, lack of ability, or poor luck. According to attribution theory, if a person expects someone else to interact with him/her in a social setting but is rejected,
then that person will attribute the cause of the rejection to some source such as physical attractiveness, athletic ability, availability, or mood (see Folkes, 1982). However, causal ascriptions will also be made if certain outcomes, for example, failure or rejection, occur over longer periods of time resulting in behaviors and states such as failure syndrome and loneliness.

Much of the early attribution research was concerned with determining the causal ascriptions of success and failure in academic achievement. This research was generated as a result of the formulation of a classification scheme for the perceived determinants of achievement behavior (Weiner et al., 1971). This classification scheme consisted of ability, effort, task difficulty, and luck placed in the dimensions of stability and locus of control (see Table 1). The ability and effort components are internal characteristics of the individual involved in an activity, whereas task difficulty and luck are variables external to the individual. Ability and task difficulty are stable, that is, fixed or unchangeable by the individual engaged in the activity, whereas effort is unstable in that it can be changed by the individual involved in the activity. Luck is a variable considered to be unchangeable by the individual.

After continued research, Weiner, Russell and Lerman (1979) concluded that achievement performance could also be influenced by mood, fatigue, illness, and bias. Weiner (1979) expanded the previous model of attribution theory by adding a controllability dimension to that of stability and locus of control. In an achievement setting, controllability refers to the causes which are controllable by the individual such as effort or controllable by others such as teacher bias and help from others. In contrast, ability and mood and task difficulty and luck would be uncontrollable by the individual engaged in the activity. (see Table 2). Abramson, Seligman and Teasdale (1978) posited another possible dimension of causality which they termed globality. The global versus specific ends of this dimension refer
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></td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Ability, Task difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Effort, Luck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: *Causes of success and failure, classified according to locus, stability, and controllability.*

| Controllability | Internal       | External       |
|-----------------|----------------|
|                 | Stable, Unstable|
|                 | Stable, Unstable|
| Uncontrollable  | Ability, Mood, Task difficulty, Luck |
| Controllable    | Typical, Immediate, Teacher bias, Unusual effort, effort, help from others |


to whether the causal ascription is task or situational specific or is a general trait, for example, failure on a math test may be ascribed to lack of ability in math or it may be ascribed to a lack of general ability.

Early attribution theory concentrated on achievement outcomes with no concern for concomitant emotions. More recently, Weiner (1979, 1982, 1984, 1985) has included a study of emotions as part of the process of linking various components of attribution theory. This linkage has been further researched by others (Brown & Weiner, 1984; Covington & Omelich, 1984, 1985; Rohrkemper, 1985; Weiner, 1980). Weiner's (1984, 1985, 1986) complete formulation of an attribution theory of motivation and emotion begins with an outcome followed by antecedents, causal ascription and dimensions, psychological consequences, and behavioral consequences such as choice, intensity of action, quality, and helping (see Figure 1 from Weiner, 1985). Weiner (1984, 1985, 1986) has classified the consequences of attributional processes as cognitive, such as expectancy of success and failure while others he classified as affective, such as pride, self-esteem, hopelessness, guilt, anger, pity, happiness, and sadness.

Empirical Research

Attribution theory in achievement. Over the past two decades many educators and psychologists have researched attribution theory in classroom settings as well as in experimental settings. In order to adequately investigate the analysis of attributions for problem classroom behavior and since I am studying a wide range of problem classroom behaviors, it is necessary to be acquainted with investigations that have been conducted in attribution theory. This study investigates role (teacher and student) and gender differences within different problem types. Considering role in this study will assess developmental issues in attribution theory. It is for these reasons that I include studies in this review that include gender, age/grade and describe a variety of situations. One of the areas of interest in
Figure 1: An attributional theory of motivation and emotion. Reproduced with permission.
attribution theory research was and still is academic achievement. Frieze and Snyder (1980) conducted a study of children's beliefs about the causes of success and failure in school settings held by first graders, third graders, and fifth graders. The subjects were shown pictures of different achievement situations and were told two stories along with the pictures, one with a positive outcome and one with a negative outcome. An outcome was considered positive if the actor's behavior resulted in success or had beneficial consequences, whereas a outcome was considered negative if the actor's behavior resulted in failure or had detrimental consequences. The four achievement situations included school testing, school art project, playing football, and catching frogs. They found that the major causal ascriptions across the situations were effort and ability along with interest for catching frogs and finishing an art project. They further found that these causal ascriptions in the academic testing situation were more internal than external compared to the art project, playing football, and catching frogs, and that children perceived success and failure to be under the child's control. Only a small percentage of the attributions were ascribed to luck or task difficulty and they also found that the causal ascriptions varied across situations. A child's belief structure or causal schemata is dependent on the child's level of maturity and experience in the situation.

Wolf and Savickas (1985) conducted research in the area of time perspective and causal attributions for achievement. In their study, time perspective refers to the subjective experience and use of time by 215 tenth-grade students. Their investigation considered effort and ability attributions for success and failure in achievement settings from an integrated time perspective dimension. Integrated time perspective includes inclinations to structure the future with events and goals (temporal continuity), evaluations of the achievability of goals with positive affect (optimism), and the use of present time in working toward goals (efficient time utilization). They found that the students who displayed a more integrated time perspective tended to attribute their success in achievement to their own effort and ability and their failures
to lack of effort. Students with a less integrated time perspective tended to attribute their achievement successes to luck and task ease and their failures to lack of ability, bad luck, and task difficulty.

Children's attributions for failure and success in reading was studied by Hiebert, Winoograd and Danner (1984). The subjects for this study consisted of 82 third-grade and 82 sixth-grade children. The subjects were administered a measure consisting of 24 items with an equal number of items dealing with evaluation of reading and comprehension of reading. The results indicated that the locus of control scores for the sixth grade subjects varied across situations, with the scores for the evaluation situations being significantly more internal than comprehension, while the internal/external scores of third grade subjects did not differ significantly across the two situations. They also found that age and achievement interacted in that low achieving third graders gave higher ratings for causes beyond their control than high achieving third graders, however, low and high achieving sixth graders did not differ in their ratings. Also, high-achieving third-grade children performed more similarly to sixth-grade children of both achievement levels than they did to the low-achieving third-grader.

Nicholls and Miller (1985) researched the differentiation of the concepts of luck and skill across grade levels, from kindergarten, second, fourth, sixth, and eighth-grade classes. As children matured in development from kindergarten to grade 8, there was a greater degree of differentiation between attributions to luck and skill on an achievement task. Children in the primary grades tended to attribute success and failure equally to luck and skill, whereas, students in grades 6 and 8 tended to attribute success and failure primarily to skill.

Research in attribution theory in academic settings has also been applied to special education. Licht, Kistner, Ozkaragoz, Shapiro, and Clausen (1985) studied individual differences in the causal attributions of learning disabled children and the relation between attributions and persistence. Thirty-eight learning disabled and 38 non-learning disabled
students were matched for age, sex, race, and IQ. Licht et al concluded that learning disabled girls were significantly more likely to attribute their difficulties to insufficient ability than non-learning disabled girls, but they did not differ in their tendency to attribute their difficulties to external factors. On the other hand, learning disabled boys were more likely to attribute their difficulties to external factors than non-learning disabled boys, but the two groups did not differ in their tendency to attribute their difficulties to insufficient ability.

Self-concept is another area which also has been researched in the context of attribution theory (Ames, 1978; Ames & Felker, 1979). Ames (1978) studied how self-concept as a trait related to children's achievement attributions and reinforcing behaviors in a competitive and noncompetitive context. A pool of 101 boys and 91 girls were administered an abbreviated version of the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale. Twenty-eight boys and 28 girls who scored in the top third and an equal number of boys and girls who scored in the bottom third of the Piers-Harris scale became the final sample. The subjects were randomly assigned, controlling for self-concept level and sex, to an outcome (success and failure) and then to reward structure (competitive and noncompetitive) conditions. After the subjects had completed puzzles, they were given a questionnaire to assess how much of their performance they attributed to ability, effort, luck, or task difficulty. She found that children with high self-concepts attributed success more to their high ability than did children with low self-concepts. A follow-up study on the effects of self-concept on children's causal attributions was conducted by Ames and Felker (1979). They also found that children with high self-concepts tend to attribute success to skill or ability more frequently than children with low self-concepts, but both groups attributed failure to lack of skill or ability.

Ability and effort have received much attention and have been found to be the major causal ascriptions in research in academic achievement situations (Frieze & Snyder, 1980; Licht et al. 1985; Wolf & Savickas, 1985). Maturation was found to be major factor in the
formulation of a child's belief structure or causal schemata (Frieze & Snyder, 1980; Hiebert et al. 1984; Nicholls & Miller, 1985) and self-concept was found to correlate with ascriptions of ability -- children with high self-concepts attributed success more to high ability than did children with low self-concepts (Ames, 1978; Ames & Felker, 1979). Affect (emotions) and affective consequences have become a focus as well in more recent investigations in determining possible linkages between cognition and affect.

**Affects in attribution.** Components of attribution theory and their affective consequences have been extensively researched (Brown & Weiner, 1984; Covington & Omelich, 1979a, 1979b, 1979c, 1981, 1984,1985; Weiner, 1982; Weiner et al. 1979). It must be noted here that the subjects for much of the research in attribution theory were college undergraduate students. In his complete attribution theory, Weiner (1982, 1984, 1985) describes the affective consequences of causal ascription such as guilt, shame, pride, hopelessness, self-esteem, anger, gratitude, and pity. Weiner et al. (1979) conducted two experiments on the cognition-emotion process or linkages in achievement contexts. In the first experiment 79 male and female college students were presented with a questionnaire containing 12 achievement conditions, each of which consisted of an outcome determined by one of six causes. While reading the situations the subjects were asked to try and recall a time when they had been in such a situation. If they could recall such a situation, they were then asked to describe it in as much detail as possible. They were also asked how they felt in the situation using three affective labels to describe their emotional reactions. The results indicated that affects such as happiness and disappointment are independent of attributions but dependent on outcomes. They did find some relationships between affects and causal dimensions. In success, internal attributions are linked with the affects related to personal self-esteem (competence, confidence, and pride), whereas external attributions were linked with affects such as gratitude, thankfulness, surprise and guilt, and require an outside causal agent.
In failure situations, internal attributions increase feelings of guilt whereas external attributions increase feelings of anger and surprise. In the second experiment the subjects were 48 male and female university students. The subjects were presented with 12 scenarios and scales for the six causal ascriptions used in the study -- ability, unstable effort, stable effort, task difficulty, others, and luck. The results indicated that individuals can use emotional cues to infer why success or failure has occurred.

Covington and Omelich (1979a) conducted a path analysis to determine whether attributions are causal influences on expectancy for success and shame. Four hundred and thirty-nine students enrolled in an introductory psychology course were given two equivalent multiple-choice tests after two instructional units. If students performed poorly on the first test and wished to improve, they had the option of taking the second test. Two hundred and six students (100 females and 106 males) who considered their performance on the first test as unsuccessful and chose to do the second test served as subjects for the study. After the students had completed the first test and were given the results, they were asked to complete a questionnaire which measured their causal ascriptions for failure, affective reactions, and grade expectancy. Their performance on the retest served as the performance measure. Covington and Omelich found that achievement motive groups did not differ in performance scores as a consequence of different attributions made for a previous failure, and that although the effort and ability attributions do contribute to negative affect and future expectancy, these causal relationships are not always in the predicted direction. In their view when attributions are expressed postdictively, they are considered reactions to performance rather than causes of performance.

In a subsequent study Covington and Omelich (1979b) investigated self-worth theory as it relates to classroom learning, specifically considering student effort. They were interested in studying ability estimates in failure, affective reactions to failure, teacher-student value
conflict, and the extent to which low ability ascriptions, and the affective reactions in failure are
influenced by differences in academic self-concept among men and women. The subjects
were 360 students enrolled in an introductory psychology course who were given a
questionnaire containing several hypothetical achievement situations involving failure on a
college examination. Each subject was to imagine as having failed the test. Conditions under
which students failed varied along two dimensions: the degree of effort expended (high or
low) and the presence or absence of excuses. Ability was estimated from two perspectives:
the students' estimates of their own ability and their estimates of the level of inability level
along the effort/excuse dimensions that they expected their peers to attribute to them. The
subjects were asked to rate their affective reactions of shame and dissatisfaction. They found
that the importance of effort and ability attributions depended on whether the individual was
the student (actor) or teacher (observer). Students who try hard and fail are less severely
punished than those who do not try hard. The findings supported the theoretical perspective
of attribution theory in that low effort appears to be sufficient in explaining failure, however
when students try hard, then attributions to inability increased dramatically. They also
concluded that affect is dependent on perceived ability.

Covington, Spratt and Omelich (1980) obtained similar results when they investigated
student and teacher reactions to effort stability in failure. The role of repeated failure attribu-
tions was investigated by Covington and Omelich (1981) using college students as subjects.
This research corroborated the findings of previous research that self-perception of ability is a
central causal aspect of achievement behavior. Failure leads to lowered self-estimates of ability
which in turn results in lowered success expectancies. Repeated failures accelerates the
negative effects on affect and cognitions when there are no external explanations for failure.
As failures continue to mount, effort expenditure becomes a more plausible explanation for
inability at a time when ability ascriptions become more powerful as contributors of further
hopelessness. They feel that this research gives direct support to recent learned helplessness formulations (Abramson et al. 1978).

Covington and Omelich (1979c) also studied student and teacher evaluative responses to successful effort. The subjects for this study were 180 male and 180 female students in an introductory psychology course. The procedure and measures were similar to the 1979b study except that instead of investigating level of teacher punishment for failure, they investigated level of teacher reward for success. They found both ability and effort attributions enhanced positive affect in success and that pride and satisfaction were the resulting positive affects. They further found that teachers and students were compatible in the value placed on effort in successful achievement situations.

Brown and Weiner (1984) studied the affective consequences of ability versus effort ascriptions. They conducted a series of experiments to investigate the affective consequences of ability and effort, concluding that shame is associated with guilt and lack of effort in failure situations, that public shame is associated with humiliation and low ability, that humiliation and guilt are unrelated negative affects, and that pride and shame are linked to effort expenditures. Weiner and Brown (1984) further stated that the effort-guilt linkage is particularly evident in the research in that failure due to lack of effort produces guilt feelings. Failure due to lack of ability results in feelings of shame and humiliation. Brown and Weiner (1984) and Covington and Omelich (1979b, 1979c) agree that pride is the product of both effort and ability in success situations.

Covington and Omelich (1985) studied values that failure-avoiding and failure-accepting students ascribe to ability and effort. They conclude that shame is experienced in failure situations in which students expend much effort and yet fail. High effort and failure implies low ability and students feel humiliated. These findings further clarify the causal role of effort and ability cognitions in eliciting negative affect following achievement failure.
Anderson (1983) conducted research investigating the causal structures for each of four types of situations consisting of interpersonal failure, noninterpersonal failure, interpersonal success, and noninterpersonal success. The subjects for this study were 9 male and 15 female undergraduate students. Each subject was given a booklet containing the instructions and materials which were descriptions of events common to college students in each of four categories: interpersonal failure, noninterpersonal failure, interpersonal success, and noninterpersonal success. There were five situations for each of the four categories. From the data the first generated cause of each situation was typed on a card. Two judges examined these causes and combined those with similar meanings. This process resulted in 63 different causes. A second group of students, 7 males and 15 females, were asked to sort the 63 causal cards into piles that seemed to go together. This activity yielded a total of 12 clusters of causes. A third group of students, 10 males and 11 females, were asked to rate the 63 causes on each of 6 causal dimensions. The dimensions used in this research included: changeability, locus, globality, stability, intentionality, and controllability. The results indicated that different types of causes were generated for the different situations, that the different situations resulted in the generation of causes that differed in dimensional location, and that the various causal dimensions were highly correlated.

Ward and Thomas (1985) studied the interrelationships of locus of control item content dimensions and hopelessness. They administered items from the Rotter, Adult Nowicki-Strickland and the Levenson locus-of-control scales and from the Beck Hopelessness Scale to 58 male and 139 female college students. All items were presented in a 5-choice (strongly agree to strongly disagree) response format. The results indicated that the hopelessness, helplessness and powerlessness affects are highly correlated with the ascriptions in the locus of control dimension of luck, fate, or chance and the internal/external control dichotomy.
Research has indicated that causal dimensions and affects are linked. Success in academic achievement situations tend to result in feelings (internal attributions) of competence, pride, confidence and feelings (external attributions) of gratitude, thankfulness, and suprise (Covington & Omelich, 1979c; Weiner et al. 1979). Failure in academic achievement situations, on the other hand, results in feelings of guilt, anger, surprise, shame and humiliation (Brown & Weiner, 1984; Covington & Omelich, 1979a, 1979b, 1981, 1985; Covington, Spratt, & Omelich, 1980; Weiner et al. 1979). Failure was also found to affect future expectancy (Covington & Omelich, 1979a) and hopelessness and helplessness (Covington & Omelich, 1981; Ward & Thomas, 1985). Another important finding was that the perception of effort and ability attributions was dependent on whether the individual was a teacher or a student (Covington & Omelich, 1979b; Covington et al. 1980). Most of the early research has investigated attributions in academic achievement situations, however, in the last few years some researchers have extended the study of attribution theory and concomitant affects to other behaviors such as judgements of help-giving (Weiner, 1980), classroom behaviors (Rohrkemper, 1985; Maas et al. 1978), and cheating (Forsyth et al. 1985).

**Gender differences.** A great deal of research has also been conducted in the last two decades investigating gender differences in attribution theory and affects about attributions, although I will describe only some of the studies which were conducted in the last several years. Studies which investigated gender differences in educational settings at elementary, secondary, and university levels were chosen from an ERIC search. Sweeney, Moreland, and Gruber (1982) investigated gender differences in performance attributions, more specifically, in regard to student explanations for personal success and failure. The subjects were 78 female and 88 male undergraduate social psychology students who received information about a midterm examination one week after taking the examination and one week after that they were asked to complete a questionnaire to assess their reactions to the course,
attributions, and affective reactions. The results indicated that female students made stronger luck attributions than did males. Female students did not make stronger task difficulty attributions than did males. There were no significant differences in effort or ability attributions for male and female students. They did obtain significant gender X test outcome for all four attribution measures. Female students tended to make stronger luck attributions than did male students when they failed; the luck attributions for male and female students were equally strong when they succeeded. Female students who failed made stronger task difficulty attributions than did the male students, however, when students succeeded, the task difficulty attributions of female students were weaker than those of the male students. Female students made weaker effort attributions than did male students when they failed, however, this tendency was reversed when the students succeeded with female students making stronger effort attributions than the male students. Most of the students tended to make internal attributions for success and external attributions for failure, however, these attributions were stronger for female students than for male students. There were no major significant differences for affective reactions to success and failure between male and female students.

Parsons, Meece, Adler, and Kaczala (1982) conducted research to investigate gender differences in attributions and learned helplessness in math. Their subjects were 180 females and 150 males from fifth to eleventh grade who were given a questionnaire which assessed the four major attributions, their expectations for their performance in both current and future math courses, and their self-concept in math. The results indicate that females tended to attribute their success and failures to skill more so than did the boys, while the male students were more likely than females to attribute their success and failures to effort. There were no significant gender differences for internal versus external attributions for success and failure. Both male and female students tended to attribute success and failure to internal causes
rather than external causes. Also, there were no significant sex differences for internal controllable and internal uncontrallable attributions for success and failure. Rank order data indicated that male students ranked ability as a more important cause of success than did female students, whereas female students ranked consistent effort as a more important cause of success than the male students. On the other hand, failure obtained the opposite results, male students ranked the importance of lack of ability as a cause for failure lower than did the female students while consistent effort was ranked higher by the male students than the female students. In regard to attitude, there were no significant gender differences other than the female students tended to have lower future expectancy scores than did the male students.

Another study was conducted by Travis, Burnett-Doering and Reid (1982) in the impact of sex, achievement domain, and conceptual orientation on causal attributions. The subjects for their study were 84 female and 59 male undergraduate psychology students who were asked to write an account of achievement of some goal in the past year and an account of an event in which they did not achieve some goal. After the achievement account they were asked to indicate to what extent the achievement was due to ability or skill. After the non-achievement of goal account, the subjects were asked to indicate to what extent this failure was due to lack of ability or skill. The results indicated that subjects tended to attribute success more to internal than to external attributions. The results yielded higher scores for unstable than stable attributions for the achievement or success account. Female students tended to attribute success more to the unstable attributions of effort and luck moreso than the male students, whereas, the male students tended to attribute success to the stable attributions of ability and task moreso than the female students. There were no simple or clear sex differences for the failure event.
Bond and Deming (1982) conducted two experiments to investigate children's causal attributions for performance on sex-stereotypic tasks. The subjects in experiment 1 were approximately equal numbers of female and male (total 165) students from the third, fifth, and eleventh grades. After some class discussion about factors that affect people's performance on tasks, specifically, luck, skill, effort, task difficulty, the students were presented with drawings depicting adolescents performing tasks. The drawings varied from one another in regard to sex of the actor, sex of the task (masculine oriented versus female oriented), and outcome (success or failure). There were no significant effects of the sex of the observer or subject. There was a grade X attribution interaction in which children of all three grade levels seldom used luck to explain performance and were most likely to use effort and skill to explain performance, but the fifth graders placed more emphasis on effort than did either the third or eleventh graders. There were significant results on a four-way interaction of actor sex X outcome X task X attribution. Generally, effort was used to explain success more than failure, however, the degree to which effort was used varied with whether the task was stereotyped as sex-appropriate to the actor. Success on "sex-appropriate" tasks was attributed to effort more often than success on "sex-inappropriate" tasks. Lack of effort was more often emphasized for failure on "sex-appropriate" tasks than for failure on "sex-inappropriate" tasks. Further analysis revealed that males' failures on "sex-appropriate" tasks were attributed primarily to lack of effort, whereas females' failures on "sex-appropriate" tasks were attributed equally to lack of skill and lack of effort. Females' failures on "sex-inappropriate" tasks were most often attributed to task difficulty which also was the attribution used to explain this type of failure situation more than any other attribution. Males failures on feminine-stereotyped tasks were most often attributed to lack of skill. The subjects for experiment 2 consisted of a new sample of 163 students from the third, fifth, and eleventh grades. The procedure was identical to that
in experiment 1 except that two new task stimuli were used. The results of this study were identical to those of the first study.

Rogers (1980) also studied the development of sex differences in evaluations of others' success and failures. The subjects for this study consisted of 240 children from three different age groups of which the average ages were 9 years 5 months, 12 years 1 month, and 15 years 9 months. The subjects were provided with 16 different versions of, "Bill is good at arithmetic. He tries hard to do the 10 problems. He gets 8 out of 10 correct." These versions, consisting of changes to sex of the person described, ability level, effort level, and outcome, were printed on separate sheets. The subjects were asked to make judgements about boys only or girls only. The subjects were told that the descriptions were accounts of how other children 'like them' had performed on a recent test. They were told to read and consider carefully all the details of each description and then to evaluate each child. The results for the age X ability interaction indicated that only the 15 year old boys gave greater rewards for lack of ability than for its presence. In the age X effort interaction, the rewards for positive effort increase with age with the greatest increase between 9 and 12 years. Also lack of effort is punished more by the older groups. Age also interacted with outcome and the results indicate that the judgements for failure become less severe with age while the judgements for success vary with the 9 year olds giving the most extreme rating, the 12 year olds giving the least extreme rating, and the 15 year olds giving more extreme rating than the 12 year olds yielding a significant difference between the 9 and 12 year olds. The sex of subject X effort interaction results indicate that girls tend to place more emphasis on effort than do boys. The results of the age X sex of subject X outcome and the age X sex of subject X sex of person judged X outcome interactions indicate that for boys the outcome information has a decreasing effect on judgements made across ages. Girls tend to show no significant difference between judging boys or girls in regard to outcome information, while boys tend to
place more importance on outcome information when they are judging boys than when they are judging girls. The oldest and youngest girls gave the higher scores for judgements of positive and negative outcomes. Boys' judgements about positive outcomes do not differentiate between the sexes and show only slight significance relative to ages. Boys' judgements about negative outcomes differ greatly for age and sex of person judged. The 9 year old boys punish girls significantly more for failure than they do boys, while 15 year old boys tend to punish their sex for failure more severely and, in fact, they actually reward girls for failure.

Callaghan and Manstead (1983) studied the effects of performance outcome and sex of the subject on the causal attributions for task performance. The subjects for their study were 70 sixth-form students (34 female, 36 male) with a mean age of 16 years 8 months who were asked to complete a questionnaire containing attributions for the outcome of the General Certificate of Education O-level examination, results of which had been received four months previously. The subjects were also divided into four groups for two experimental tasks and asked to complete a questionnaire of attributions about the outcome of these tasks. Before the practice and main tasks the subjects were asked to rate the number of correct solutions they expected to achieve out of a total of 10. The four conditions were from the two performance outcomes (success and failure) on two successive tasks (practice and main). The four conditions, then, were success followed by success, success followed by failure, failure followed by success, failure followed by failure.

The results indicated that those who failed on the practice had higher expectations than those who succeeded. The students who succeeded on the main task were more pleased with their public examination results than the students who failed on the main task. Ability attributions were stronger following practice failure than following success. Performance outcome on the practice task also had a significant effect on the ability
attributions following the main task. Students who failed on the practice task provided stronger ability attributions for main task performance than students who succeeded on the practice task. Students who failed the main task made stronger ability attributions for this outcome than the students who succeeded on the main task. There were no significant differences for effort attributions following the practice task, however, a three-way interaction between practice outcome, main task outcome, and sex of subject had a significant effect on effort attributions following the main task. Males made stronger effort attributions than females on all conditions except for practice failure followed by main task success, where female effort attributions were much stronger than those of the males. Males made stronger task difficulty attributions than females for practice task performance as well as for main task performance. Students who failed on the main task made stronger task difficulty attributions than did the students who succeeded on the main task. Students who failed on the practice task made stronger luck attributions than students who succeeded, a result that was true also for students who failed the main task. Internality attributions were stronger for females than for males for practice task performance as well as for main task performance. Callaghan and Manstead (1983) suggest that these sex differences are a reflection of the stronger task difficulty (external) attributions made by males for performance on both practice and main tasks. Students who failed on the practice task made more internal attributions for main task performance than students who had succeeded on the practice task. Students who succeeded on the main task made more internal attributions for that outcome than the students who failed. There was a significant interaction between main task performance due to practice task outcome and sex of the subject which indicate that females who had failed on the practice task were much more likely than males to make internal attributions for main task performance. Stability attributions for practice task performance did not vary significantly, while
for main task performance, students who failed made stronger attributions to stable factors than did the students who succeeded.

Chandler, Shama, and Wolf (1983) extended attribution research by conducting a study investigating gender differences in achievement and affiliation attributions across five nations: India, Japan, South Africa, the United States, and Yugoslavia. The participants consisted of 684 (314 males, 370 females) university students (age range 19 to 24) enrolled in teacher training, physical sciences, and social science. The students were administered a Multidimensional-Multiattributional Casaulity Scale (MMCS), as part of their regular class assignment, consisting of 24 items tapping the achievement domain and 24 items tapping the affiliative domain. There were 6 items for each of the four attributions (ability, effort, task, luck) randomized across success and failure within each domain.

On achievement attributions there was a significant difference between males and females for task where females attributed their achievement more significantly than males to task factors. This result contributed to the finding that females were significantly more internal overall than males. There was a significant three-way interaction between country, gender, and success/failure where Indian females attributed their achievement success, but not their failures, significantly less to task factors. Also, South African males and Yugoslavian females attributed their failures significantly more than their success to task factors. There was also a significant gender X success/failure interaction for ability attributions where both males and females attributed their successes to ability significantly more than failures to lack of ability. A significant gender X success/failure interaction occurred on the stability dimension, as well as a significant country X gender X success/failure interaction. Both genders believed the attributional causes were significantly more changeable (that is, unstable) for their failures than for their successes. On the other hand, females attributed their achievement successes to unstable causes more significantly than males. For failure, males attributed it more significantly
to unstable causes than did females. Japanese and American men also held significantly stronger beliefs in unstable or changeable causes for failures than for successes.

For affiliation attributions, females attributed social affiliation significantly more to ability, effort, and overall internal causes. Significant country X gender interactions indicated that Indian and Japanese females make higher internal attributions than did males. The country X gender X success/failure interaction also revealed significant effects. Scheffe' comparisons indicated that Indian males attributed social failure significantly less to internal causes than females for both success and failure. The results also indicated that both Japanese males and females believed that they were more responsible for their social failures than for their successes. On the other hand, females believed that they were more responsible for both their successes and failures than males. South African females held stronger beliefs than males that they were more responsible for their successes than their failures. In America, both genders were more internal for success than females were for failure. Also, females provided more internal attributions for success than males provided for failure.

Research has indicated that gender differences do exist in attribution theory. Females provide stronger internal attributions for success and external attributions for failure (Callaghan & Manstead, 1983; Chandler et al., 1983; Sweeney et al., 1982). The results indicated mixed results of effort and ability for males and females in regard to success and failure, however, generally, girls tend to place more emphasis on effort (Rogers, 1980), however, the reverse was also found (Parsons et al., 1982). Achievement was considered to be more unstable than stable with females attributing success more to the unstable conditions of effort and luck than males, whereas males tend to attribute success more to the stable conditions of ability and task (Travis et al., 1982), whereas, achievement outcome was attributed to unstable causes dependent on the gender of the participant (Chandler et al., 1983). Gender of actor was considered to be a significant variable in determining attributes (Bond & Deming, 1982;
Rogers, 1980). The thesis has considered attribution theory in the academic achievement setting, affects associated with the attributions made in regard to success and failure, and now gender differences in the types of attributions made in achievement settings. Since a major focus of this investigation is on problem classroom behavior, it is now necessary to turn to a discussion of relevant research in this area in order to determine attribution theory has been applied to various interpersonal behaviors.

Attribution and behavior. As reflected in the foregoing part of the review the majority of attribution research has been concerned with achievement contexts and associated affects. While the research on students' and teachers' perceptions of disruptive or disordered behavior has not been prolific, there is some recent research. Donnan and Pipes (1985) conducted research with counsellor trainees in assessing whether they attributed their and others' behavior to traits or situations, or an interaction of the two. Participants in the study included 26 women and 11 men enrolled in a master's degree program in counsellor education who were given several paragraphs in random order, each of which described possible explanations for causes of human behavior: traits, situations, interaction, child rearing, education, and sex. Of the total sample 20 students were asked about the causes for "your own behavior", and 17 students were asked about causes for "someone else's behavior". After the students had read all the statements they were told to read each statement again and then on a 100-point scale, rate the likelihood that the theory is a valid or true explanation of their own behavior (or someone else's behavior). After all the statements had been evaluated, the students were asked to select one statement they considered most valid. The results indicated that the trainees rated interaction among traits and situations highly as an explanation for behavior. From an attribution perspective they tended to attribute their own behavior to external causes and others' behavior to internal causes.
Weiner (1980) conducted six experiments investigating the relations of causal attributions and affect to judgements of help-giving. In the first experiment he examined the causal dimensions of locus, stability, and control on judgements for lending class notes. The subjects for experiment 1 were 15 male and 15 female students enrolled in an introductory psychology course who were presented with 16 scenarios, 8 with a "professor" theme and 8 with an "employer" theme, and were asked to judge the likelihood for help-giving. The "professor" theme conveyed that the student always (stable) or sometimes (unstable) did not take notes because of something to do with himself (internal) or something to do with the professor (external). Also, the student either was unable to take notes (uncontrollable) or did not try (controllable). The "employer" theme conveyed that the student did not have the notes because he (or the boss) always (or sometimes) was responsible for him coming late to school which he could (or could not) have avoided. After the presentation of the causal statements the subjects were asked to rate the likelihood of lending their class notes to the student. The results indicated that interpersonal judgements are definitely influenced by perceived personal control.

In the second experiment (Weiner, 1980) the subjects were 40 male and female students who were presented with scenarios depicting a person falling - in one scenario this person is carrying a black cane and is apparently ill, while in the alternate scenario the person is carrying a liquor bottle in a paper bag and smells of liquor. The subjects are asked to make a statement describing their feelings as if they were in the situation observing the scene. The subjects were also asked to rate the causes of the falling behavior on a bipolar scale for each causal dimension: locus (internal-external), stability (permanent-temporary), and controllability (controllable - uncontrollable). The results yielded many affects which were classified into the following categories: sympathy, concern, negative affect toward the person, general discomfort, fear, caution, surprise, positive action, apathy, personal shortcomings, information
seeking, description, and unclassified. The highest category for both ill and drunk person was sympathy and for the drunk person negative affect toward the person was also very high in percentage of reactions as opposed to the negative affect toward the ill person. These results indicate that affect also mediates judgments of help-giving. The ratings of the three causal dimensions indicated that drunkenness was more controllable and internal than illness, while there was no difference for the stability dimension.

The subjects for experiment 3 (Weiner, 1980) consisted of 28 male and female university students who were presented with the same two scenarios (ill and drunk person) as in experiment 2. After the presentation of the scenarios the subjects were asked to rate the degree to which the cause was perceived as personally controllable (under personal control-not under personal control), their feelings of sympathy and pity (a great deal-none), their feelings of disgust and distaste (a great deal-none), and their likelihood of helping (definitely would help-definitely would not help). The results indicate that perceptions of personal control were negatively related to feelings of sympathy, positively related to feelings of disgust, and negatively related to judgements of help. Also, sympathy was positively related to judged help-giving, while disgust was negatively related to judged help-giving.

The attributions and affects believed to mediate help-giving were manipulated in experiments 4 and 5 by providing the levels of personal control or the affects in the situation. The results indicate that regardless of the perceptions of personal control and the specified affects, falling because of drunkenness versus illness results in different judgements of help-giving, such that more help was warranted for the latter than the former. Experiment 6 (Weiner, 1980) followed the same procedure as 4 and 5, however the following three variables were investigated: drunk-ill, attributions, and affects. The results indicate that the person most likely to be helped was the ill person, the cause was perceived to be external (not under
personal control), and the affective reaction was sympathy. Weiner summarizes the general findings as follows:

First, there is no doubt that there is a union between drunkenness, perceived personal control, negative outward-directed affective reactions, and judgments to neglect, as well as between illness, perceived lack of personal control, positive outward-directed affective reactions, and judgments to help.... It also is quite clear that affective reactions are an important determinant of stated reports about helping.... Finally, thoughts about personal control at best only weakly exert direct influence on helping judgments.... It appears that much of the relation between the judgments of personal control and rated help exists because perceptions of control are strongly related to affective reactions. (p. 196).

In other words, a temporal attribution-affect-action sequence is hypothesized to exist in which the attributions guide the feelings which then result in behavior. Attributions of uncontrollable factors elicited a positive emotional reaction (sympathy) and resulted in helping behavior, whereas attributions of controllable factors such as lack of effort elicited a negative emotional reaction (disgust, anger) and resulted in avoidance behavior. In the preceding research it is evident that the antecedents for certain behaviors determine to a large extent the types of attributions made. Since the focus of this investigation is on the problem behaviors that occur in classrooms, it is now necessary to consider some definitions of problem behavior and the kinds of problem classroom behaviors which will be considered for this investigation.
Problem Behavior

It is useful to conceptualize classroom behavior as actions along a continuum of disruptive to nondisruptive. Problem behavior often has different meanings for different people as well as different meanings in different contexts such as self-contained special classes, regular classrooms (e.g., during reading time, art class or math class) or in students' homes. This section describes definitions of disruptive or problem behavior and the contexts or situations in which it occurs.

A great deal of research has been conducted in attempts to define classroom disruptive behavior or classroom misbehavior. However, much of this research has been conducted with populations of special students, that is, students who have been diagnosed as behaviorally disordered, generally using the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual for Mental Disorders (3rd. ed.) (1980) criteria, and who generally have been placed in special classes. Frequently these children are labelled as emotionally disturbed, behaviorally disordered, or socially maladjusted. Bower's (1969) definition of disturbed or emotional disturbance is used by educators. He defines disturbed and emotionally handicapped students as "those who exhibit one or more of five characteristics to a marked extent and over a long period of time:

1. An inability to learn which cannot be explained by intellectual, sensory, or health factors...
2. An inability to build or maintain satisfactory interpersonal relationships with peers and teachers...
3. Inappropriate types of behavior or feelings under normal conditions...
4. A general, pervasive mood of unhappiness or depression...
5. A tendency to develop physical symptom, pains, or fears associated with personal or school problems." (pp. 22-23).
Questionable in this definition are terms such as *marked extent* and *long period of time* since the parameters for these terms are not specified.

Several researchers have attempted to describe the general behavior patterns of disturbed children. Epstein, Kaufmann, and Cullinan (1985) obtained a list of school behaviors through parent and teacher ratings describing characteristics of seriously emotionally disturbed children. Such children (a) disrupt other children, (b) are compulsive, (c) do not complete required work, (d) are destructive to own and others' belongings, (e) do not follow commands of authority figures, (f) are undependable, (g) exhibit inappropriate behaviors, (h) are unhappy or depressed, and (i) develop poor interpersonal relationships. They further state that the primary factors in children's behavior disorders consists of aggression and classroom disruption. Slade and Saudargas (1986) found that there was a reliable difference in the behaviors exhibited by behaviorally disordered students in a resource room and students in a regular classroom, suggesting that behavior settings influence these behaviors. Kazdin (1987) describes some conduct disorders as chronic lying, stealing, physical violence leading to injury, and fire-setting.

These definitions all describe children with severe behavior disorders, however the purpose of this study is to study 'normal' classroom disruptive behavior, that is, those misbehaviors that normally occur in most regular classrooms, not severely socially maladjusted or emotionally disturbed children. The purpose of this research is to consider normal classroom misbehavior in the context of attribution theory. The classroom misbehaviors considered in this study are those that occur primarily in a normal social context of peer interrelationships.

Rohrkemper (1985) conducted research in which she studied individual differences in students' perceptions of routine classroom events. As part of her investigation she studied children's perceptions of student misbehavior and teacher behavior toward the misbehaving student. The subjects for the study consisted of 8 elementary teachers and selected
students from their classes. The students came from two different groups: the first group consisted of students who were difficult to teach and the second group consisted of students who were not troublesome. For the first group, each teacher was asked to identify one male and one female student who best represented one of a range of behavior patterns categorized by three levels of problem ownership: teacher-owned problems (underachievers, aggressive, and defiant students), student-owned problems (low achievers, failure-syndrome students, and those rejected by peers), teacher-student shared problems (hyperactive, distractible, and shy students). This process resulted in the selection of 32 students (4 per classroom, 2 boys and 2 girls) who were representative of each of the three levels of problem ownership. The second group consisted of 48 students (6 per classroom, 3 boys and 3 girls) selected by the teachers as being not difficult and who were a pleasure to teach. The students were asked to respond, via a questionnaire in an interview, to 3 vignettes depicting the three levels of ownership: underachievement (teacher-owned), hyperactivity (teacher-student shared), and low achievement (student-owned). The results indicated that non-problem student observers held hyperactive children accountable for their distracting behavior and responded negatively to the hyperactive character. The problem student observers attributed the hyperactive behavior in the vignette to external causes and that the behavior was unintentional. The non-problem student observers held underachieving students responsible for disruptive behavior since the behavior was considered to be intentional and controllable by the student, whereas, the low-achieving students were not held blameworthy since their difficulties were seen as a result of unintentional and uncontrollable factors. The students expressed negative affect toward the underachieving vignette characters they considered responsible for the misbehavior, whereas they felt sympathetic toward the low-achieving vignette characters.
Rohrkemper (1987) stated that students generally understand the relationship between teachers' perceptions and attributions of student behavior and the subsequent teacher behaviors as responses to the perceptions and attributions. She found that students' perceptions of each other "operated on a similar attribution/accountability principle" (p. 7), but that their perceptions of each other and their subsequent behaviors toward each other were based on differently perceived needs. Her results indicated that students need to understand their teachers' perceptions and expectations. Rohrkemper also concluded that teacher socialization style significantly influenced student adaptation to classroom routines and procedures. The differences in perceptions and the subsequent behavioral responses of the teachers and students to their perceptions and expectations holds wide implications for academic learning and classroom management.

Reed and Busby (1987) studied teacher perceptions of classroom management and discipline problems. The subjects in their study consisted of a stratified sample of teachers from eight school districts in central Virginia. Their study indicated that of 15 discipline problems, the teacher sample perceived inattentiveness (57.6%), talking at inappropriate times (66.4%), and avoidance of work (48.0%) as the three discipline areas of most concern. The authors stated that these problems were related to teacher organization and planning as well as student responses to their environment.

Maas et al. (1978) conducted research in children's conceptions of disordered behavior. The subjects for this study consisted of 60 children (20 from each of grades 2, 4, and 6, half male and half female) from a middle-class, suburban school. The children were presented, visually and aurally, with 3 vignettes portraying three types of disordered behavior: anti-social, self-punitive, and withdrawn behavior. After the children had read and heard the vignettes, they were interviewed individually with questions designed to determine the causes of the disordered behavior as well as affects associated with the disordered behaviors.
They found that children in the sixth grade attributed the cause of disordered behaviors to social/environmental factors more frequently than did the children in the second grade. Further, the older children were more likely to believe that the behaviors could be changed by changing the social environment, in other words, implying that the disordered behaviors were considered as uncontrollable by the actors. Another important finding was that the antisocial actor was viewed as wanting to behave as s/he did by more children of all ages than was either of the other two actors.

Forsyth et al. (1985) conducted research in cheating behavior. The subjects for the study were 39 male and 12 female college students who were exposed to an experimental situation in which cheating behavior was readily engaged in after prompts from the experimenter and a confederate student that a certain number of correct answers were needed. The answer sheet for the assignment was easily accessible. Forsyth et al found that the cheating students externalized the causes of their cheating behavior and supplied various excuses. They feel that those who cheat insulate themselves from the consequences of their behavior, especially damage to self-esteem. As a result of this research they feel that cheating behavior can be reduced by shifting the attributions for cheating from external to internal causes.

The study of attribution theory and concomitant affects in the last few years has been extended to include other behaviors such as judgements of help-giving (Weiner, 1980), classroom behaviors (Maas et al. 1978; Rohrkemper, 1985), and cheating (Forsyth et al. 1985). Not only were the dimensions of locus and stability investigated, but also controllability (Donnan & Pipes, 1985). It is now necessary to consider research describing attempts at formulating definitions of problem behavior.
Definitions

The purpose of this research is to add to this body of knowledge by investigating classroom behavior from an attribution perspective (Brophy & Rohr kemper, 1981) and including a comparison of student and teacher perceptions of the causal ascriptions and affects of various classroom behaviors since differences have been found to be significant in previous research (Covington & Omelich, 1979b; Covington et al. 1980).

For Charles (1981), "misbehavior means student actions that disrupt, destroy, defy, hurt, or infringe on others' rights. It includes such specific categories of acts as cruelty, disrespect, boisterousness, cheating, fighting, name-calling, sarcasm, defiance, and apathy" (p. 4). In defining aggressiveness Stewart (1981) states "aggressive behavior includes fighting with other children in the neighbourhood and at school, constant teasing of other children, extreme competitiveness, physical attacks on adults, and verbal abuse of adults" (p. 355), and, "aggressiveness is usually associated with disobedience and with a cluster of traits (sometimes known as temperament) which, for these children, includes impulsivity, Impatience, quick temper, and recklessness" (p. 356). Stewart (1981) defines disobedience and resistance to discipline as including, "not following directions, not paying attention to requests or doing the opposite, disregarding household rules, and being defiant or disrespectful" (p. 365-366). Many of the definitions of behaviors presented so far reflect interpersonal relationships or social skills.

Social skills may be thought of as "those behaviors that involve interaction between the child and his peers or adults, where the primary intent is the achievement of the child's or adult's goals through positive interactions" (Cartledge & Milburn, 1986, p. 8). In discussions about classroom misbehaviors in a social context, that is, interpersonal relationships, misbehaviors can be considered as deficits or excesses in social skills. However, these deficits or excesses may be due to a variety of reasons such as stress or misconceptions about
social conventions. Stephens (1978) developed a social skills curriculum for the elementary schools which included various skills under the headings of self-related behaviors, task-related behaviors, environmental behaviors, and interpersonal behaviors. The self-related behaviors include: accepting consequences, ethical behavior, expressing feelings, positive attitude toward self, responsible behavior, and self care. The task-related behaviors include: asking and answering questions, attending behavior, classroom discussion, completing tasks, following directions, group activities, independent work, on-task behavior, performing before others, and quality of work. Environmental behaviors include: care for the environment, dealing with emergencies, lunchroom behavior, and movement around the environment. The interpersonal behaviors include: accepting authority, coping with conflict, gaining attention, greeting others, helping others, making conversation, organized play, positive attitude toward others, and playing informally. Classroom misbehavior or 'normal' behavior problems can be considered as the absence of or lack in the use or knowledge of some of these social skills.

Barber and Allan (1986) conducted a needs assessment survey of 200 elementary school teachers of which 61% returned the survey sheet. The survey included four general areas of classroom behavior: academic, social, emotional, and physical. The academic area indicated the following percentages of problem behavior on the returned survey sheets: daydreaming during worktime - 57%, difficulty in completing tasks - 40%, difficulty in starting tasks - 27%, and failing to complete homework - 26%. In the social area the results were as follows: inappropriate talking - 57%, pushing and hitting in class - 37%, tardiness - 37%, fighting out of class - 35%, out of seat - 34%, negative peer influence - 34%, name calling - 30%. The emotional area yielded the following results: lying - 38%, shyness - 35%, sadness and depression - 27%, dependency on teacher - 27%, and temper tantrums - 26%.

Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) studied the influence of problem ownership of teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. The problem
behaviors that they define are failure syndrome, perfectionism, underachiever, low achiever, hostile aggressive, passive aggressive, defiant, hyperactive, short attention span/distractible, immature, rejected by peers, and shy/withdrawn. They describe failure syndrome as a problem in which children are convinced that they cannot do the work. The behavior includes avoidance of beginning a task or giving up too easily. When they do perform the task the expectancy is for failure even if they have been successful on occasion. Perfectionists are children who exhibit unnecessary anxiety about making mistakes in their work. They tend to set unrealistically high standards for themselves so they are never satisfied with their work even when they should be. Underachievers are children who place very little value on school work and will do only enough to satisfy the requirements of a particular assignment. Low achievers are children who have difficulty doing the work even though a willingness to do the work is present. These children typically lack the ability or readiness for certain tasks rather lack of motivation. They describe hostile aggressive children as those who express their hostility through direct and intense behavior. Passive aggressive children are those who resist and oppose the teacher through indirect means; it is often difficult to judge whether these children are resisting deliberately. Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) describe defiant children as those who resist authority and engage in power struggles with the teacher. They do not wish to take direction from anyone and generally want their own way. Hyperactive children are described as those who seem to exhibit great difficulty sitting still and are constantly moving. Many of their behaviors and movements seem to have no purpose. The problem of short attention span/distractibility is exhibited by children who seem to be unable to concentrate on or attend to any task for any significant length of time. The problem of rejection by peers is exhibited by children who frequently seek interaction with peers but are ignored, excluded, or rejected. Shy/withdrawn children are described as those who tend to avoid personal interaction with others, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others.
In summary, this chapter described attribution research in academic settings to explain the implications of the theory in classroom settings as well the research conducted in the area of discipline and classroom management. Marshall and Weinstein (1984), in writing about student self-evaluations, state that it is the total environment of the classroom in which teacher and students interact that determines how specific events are interpreted. Covington and Omelich (1985) found direct linkages between guilt/shame and the ability and effort causal ascriptions. Other linkages between causal ascriptions and emotional consequences have been found by various researchers (Brown & Weiner, 1984; Rohrkemper, 1985; Russell & McAuley, 1986; and, Weiner, 1980). In this study I investigate how both teachers and students perceive student disruptive behavior, their causal ascriptions of the misbehavior, and their perceptions of accompanying affects.

Many books on classroom management and much of the research on classroom management and problem student behavior do not include a concise definition of problem behavior in classrooms. These sources include discussions of specific behaviors and management problems, but not an inclusive definition. For the purposes of this research, problem behavior in the classroom consists of those behaviors which tend to interrupt the routine procedures in the classroom and the ongoing learning process. The specific problem behaviors included in this research are the problem student types with accompanying vignettes described by Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) and consist of the following: failure syndrome, perfectionist, underachiever, low achiever, hostile aggressive, passive aggressive, defiant, hyperactive, short attention span/distractible, immature, rejected by peers, shy/withdrawn (see Appendix A).
In the classroom context, classroom behavior and interpersonal relationships are achievement-related constructs, that is, students succeed or fail at achieving appropriate classroom behavior and interpersonal relationships just as students succeed or fail at academic tasks. In other words, classroom behavior and interpersonal relations in the classroom can be considered as the attainment or non-attainment of goals. Since this study uses Brophy and Rohrkeper's (1981) problem student types, all the vignettes can be considered to depict non-attainment of goals by virtue of the designation 'problem student type'. However, this consideration is from the perspective of the observer. In actual classroom situations some of the behavior outcomes may be considered as attainment of goals from the perspective of the student exhibiting the problem behavior.

The major purpose of this research is to investigate claims of attribution theory by applying it to behavior and interpersonal relationships in the classroom. More specifically, the research considers the causal attributions and affects that both teachers and students ascribe to the same problem behaviors in the classroom, in regard to locus, stability, and controllability. Because of the paucity of research on interpersonal classroom behavior from an attributional perspective, the hypotheses for this study must be based on the extrapolation of attribution theory research on outcomes of achievement related tasks. By far the most parsimonious theoretical model for this research has included the three dimensions of stability, locus, and controllability. However, research in interpersonal contexts other than achievement settings (Folkes, 1982; Grunea & Horvath, 1989; Kelley, 1971) indicates that other attributional dimensions and causal ascriptions might be feasible. This possibility is also suggested by Weiner (1986) in his review of attribution theory.

Purpose

Major Questions

In the classroom context, classroom behavior and interpersonal relationships are achievement-related constructs, that is, students succeed or fail at achieving appropriate classroom behavior and interpersonal relationships just as students succeed or fail at academic tasks. In other words, classroom behavior and interpersonal relations in the classroom can be considered as the attainment or non-attainment of goals. Since this study uses Brophy and Rohrkeper's (1981) problem student types, all the vignettes can be considered to depict non-attainment of goals by virtue of the designation 'problem student type'. However, this consideration is from the perspective of the observer. In actual classroom situations some of the behavior outcomes may be considered as attainment of goals from the perspective of the student exhibiting the problem behavior.

The major purpose of this research is to investigate claims of attribution theory by applying it to behavior and interpersonal relationships in the classroom. More specifically, the research considers the causal attributions and affects that both teachers and students ascribe to the same problem behaviors in the classroom, in regard to locus, stability, and controllability. Because of the paucity of research on interpersonal classroom behavior from an attributional perspective, the hypotheses for this study must be based on the extrapolation of attribution theory research on outcomes of achievement related tasks. By far the most parsimonious theoretical model for this research has included the three dimensions of stability, locus, and controllability. However, research in interpersonal contexts other than achievement settings (Folkes, 1982; Grunea & Horvath, 1989; Kelley, 1971) indicates that other attributional dimensions and causal ascriptions might be feasible. This possibility is also suggested by Weiner (1986) in his review of attribution theory.
An additional purpose of the research is to determine the observers' perceptions of the actors' affect as well as to discover the observers' affect in regard to the behavior of the actor in the vignette. While Weiner (1986) mentioned in his model the affective consequences of pride, self-esteem, hopelessness, helplessness, relaxation, surprise, shame, guilt, anger, gratitude, and pity, he does concede there may be other affects or affective consequences. Since a major part of Weiner's research in attribution theory of motivation is concerned with academic achievement settings and a minor part is concerned with affiliative settings with associated affective consequences, it is quite conceivable there are other affective consequences or emotional states associated with classroom behavior.

Based on the review of the literature on attribution theory and problem behaviors, I ask the following questions:

1. Do students and teachers provide significantly different attributions of the causes of problem behaviors in the classroom? Do teachers and students reveal significantly different causal ascriptions? In other words, does role have a significant effect?

2. Do males and females provide significantly different attributions of the causes of problem behaviors in the classroom? Do males and females reveal significantly different causal ascriptions? In other words, does gender of the participant have a significant effect?

3. Does the gender of the actor in the vignettes significantly affect the responses made by teachers and students and males and females in regard to causal ascriptions and attributions?

Supplemental Questions

A second purpose of this research project is validate the problem student types as described by Brophy and Rohr kemper (1981). Two smaller empirical studies were conducted
for this purpose. First, the videotape that was designed to depict the 12 problem classroom behaviors described by Brophy and Rohr kemper (1981) needed to be validated. A second investigation was a multidimensional scaling study to determine whether Brophy and Rohr kemper's (1981) problem types are differentiable from each other. This study examined how similar or dissimilar the problem types were from each other and the extent to which there might be clusters of problem types.
CHAPTER 3
METHOD

Participants

The student participants were grade 6 and 7 students randomly chosen from two randomly selected classes from each of two of the largest schools in a suburban Vancouver school district. The participants were predominantly of Caucasian background and from a middle socio-economic status. There were 10 males and 10 females from each of the two schools, yielding a total of 40 student participants. The teacher participants were 10 male and 10 female teachers, randomly chosen from a pool of 42 volunteer teachers who have had experience teaching at the grade 6 and 7 level in the same school district as the student participants. Of the remaining teachers, 20 agreed to participate in the classification study described in Chapter 5.

Variables

Independent variables. Twenty-four vignettes of problem classroom behavior were represented on videotape depicting 12 problem student types, one each for a male and a female student. The vignettes were based on the problem descriptions reported by Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981). Videotapes were used instead of written scenarios to provide depictions of problem classroom behavior that were more representative of what teachers and students might encounter in classrooms than is possible in print media. The videotape could portray important information such as tone of voice, facial expressions, and the activity of other children in the classroom. There are 2 vignettes for each problem student type as shown in Appendix A, (the vignettes are systematically provided, that is, numbers 1 and 13 depict problem type A, numbers 2 and 14 depict problem type B, and so on). Gender of actor in the vignettes was balanced across the 12 problem types. (For each vignette representing a problem type, either a boy or a girl was used as the actor in the scene. Thus, there were 12
boy and 12 girl vignettes, one each for the 12 problem types.) A major difficulty in writing the scripts for the vignettes was that of inferential bias, that is, attempting to write scripts which would not contain background information that could bias the responses of the student and teacher participants. The first writing of the scripts contained no inferences such as tone of voice or specific wording of the problem behavior. However, the participants in a pilot study were unable to describe the problem behavior that ten of the vignettes were supposed to depict. The identified vignettes then were rewritten to include more information about the problem behavior, however, this process did result in some inferential bias injected into some of the vignettes, as some respondents stated, "Oh, that one's obvious". It was very difficult to depict some of the vignettes accurately on the video due to the nature of the problem type (e.g., the shy/withdrawn behavior, or passive-aggressive behavior) since there was very little or no overt behavior.

The vignettes were produced on video-tape using a regular classroom group of grade 6 and 7 students. The classroom was multi-racial in that many ethnic groups were represented. After the vignettes were read to the class, the students chose which vignette character they wished to portray. A student was only used once as the main actor in a given vignette to prevent student identification with too many problem behaviors. The teacher in the video was the regular teacher for that class. The students acting out the vignettes were chosen from a community different than the one from which the subjects were chosen. The vignettes were randomized within each set (1-12 and 13-24) and the order of presentation was randomized to avoid systematic bias.

**Dependent variables.** The questionnaire (see Table 3) used in this research is based on one developed by Russell (1982) which measures causal ascriptions for an event (here, a problem classroom behavior). The questionnaires were personalized for each separate vignette by adding the name of the 24 respective students to the initial question stem. The
Table 3: Causal Dimension Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1</th>
<th>Reflect an aspect of the situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Instructions: Think about the reason you have written above. The items below concern your impressions or opinions of this cause. Circle one number for each of the following scales.

1. Are the causes things that:
   Reflect an aspect of the situation |
   of __________ | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

2. Are the causes:
   Controllable by | Uncontrollable by __________ |
   | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

3. Are the causes things that are:
   Permanent | Temporary |
   | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

4. Are the causes things:
   Intended by ________ | Unintended by ________ |
   | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

5. Are the causes things that are:
   Outside of ________ | Inside of ________ |
   | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

6. Are the causes things that are:
   Changing over time | Stable over time |
   | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

7. Are the causes:
   Something about others |
   | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

8. Are the causes things that are:
   Changeable | Unchanging |
   | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

9. Are the causes things for which:
   No one is responsible | Someone is responsible |
   | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

Now please write down some additional possible causes for the misbehavior or problem behavior in the vignette.

10. To what extent have you seen children act like this in classrooms you've been in.
    Very similar | Not similar at all |
    | 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 |

11. What is the main thing you saw in the scene?

12. Please describe in one word or phrase how you think ________ felt in this scene.

13. Please describe in one word or phrase how you feel about ________ behavior.
instrument first asks participants to write down a cause for a particular behavior which is followed by nine Likert scales measuring the degree of locus, stability, and controllability. The instrument consists of 3 items per dimension. A total score for each subscale is computed by summing the responses to the individual items as follows: locus of causality -- items 1, 5, 7; stability -- items 3, 6, 8; and, controllability -- items 2, 4, 9. High scores in the subscales indicate that the cause is perceived as internal, stable, and controllable. Each of the three respective subscale scores was computed separately for each of the 24 vignettes.

The instrument has demonstrated reliability and validity using undergraduate subjects (Russell, 1982; Russell, McAuley & Tarico, in press). Russell (1982) summarizes: "the three subscales that form the final Causal Dimension Scale appear to measure the dimensional properties of causes identified by Weiner (1979). A three-mode factor analysis confirmed the three-factor structure of the Causal Dimension Scale and all three subscales were found to be internally consistent" (p. 1143). The data in Russell's study formed an individuals X experimental conditions X rating scales matrix which allowed Russell to analyze the factors for each mode as well as a core matrix relating the factor structure for each mode to all others. Further evidence in support of the validity of the Causal Dimension Scale is provided by Gruneau and Horvath (1989). Although the Causal Dimension Scale has been used previously with adults only and has not been administered to children, pilot work suggested that grade 6/7 students in British Columbia could use the instrument. The reliability data from this present study, reported in the next chapter, suggest that the instrument can be used with children.

For the purposes of this investigation, I added several questions to the Causal Dimension Scale (see Table 3). One question which was included assessed the representativeness of the vignettes in depicting classroom behaviors and was worded as follows:
To what extent have you seen children act like this in classrooms you've been in.

Very similar  9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1  Not similar at all

Another question asked whether the participants actually saw what was shown in the vignette (i.e., did the participants see what I intended them to see on the video-tape) and was worded:

What is the main thing you saw in the scene?

The student and teacher participants were asked to describe in words, phrases, or sentences what they saw in the video.

Weiner (1984) and Russell and McAuley (1986) have investigated various affects in the attribution process. In this research I was also interested in determining which affects were prevalent within the actor from the perception of the participant and which affects were experienced by the participant about the actor's behavior. Thus, two questions were added to determine the affects displayed by the actor in the vignette as perceived by the participant and the affect that the participant has about the actor in the vignette. These two questions were worded as follows:

Please describe in one word or phrase how you think (actor's name) felt in this scene.

Please describe in one word or phrase how you feel about (actor's name) behavior.

Design

The design for this study was a 2(role: teacher and student) X 2(observer gender: male and female) X 12(problem type) X 2(actor gender: boy and girl) repeated measures MANOVA with the role and observer gender serving as between subjects variable and problem type and actor gender serving as within subjects variables. There were three dependent variables: locus, stability, and controllability as discussed in the previous section.

Procedure

The collection of the data took place over several days. The student and teacher participants were given the following instructions:
Hello, my name is Frank Groenewold. First, I would like to thank you for participating in my research. On this video you will see scenes in which students are disrupting the class in some way. After each scene I will stop the VCR and ask you to complete a short questionnaire about your ideas about the causes of the disruptive behaviour, your thoughts about the feelings of the disruptive student, and your feelings toward the disruptive student. As you view the scene on the video, please think of some possible causes of the disruptive behaviour. Again thank you for participating in this study.

The videotape was shown in one group sitting during the morning of a school day to the students in each school. After each vignette I stopped the videotape recorder and each student completed a questionnaire (see Table 3) about the vignette, a procedure they were asked to do for each of the 24 vignettes. The procedure for administering the instrument involved asking the participants to record one cause after viewing each vignette. They were then asked to complete the Causal Dimension Scale (Russell, 1982, see Table 3) after each vignette. After participants completed the Causal Dimension Scale, they were asked to write down some additional possible causes for the misbehavior or problem behavior. The students completed the exercise in two and one-half hours which included a fifteen minute recess break after one and one-half hours. The video was shown in one sitting to the teachers after school at three different times to allow the teachers the flexibility needed in their schedules to view the video and complete the questionnaires. The teachers completed the exercise in one and one-half to two hours. A transcription of the vignettes as they appear on the videotape can be found in Appendix A.

Coding.

Open ended responses were collected for a number of questions. These responses
were coded into categories, which then served as the basis for statistical analysis. Typically in attribution research, forced-choice response formats are used, based on Weiner's categories. The use of response formats such as these limits a study to testing these, and only these, attributional categories. Such an approach biases the study in favor of support for the predictions derived from the theory. To avoid this bias, open-ended responses were used here as a means of constituting a more rigorous test of the application of attribution theory to problem classroom behavior. The coding of causal ascriptions in response to the question regarding the cause of the problem behavior involved several stages. In the first stage I grouped the causal ascriptions under common headings such as perfectionism, insecurity, low self-image, work habits, achievement, home factors, peer behaviors, etc. This process yielded a large number of possible categories. Subsequent categorization involved placing the various terms under the major or first level headings of achievement, affiliation, aggression, power, emotions, disruptiveness, situational characteristics, other, and uncodable which all formed the first level of a coding scheme. Some of these terms such as achievement and affiliation have been used extensively by Weiner (1986) who also mentioned power and aggression as viable causal ascriptions. A second level of causal ascriptions under the major heading of achievement includes: ability, effort, strategy, task, expectations, inattentiveness, insecurity, low self-image, and moral injunctions. The second level of causal ascriptions under affiliation included physical characteristics, personality, social skills, others' behaviors, home factors, low self-image, moral injunctions, distracting behaviors, and attention-getting behaviors. Aggression included antagonism and attitude while power included defiance, insolence, and attitude. The major heading of disruptiveness included impulsiveness and hyperactivity while the major headings of emotions (including emotional states as causal ascriptions), situational characteristics, other, and uncodable did not have any second level categories. Some of these major and minor categories overlapped or had very low frequencies
of occurrence. To eliminate these problems, a third stage in the development of the coding system involved collapsing and re-arranging categories. The final coding system with a total of four major categories is shown in Table 4. The causal ascriptions were coded by two research assistants and me. After I coded the ascriptions, I printed each causal ascription on a separate piece of paper. The two research assistants sorted the causal ascriptions according to the definitions in Table 4, by placing individual causal ascriptions into one of sixteen bags labelled with the categories. The affects were coded according to a categorization scheme from Gazda (1973). This scheme represents manifestations of emotional states and includes nine categories shown in Table 5. A miscellaneous category, 'other', was added since some of the responses, such as moral injunctions, did not fall under any of Gazda's categories. I categorized all the affect responses into the nine categories described above according to the definitions shown in Table 5. Each affect response was then printed on a separate piece of paper. Two different research assistants sorted the affect responses into the categories by placing the individual affect responses into one of nine bags labelled with the categories.

The following decision rules were used in coding. In cases where the participants did not provide a response, I left a blank in the data file. Where the participants were asked to write down one cause for the actor's behavior, many participants wrote two or more causal ascriptions. The first two ascriptions were recorded. Where participants recorded only a single ascription, a blank was recorded where they did not provide a second one. This decision rule was also used in recording the codes for the section asking for additional causal ascriptions. There were 65 questionnaires for which the participants did not record the first causal ascription. The responses on the Causal Dimension Scale were nonetheless included in data analysis since the participants must have had an implicit causal ascription in mind in order to complete the Causal Dimension Scale. A total of 21 ascription responses were not coded because some of the responses did not directly answer the
Table 4: Causal ascriptions - Dictionary of terms and coding scheme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(11) Ability - causes which are ascribed to lack of ability, lack of understanding, lack of skills, and weakness in a subject area; includes any terms or phrases which describe or allude to a lack of ability and understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Effort - causes which describe non-production, disinterest, lack of trying, work habits, and giving up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Task - includes all descriptions about the level of difficulty of the task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Expectations - causes which describe or allude to expectations for academic achievement or interpersonal behaviours placed on the student by him/herself, parents, or teacher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Inattentiveness - causes which are ascribed to lack of concentration, lack of attention, not listening, distraction, daydreaming, and mind being preoccupied with other thoughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Insecurity - causes which describe shyness, embarrassment, lack of confidence, lack of self-assurance, being unsure, reluctance to answer, fear of failure, fear of success, and avoidance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(21) Social skills - causes which are ascribed to lack of communication, inappropriate behaviours directed toward others, social outcast, poor social status, not having any friends, negative toward others, and withdrawal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22) Others' behaviours - causes which are described as behaviours which other people direct at the actor, such as, poor teaching skills, ridiculed, rejection, ignored by others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) Home factors - causes which can be ascribed to poor home environment, poverty, neglect, parenting problems, abuse, and culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Distracting behaviours - causes which can be described as attention-getting, impulsiveness, and hyperactivity and are exemplified by behaviours such as foolish behaviour, goofing off, fidgety, talkativeness and disruptiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(31) Physical characteristics - causes which are ascribed to physical features and concerns such as lack of coordination, fatigue, deafness, medical problems, allergies, confusion, and having a bad day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32) Personality characteristics - causes which are ascribed to behavioural and psychological factors such as perfectionism, citizenship, stealing, stubborness, mischievousness, habits, impatience, unambitious, lying, vengeful, unorganized, childishness, and self-image.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Causal ascriptions - Dictionary of terms and coding scheme - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>Attitudinal - causes which are described as negativeness and indifference and include ascriptions such as doesn't care and hates school and work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(34)</td>
<td>Aggressive - causes which are described as insolence, defiance, and antagonism and includes behaviours such as direct disobedience, power struggle, fighting, lack of respect for authority, and rudeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35)</td>
<td>Emotional - causes which describe or denote feelings or feeling states such as anger, pride, hurt, discouragement, frustration, hatred, lonely, moody, and anxious.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Situational:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(41)</td>
<td>Causes which are related to the situation or environment and include ascriptions such as overcrowdedness, size of desk, physical needs, and logistics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in ( ) denote codes used in analyzing causal ascriptions.
### Table 5: Affects - Dictionary of terms and coding scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Love, Affection, Concern</td>
<td>an emotional state characterized by a strong affection and liking for someone or something as well as sympathy and concern for someone and may be caused by situations, people, or events. Some related terms: pity, curious, hopeful, understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elation, Joy</td>
<td>an emotional state characterized by feelings of happiness and satisfaction including a sense of positiveness in one's life and may be caused by situations, events, or people. Some related terms: pleased, enjoyment, gratified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Potency</td>
<td>an emotional state characterized by a sense of accomplishment, confidence, and control and feels tough, mean and defiant and may be caused by situations, people, or events. Some related terms: successful, challenged, motivated, serious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>an emotional state characterized by sadness, rejection, loneliness, helplessness, disinterest, disappointment, shame and may be caused by situations, people, or events. Some related terms: sad, apart, betrayed, alone, hurt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>an emotional state characterized by feeling pain, puzzlement, confusion, dissatisfaction, bewilderment, disgust, pressure, embarrassment and may be caused by situations, people, or events. Some related terms: bewildered, dumb, shocked, guilty, impatient, strange.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fear, Anxiety</td>
<td>an emotional state characterized by fear, worry, nervousness, lack of self-confidence, restlessness, shyness and may be caused by situations, people, or events. Some related terms: panic, tense, unsure, unresponsive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Belittling, Criticism, Scorn</td>
<td>an emotional state characterized by belittling, ridicule, being ignored and may be caused by situations, people, or events. Some related terms: neglected, negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Impotency, Inadequacy</td>
<td>an emotional state characterized by feeling unsuccessful, small, naive, tired, defensive and may be caused by situations, people, or events. Some related terms: pathetic, powerless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Anger, Hostility, Cruelty</td>
<td>an emotional state characterized by feeling mad, frustrated, unfriendly, irritated, impish, irritable and may be caused by situations, people, or events. Some related terms: upset, reactionary, tough, annoyed, obstinate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Numbers in () denote codes used in analyzing the affects.
question (e.g., should find his problem), others were judgemental in nature (e.g., she should answer), while some other additional ascription responses were exact repeats of the ascriptions responses initially asked for in the questionnaire.

Question 11 on the questionnaire asked, "What is the main thing you saw in the scene?" These responses were coded a 0 if the response was very dissimilar to what the scene attempted to portray and coded a 1 where the response was similar to what the scene attempted to portray. Instances where respondents attempted to analyze what the actor might be attempting to do or what the actor might be feeling, for example, "he had a poor home life", were scored as 0. Responses which accurately described a state (e.g., stubborn) for a vignette where the actor did indeed display that kind of behavior, for example, passive-aggressive, were coded a 1.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter examines and describes the results of this study in detail. The first section describes the results of the coding procedures. The second section describes the descriptive statistics. The third section examines the results of the attributions for the problem behavior types. This section reports the results of the MANOVA, univariate ANOVA's and post hoc Scheffe's. The fourth section describes the predominant causal ascriptions and the role and gender differences for these causal ascriptions. The fifth section describes through confidence intervals the problem types which are representative of what happens in regular classrooms. The sixth section describes an examination of whether or not the participants saw in the vignettes what I intended them to see. The last section will summarize the findings reported in this chapter.

Descriptive Statistics

The initial percent of agreement on the causal ascriptions was obtained by including all ascriptions per category agreed upon by at least two of the three sorters. There were a total of 1008 causal ascriptions. At least two sorters agreed on 87.9% (886) of these ascriptions which left 122 (12.1%) ascriptions on which all three sorters disagreed. The remainder of the ascriptions were subsequently recategorized by the same sorters until again there was at least agreement from at least two sorters, a process which yielded further agreement on 113 (11.21%) ascriptions for a total of 99.11% of agreement on the ascriptions. This process left 9 causal ascriptions (.89%) on which all three coders disagreed. I then assigned these ascriptions to the categories. Once this laborious task was completed, I recorded the results of the categorizations. A final thesaurus of causal ascriptions is reported in Appendix B. The coding procedures were conducted using liberal criteria which casts some doubt on these data. Implications of these shortcomings will be discussed in Chapter 6.
One male student failed to respond to the Dimensions of Causality questionnaire for one of the 24 vignettes. This student's data were dropped from these analyses; thus the resulting sample size is 59. The alpha reliability coefficients calculated on the data for the entire sample were high for all three dependent variables: locus, .85; stability, .94; and, controllability, .89. Correlations among the three dependent variables - locus, stability, and controllability from the Causal Dimension Scale - were calculated for the entire sample and separately for the different levels of the sampling design (Table 6). For the entire sample, two of these correlations were statistically significant. The intercorrelations between locus and controllability was .27 (p<.05) and between stability and controllability it was -.23 (p<.05). When these correlations were calculated separately for the students and the teachers and for the males and the females, three correlations were significant. The correlations between locus and controllability were .50 (p<.05) for the teachers only, .47 (p<.01) for the males only, and .82 (p<.01) for the male teachers only.

Attributions for Problem Behaviors

As stated earlier, one male student failed to respond to the Dimensions of Causality questionnaire for one of the 24 vignettes. This student's data were dropped from these analyses; thus the resulting sample size is 59. For the remaining data, there were 18 missing item responses. In these cases, the item mean for the entire sample was used.

The data analysis strategy for the main body of findings was to begin with a 2 x 2 x 12 x 2 MANOVA (see the Design section above). This was followed where appropriate with separate ANOVAs for the three dimensions of attributions and Scheffe post hoc analyses. In all cases, significant ANOVA results are only interpreted following significant effects on the corresponding source of variance in the MANOVA.
Table 6: Correlations among locus, stability, and controllability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>locus X stability</th>
<th>locus X controllability</th>
<th>stability X controllability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total sample</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.50*</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role X Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05*  
*p < .01**
The between subjects component of the MANOVA (see Table 7) yielded a significant role X gender interaction, while the within subjects results produced a significant main effect for problem type, and significant problem X actor and problem X gender X role X actor interactions. The last interaction is based on 96 cells and defies interpretation. Also, on none of the subsequent ANOVA's was there a clearly interpretable and statistically reliable four way interaction effect. Because of these ambiguities and the sheer difficulty of sensibly interpreting a 96 cell interaction, this interaction is not discussed further. The MANOVA also yielded significance at the .06 level for problem X role interactions and actor X role X problem type interactions which I will interpret since they are marginally significant and they also yield significant results on the ANOVAs. Thus, the following ANOVA interpretations are based on univariate analyses corresponding to the three remaining significant MANOVA effects as well as the two interactions at the .06 level of significance shown in Table 7.

To help the reader follow the presentation of these results, the significant effects for the MANOVA and subsequent ANOVAs are summarized in Table 11. On the three ANOVAs (see Tables 8, 9, and 10 for the ANOVA summary tables and Tables 22, 23 and 24, Appendix C, for the corresponding means and standard deviations), the role X gender interaction was significant for controllability only. These results, shown graphically in Figure 2, lie primarily in the mean differences in attributions of female students and teachers. While the means of both male samples lie in the midrange on controllability, the female students believe that problem behaviors are more controllable than do the female teachers.
Problem type main effects. The problem type main effect was significant for all three dependent variables. In order to determine which problem types contributed to the significance, post hoc Scheffe tests were conducted. For ease and parsimony of interpretation, the differences between actor and observer and actor and role are always interpreted within problem type in the interactions. For locus (Table 12, low numbers indicate externality, high numbers indicate internality) the mean for the problem type rejected by peers was significantly lower than all the other problem types except for immaturity.
Table 7: **Manova results.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X actor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X problem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X problem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X problem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor X problem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X actor X problem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor X problem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor X problem</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**p < .01
Table 8: Univariate results for locus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender</td>
<td>113.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>97.14</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X actor</td>
<td>32.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>13.69</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem</td>
<td>343.66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.16</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X problem</td>
<td>115.08</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X problem</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X problem</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>20.02</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor X problem</td>
<td>49.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X actor X problem</td>
<td>40.71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor X problem</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor X problem</td>
<td>20.38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01  
* p < .05
### Table 9: Univariate results for stability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td>44.09</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>201.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender</td>
<td>246.41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>183.93</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td>62.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X actor</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem</td>
<td>27.31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X problem</td>
<td>23.77</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X problem</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X problem</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor X problem</td>
<td>71.83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X actor X problem</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor X problem</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor X problem</td>
<td>22.11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>14.80</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* ** p < .01  
  * * p < .05
Table 10: *Univariate results for controllability.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td>260.84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender</td>
<td>968.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>134.84</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X actor</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem</td>
<td>442.76</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.01</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X problem</td>
<td>47.71</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X problem</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X problem</td>
<td>39.62</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor X problem</td>
<td>91.57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X actor X problem</td>
<td>33.29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor X problem</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor X problem</td>
<td>24.84</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>error</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01
* p < .05**
Table 11: Probability levels of statistically reliable effects of MANOVA and ANOVA's on locus, stability, and controllability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>MANOVA</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Controllability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role X gender</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem X actor</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem X role</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem X role X actor</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem X gender X role X actor</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: Role by gender interaction for controllability.
Table 12: Post hoc Scheffe's for problem type means - locus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Rej/Peers</th>
<th>Imm</th>
<th>SAS/Dist</th>
<th>Shy/With</th>
<th>Low Achiev</th>
<th>Host Agg</th>
<th>Perf</th>
<th>UnAchiev</th>
<th>Hyp</th>
<th>Fail Syn</th>
<th>Def</th>
<th>Pass Agg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rej/Peers</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.41*</td>
<td>4.89*</td>
<td>5.07*</td>
<td>5.19*</td>
<td>5.69*</td>
<td>5.76*</td>
<td>5.80*</td>
<td>6.05*</td>
<td>6.88*</td>
<td>7.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imm</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS/Dist.</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy/With</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achiev</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Agg</td>
<td>18.98</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnAchiev</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyp</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail Syn</td>
<td>19.84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Agg</td>
<td>20.81</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

- Fall Syn: Failure syndrome
- Perf: Perfectionism
- UnAchiev: Underachiever
- Low Achiev: Low Achiever
- Host Agg: Hostile aggressive
- Pass Agg: Passive aggressive
- SAS/Dist: Short attention span/distractible
- Imm: Immature
- Rej/Peers: Rejected by peers
- Shy/With: Shy/Withdrawn
- Def: Defiant
- Hyp: Hyperactive
Thus, the teachers and students in this study believed that rejection by peers is a problem behavior that tends to result from external causes. For stability (Table 13), while the ANOVA main effect for problem type was significant, there were no means or groups of means for problem types which formed homogeneous sets. Thus, further interpretation of the effect of problem type on stability ratings is unwarranted. Controllability (Table 14, low numbers indicate uncontrollability, high numbers indicate controllability) yielded significant differences in the following problem types: rejection by peers was significantly different from low achiever, failure syndrome, shy/withdrawn, underachiever, hyperactive, hostile aggressive, passive aggressive, and defiant; short attention span/distractible was significantly different from passive aggressive and defiant; and, immaturity was significantly different from defiant. Thus, in terms of controllability, the defiant, passive aggressive, and hostile aggressive problem types anchor the controllable end of the dimension, while rejected by peers, short attention span/distractible, perfectionism, and immature problem types anchor the uncontrollable end of the dimension.

**Actor by problem type interactions.** The MANOVA also yielded significant results for the actor X problem type interaction, which proved to be statistically significant on the ANOVAs for all three dependent variables. Post hoc Scheffe tests were calculated to determine which means in the actor X problem type interactions contributed to these significance results (see Table 15). Figures 3-5 show the interactions for locus, stability, and controllability, respectively. The clearest way of interpreting these interactions is to examine the differences between the boy and girl actors for the 12 problem types. For locus there is a significant difference between the boy and girl actors for the perfectionist problem type, in which the observers considered the perfectionistic behavior of the female actor to be more internal while perfectionist behavior of the male actor was judged to be significantly more external. For
### Table 13: Post hoc Scheffé's for problem type means - stability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Pass Ag</th>
<th>Low Achiev</th>
<th>Hyp</th>
<th>Shy/With</th>
<th>Perf</th>
<th>Imm</th>
<th>Def</th>
<th>Fail Syn</th>
<th>SAS/Dist</th>
<th>UnAchiev</th>
<th>Host Agg</th>
<th>Rej/Peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass Ag</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achiev</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyp</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy/With</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imm</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail Syn</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS/Dist</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnAchiev</td>
<td>11.94</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Agg</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rej/Peers</td>
<td>12.96</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
Table 14: Post hoc Scheffe's for problem type means - controllability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Type</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Rej/Peers</th>
<th>SAS/Dist</th>
<th>Immun</th>
<th>Perf</th>
<th>Low Achiev</th>
<th>Fail Syn</th>
<th>Shy/With</th>
<th>UnAchiev</th>
<th>Hyp</th>
<th>Host Agg</th>
<th>Pass Agg</th>
<th>Def</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rej/Peers</td>
<td>14.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.92*</td>
<td>4.01*</td>
<td>4.82*</td>
<td>5.43*</td>
<td>5.61*</td>
<td>6.28*</td>
<td>7.11*</td>
<td>7.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS/Dist</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.58*</td>
<td>4.74*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immun</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>3.99*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achiev</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail Syn</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy/With</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnAchiev</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyp</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Agg</td>
<td>20.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass Agg</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fail Syn</th>
<th>Failure syndrome</th>
<th>Host Agg</th>
<th>Hostile aggressive</th>
<th>SAS/Dist</th>
<th>Short attention span/distractible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>Pass Agg</td>
<td>Passive aggressive</td>
<td>Immun</td>
<td>Immature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnAchiev</td>
<td>Underachiever</td>
<td>Def</td>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>Rej/Peers</td>
<td>Rejected by peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achiev</td>
<td>Low Achiever</td>
<td>Hyp</td>
<td>Hyperactive</td>
<td>Shy/With</td>
<td>Shy/Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 15: Post hoc Scheffe's for actor X problem type means - locus, stability, controllability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Controllability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure syndrome</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
<td>4.53*</td>
<td>3.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underachiever</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low achiever</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile aggressive</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive aggressive</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.87*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactive</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short attention span/Distractible</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>4.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected by peers</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy/Withdrawn</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.41*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table entries are pairwise contrasts between the actor and problem type means. *p < .05
Figure 3: Interactions of actor and problem type for locus.
Figure 4: Interactions of actor and problem type for stability.
Problem Types

Figure 5: Interactions of actor and problem type for controllability.
stability, the significant differences were for perfectionism where perfectionistic behavior is considered to be more stable for the female actor than for the male actor, and rejected by peers where rejection by peers was considered to be more stable for the male actor than for the female actor. For controllability, the significant differences were for perfectionism where perfectionistic behavior is considered to be more controllable for the female actor than for the male actor, passive aggressive where the passive aggressive behavior was seen to be more controllable for the male actor than for the female actor, immaturity where immature behavior is considered to be more controllable by the male actor than by the female actor, and shy/withdrawn where this behavior is seen to be more controllable by the female actor than by the male actor.

Perfectionism was the only problem type that was viewed significantly differently by the observers for all three dependent variables. Whereas perfectionistic problems in girls are seen to be more internal, stable, and controllable, this problem in boys is seen to be more external, less stable, and more uncontrollable.

Role by problem type interaction. The MANOVA also yielded results of .06 for the role X problem type interaction, which proved to be statistically significant at the .01 level on the ANOVAs for locus and controllability. Post hoc Scheffe tests (see Table 16) were calculated to determine which means in the role X problem type interactions contributed to these significance results. Figures 6 and 7 show the role X problem type interactions for locus and controllability, respectively. The clearest way of interpreting these interactions is to examine the differences between teachers and students for each of the 12 problem types. For locus there are significant differences for several problem types. There is a significant difference between teachers and students for the failure syndrome problem type in which students considered failure syndrome to be more internal than teachers who considered
Table 16: Post hoc Scheffe's for role X problem type means - locus and controllability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Controllability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure syndrome</td>
<td>1.80*</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>1.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underachiever</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low achiever</td>
<td>2.40*</td>
<td>2.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile aggressive</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive aggressive</td>
<td>1.95*</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>2.14*</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactive</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>2.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short attention span/Distractible</td>
<td>3.02*</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature</td>
<td>1.78*</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected by peers</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy/Withdrawn</td>
<td>2.31*</td>
<td>2.89*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table entries are pairwise contrasts between role and problem type means. *p < .05
Figure 6: Interactions of role and problem type for locus.
Figure 7: Interactions of role means and problem type for controllability.
failure syndrome to be more external. Students considered the low achiever problem type to be more internal than the teachers who considered low achievement to be more external. The passive aggressive problem type was considered to be more internal by the teachers than by the students who considered passive aggressive behavior to be more external. Teachers considered the defiant problem type to be more internal than students who considered defiant behavior to be more external. The short attention span/distractible problem type was considered to be more internal by the students than by the teachers who considered short attention span/distractibility to be more external. The immature problem type was considered to be more internal by the teachers than by students who considered immaturity to be more external, and the teachers also considered the rejected by peers problem type to be more internal than the students who considered rejection by peers to be more external. The difference between teachers and students on the rejected by peers problem type is quite dramatic, with the students clearly ascribing causes of this problem to external sources. The shy/withdrawn problem type was considered to be more internal by the students than by the teachers who considered shy/withdrawn behavior to be more external in locus.

For controllability, students considered the perfectionist problem type to be more controllable than the teachers who consider perfectionism to be more uncontrollable. Students considered the low achiever problem type to be more controllable than the teachers who consider low achievement to be more uncontrollable. The hostile aggressive problem type is considered to be more controllable by the students than by the teachers who consider hostile aggressive behavior to be more uncontrollable. Students also considered the hyperactive problem type to be more controllable than the teachers who considered hyperactive behavior to be more uncontrollable. The shy/withdrawn problem type is considered to be more controllable by the students than by the teachers who considered shy/withdrawn behavior to be more uncontrollable.
Role by actor by problem type interaction. The MANOVA also yielded a result at the .06 level of significance for the role X actor X problem type interaction, which proved to be statistically significant at the .01 level on the ANOVAs for locus and controllability. Post hoc Scheffe tests were calculated to determine which means in the role X actor X problem type contributed to these significant results (see Table 17). Figures 8 and 9 show the interactions for locus and controllability respectively. The clearest way to interpret these interactions is to examine the differences between role means of the boy and girl actors for each of the 12 problem types.

For locus, teachers considered the perfectionist problem type to be more internal for the female actors than for the male actors where perfectionism was considered to be more external. Teachers also considered the underachiever problem type to be more internal for the female actor than for the male actors for whom underachievement was considered to be more external. The passive aggressive problem type, on the other hand, was considered by the teachers to be more internal for the male actors than for the female actors for whom passive aggressiveness was considered to be more external. The immature problem type also was considered by the teachers to be more internal for the male actors than for the female actors where immaturity was considered to be more external. Both teachers and students considered the rejected by peers problem type to be significantly different for the male and female actors. The teachers considered the rejected by peers problem type to be more internal for the female actors than for the male actors where rejection by peers was considered to be more external, whereas the students considered the rejected by peers problem type to be more internal for the male actors than for the female actors for whom rejection by peers was considered to be more external.

For controllability, teachers considered the perfectionist problem type to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors where perfectionism was considered
Table 17: Post hoc Scheffe's for role X actor X problem type means - locus and controllability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Controllability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Role1</td>
<td>Role 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure syndrome</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>6.10*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underachiever</td>
<td>2.55*</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low achiever</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile aggressive</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive aggressive</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactive</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short attention span/Distractible</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature</td>
<td>3.10*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected by peers</td>
<td>1.90*</td>
<td>3.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy/Withdrawn</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Table entries are contrasts among the role, actor and problem type means.
*p < .05
Figure 8: Interactions of role and actor and problem type for Locus.
Figure 9: Interactions of role and actor and problem type for controllability.
to be more uncontrollable, and students also considered the perfectionist problem type to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors for whom perfectionism was also considered to be more uncontrollable. Teachers considered the underachiever problem type to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors where underachievement was considered to be uncontrollable, whereas students considered the underachiever problem type to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors for whom underachievement was considered to be more uncontrollable. For the hostile aggressive problem type, teachers considered hostile aggressiveness to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors for whom hostile aggressive behavior was considered to be more uncontrollable, whereas students considered the hostile aggressive problem type to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors for whom hostile aggressive behavior was considered to be more uncontrollable. Both teachers and students considered the passive aggressive problem type to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors for whom passive aggressive behavior was considered to be more uncontrollable.

Teachers only considered the defiant problem type to be significantly different between the actors where teachers considered defiant behavior to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors for whom defiant behavior was considered uncontrollable. Students only considered the hyperactive problem type to be significantly different between the actors where students considered hyperactive behavior to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors for whom hyperactive behavior was considered to be uncontrollable. Teachers only considered the short attention span/distractible problem type to be significantly different between the actors where they considered short attention span/distractible behavior to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors for whom short attention span/distractible behavior was
considered to be more uncontrollable. Both teachers and students considered the immature problem type to be significantly different between the actors where both teachers and students considered the immature problem type to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors for whom immature behavior was considered to be more uncontrollable. Teachers only considered the rejected by peers problem type to be significantly different between the actors where they considered the rejected by peers problem type to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors for whom rejection by peers was considered to be more uncontrollable. Students only considered the shy/withdrawn problem type to be significantly different between the actors where they considered the shy/withdrawn problem type to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors for whom shy/withdrawn behavior was considered to be more uncontrollable.

Causal Ascriptions

The histograms depicting the proportions of causal ascriptions of gender nested in role for each problem type yielded some interesting results which are described in this section. The frequencies of occurrence of the subcategories of causal ascriptions described in Table 4 were quite variable, with a large number of very small or zero frequencies for some subcategories disaggregated by role and gender (see Tables 25 and 26, Appendix D). As a consequence, the data described in this section are aggregated to the major categories listed in Table 4 (i.e., academic, social and personal). Since there were only a total of 13 causal ascriptions for the situational domain, the results for the academic, social and personal domains only are reported here. In this section, for the causal ascription categories just mentioned, I describe the general differences between gender nested in the two roles. The reader is urged to refer to Tables 25 and 26 for detailed frequencies of causal ascriptions within the categories for each gender and role per problem type. Because of the wide range in
the number of attributions to the various categories of causes, and because of the unequal numbers of males and females, and teachers and students, the data reported in the figures in this section have been converted to average number of ascriptions or attributions.

The causal ascriptions for failure syndrome were considered to be mostly in the academic domain by all the participants. Female students also attributed the causes of failure syndrome to personal characteristics more frequently than the other participants (see Fig. 10). Social characteristics were seldom considered by any of the participants. Teachers of both genders seemed to be consistent in their attribution of failure syndrome to personal characteristics while the female students made more personal attributions for failure syndrome than did male students. All participants attributed the causes of perfectionism almost equally to the academic domain while students made these attributions more consistently than did the teachers. The frequency of attributions to personal characteristics were quite similar for all participants, although the females were more consistent than were the males in considering perfectionism to be a personal characteristic (see Fig. 11).

The causal ascriptions for the underachiever problem type were distributed across all three domains (see Fig. 12). Both males and females made most of the attributions in the academic domain, with females making academic attributions more frequently than males for both roles. Students generally made more academic attributions than did the teachers. Both males and females made an almost equal number of attributions to personal characteristics, with female teachers making slightly more of these attributions than did the other participants. Students made more social attributions than did the teachers, with female students making the majority of these attributions.

The causal ascriptions for the low achiever problem type were predominantly in the academic domain (see Fig. 13). The frequency of the attributions for academic causes were equal for males and females across role. Very few participants attributed the causes of low
Fig. 10: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for failure syndrome.
Fig. 11: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for perfectionism.
Fig. 12: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for underachiever.
Fig. 13: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for low achiever.
achievement to social characteristics, however, there were more attributions to personal characteristics with females making more of these attributions than did males. Male teachers also tended to make more personal attributions than did male students. The causal ascriptions for the hostile aggressive problem type were predominantly attributed to personal characteristics (see Fig. 14). The frequency of attributions in the personal domain was almost equal for males, while female students made more attributions to personality characteristics than did female students. Hostile aggressiveness was also attributed to social characteristics with teachers making the majority of these attributions, although male students on the average made an equal number of frequencies than did female teachers. There was very little difference in the average number of attributions for male and female teachers. The average number of social attributions made by female students was low.

The average number of causal ascriptions for the passive aggressive problem type varied across the three domains. However, the majority of the attributions were made for the social and personal domains (see Fig. 15). Students and teachers generally made an equal number of attributions to social characteristics, however, male students made more of these attributions than did the other three groups of participants. This pattern was reversed for the average number of attributions made to personal characteristics with teachers making the majority of these attributions and female teachers making more than the other three groups of participants. Students made a much higher number of academic attributions than did the teachers with female students making more of these attributions than did male students and male teachers. Female teachers did not make any attributions to the academic domain.

The causal ascriptions for the defiant problem type were predominantly attributed to personal characteristics (see Fig. 16). Female teachers and students made many more of these attributions than did the male teachers and students. Few attributions were made to either the social or academic domains. The majority of the causal ascriptions for the
Fig. 14: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for hostile aggressive.
Fig. 15: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for passive aggressive.
Fig. 16: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for defiant.
Hyperactive problem type were in the social domain although there were also a substantial number of causal ascriptions in the personal domain (see Fig. 17). Male teachers made a higher number of attributions to social causes than did male students, while female teachers and students made an equal number of attributions to social characteristics. Very few participants made attributions to the academic domain for hyperactivity. Students generally made a higher number of attributions to personal characteristics for hyperactivity than did teachers. While there were no gender differences for students in numbers of attributions to personal characteristics, there was a gender difference in the average number of attributions for teachers with female teachers making more personal attributions than did male teachers.

The causal ascriptions for the short attention span/distractible problem type were predominantly made in the academic domain (see Fig. 18). Teachers and students made an almost equal number of attributions with male teachers and students slightly higher than female teachers and students. Very few participants attributed short attention span/distractibility to social causes. Female teachers and students made a higher number of attributions to personal characteristics than did male teachers. Male students made no attributions to personal characteristics for short attention span/distractibility.

The majority of the causal ascriptions for the immature problem type were in the social and personal domains (see Fig. 19). Male teachers made a higher number of attributions to social causes than did female teachers, whereas the students made almost an equal number of attributions with the female students slightly higher than the male students. Students generally made a higher number of attributions to personal characteristics than did teachers. Females teachers and students made a higher number of attributions than did male teachers and students. Male students attributed immaturity more highly to personal characteristics than
Fig. 17: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for hyperactive.
Fig. 18: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for short attention span/distractible.
Fig. 19: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for immature.
Male teachers made more attributions for immaturity to social characteristics than did the other groups of participants.

The causal ascriptions for the rejected by peers problem type are virtually all attributed to social causes (see Fig. 20) with teachers making slightly more of these attributions than students. None of the participants attributed rejection by peers to academic issues. Students made a slightly higher number of attributions to personal characteristics for rejection by peers with female students making most of these attributions. The majority of the causal ascriptions for the shy/withdrawn problem type are attributed to the academic domain (see Fig. 21). Students generally made a higher number of these attributions than did teachers, with female teachers making the smallest number of attributions to academic issues for shy/withdrawn behavior. All groups of participants made the same number of attributions to social causes for shy/withdrawn behavior except male students who made slightly more of these attributions. Female teachers and students tended to make a higher number of attributions to personal characteristics for shy/withdrawn behavior than did male teachers and students who made an equal proportion of these attributions. Female teachers made a slightly higher number of personal attributions than did female students.

Data for the question asking for additional causes were not analyzed since this section was responded to very infrequently, and, therefore, would not be very meaningful for this analysis. Of the 20 teacher participants, only 2 teachers provided additional causes for all 24 vignettes and 8 teachers provided additional causes for 20 or more vignettes. Six teachers did not provide any additional causes, while the remainder of the teachers' additional cause responses ranged from 11 - 19 of the vignettes. Of the 40 student participants, 6 provided additional causes for all 24 vignettes and 15 students provided additional causes for 20 or more vignettes. Twelve students did not provide additional causes for any of the vignettes,
Fig. 20: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for rejected by peers.
Fig. 21: Average number of ascriptions per person for gender nested in role for shy/withdrawn.
while the remainder of the students' additional cause responses ranged from 1 - 19 of the vignettes.

**Affects**

Since there is great deal of data missing on the last two questions dealing with affects, the data were judged insufficient for analysis. Two problems were very evident with these two questions. The first problem was attenuation, that is, as the participants worked through the questionnaire, many stopped answering the last two questions about half way through the questionnaire and some did not respond to these at all, thereby reducing greatly the reliability of these data. For question #12, 4 teachers out of 20 answered this question for all 24 vignettes and 10 teachers out of 20 answered this question for 20 - 24 vignettes. The other 10 teachers answered this question for less than 20 vignettes with 4 teachers providing responses for less than 10 vignettes. Nine of the possible 40 students answered #12 for all 24 vignettes and 15 students answered this question for 20 - 24 of the vignettes. The other 25 students answered this question for less than 20 vignettes with 14 students answering this question for less than 10 vignettes including 1 student who did not respond to this question at all. This pattern of attenuation was slightly worse for question #13. Three teachers out of 20 answered this question for all 24 vignettes and 7 teachers out of 20 answered this question for 20 - 24 vignettes. The other 13 teachers answered this question for less than 20 vignettes with 6 teachers providing responses for less than 10 vignettes including 2 teachers who did not respond to this question. Six of the possible 40 students answered #13 for all 24 vignettes and 10 students answered this question for 20 - 24 of the vignettes. The other 30 students answered this question for less than 20 vignettes with 18 students answering this question for less than 10 vignettes including 5 students who did not respond to this question at all. The other problem was perseveration, that is, some participants, especially students,
would write down the same answers regardless of the vignette (e.g., "I don't know", "O. K.", "good", "bad").

Representativeness of Problem Types

The purpose of question #10 of the questionnaire (see Table 3) was to determine the degree to which the participants considered the problem type behaviors depicted in the vignettes to be representative of behaviors they have seen in classrooms in which they have been. These data were analyzed by calculating 95% confidence intervals around the grand mean for each problem type (see Fig. 22). The means for all the problem types fell above the midpoint of the scale of 1 - 9 in the question except for the girl actor for hostile aggressiveness. In addition, the midpoint of the scale fell within the confidence intervals for both the boy and girl defiant problem types, the boy actor for hyperactiveness, and the girl actors for immature and shy/withdrawn behaviors. Further analyses were conducted by way of 2 X 2 (role and gender) ANOVA's calculated separately for each of the 24 vignettes. These results (see Table 18) indicated that statistically significant F ratios were obtained on 7 vignettes. Six were for the role main effect and 1 for the gender main effect. No statistically significant interactions were found in these analyses. Teachers and students considered the representativeness of scene on the video to be significantly different for the underachieving boy actor, the hostile aggressive girl actor, both boy and girl actors portraying short attention span/distractible behavior, the immature boy actor, and the shy/withdrawn boy actor. The only significant difference for gender was for the hyperactive boy actor. These results indicate that the 18 of the 24 vignettes were generally representative of problem behaviors the participants had seen in classroom situations in which they have been.

Validation of Vignettes on the Video

The purpose of question #11 (see Table 3) was to determine whether or not the participants reported seeing the problem type that was portrayed on the video. These data
Fig. 22: Confidence intervals for representatives for each vignette within problem type.
Table 18: Means and standard deviations for the representativeness of the 24 vignettes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Actor</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure Syndrome</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>6.40 (2.09)</td>
<td>6.51 (2.39)</td>
<td>6.10 (2.65)</td>
<td>6.83 (1.82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>6.85 (2.37)</td>
<td>6.95 (2.45)</td>
<td>6.38 (2.91)</td>
<td>7.43 (1.68)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>6.90 (2.08)</td>
<td>6.80 (2.30)</td>
<td>6.62 (2.46)</td>
<td>7.03 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>6.85 (1.57)</td>
<td>7.03 (2.29)</td>
<td>6.97 (2.40)</td>
<td>6.97 (1.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underachiever</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>5.30 (2.03)</td>
<td>7.34 (2.25)*</td>
<td>6.32 (2.67)</td>
<td>6.93 (2.05)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>6.11 (2.13)</td>
<td>7.03 (2.82)</td>
<td>6.50 (2.70)</td>
<td>6.93 (2.58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Achiever</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>6.25 (2.63)</td>
<td>7.28 (2.16)</td>
<td>6.55 (2.69)</td>
<td>7.30 (1.97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>5.70 (2.43)</td>
<td>6.82 (2.64)</td>
<td>6.28 (2.69)</td>
<td>6.60 (2.55)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile Aggressive</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>6.40 (2.35)</td>
<td>6.39 (2.39)</td>
<td>6.55 (2.69)</td>
<td>6.23 (2.79)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>4.95 (2.48)</td>
<td>3.49 (2.83)*</td>
<td>3.38 (2.41)</td>
<td>4.57 (3.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Aggressive</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>6.85 (2.21)</td>
<td>5.61 (3.00)</td>
<td>5.86 (2.80)</td>
<td>6.21 (2.83)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>5.75 (2.67)</td>
<td>6.39 (2.67)</td>
<td>5.59 (2.89)</td>
<td>6.73 (2.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiant</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>4.70 (2.45)</td>
<td>5.82 (3.02)</td>
<td>4.79 (2.87)</td>
<td>6.07 (2.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>4.74 (2.47)</td>
<td>5.62 (3.22)</td>
<td>5.14 (3.23)</td>
<td>5.50 (2.81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperactive</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>5.25 (2.81)</td>
<td>5.15 (3.45)</td>
<td>4.17 (3.31)</td>
<td>6.18 (2.85)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>6.30 (1.53)</td>
<td>7.41 (2.33)</td>
<td>7.21 (2.08)</td>
<td>6.87 (2.22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short attention span/</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>6.70 (2.23)</td>
<td>7.84 (1.65)*</td>
<td>7.46 (2.05)</td>
<td>7.43 (1.85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distractible</td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>5.70 (2.13)</td>
<td>7.61 (1.55)*</td>
<td>6.96 (2.15)</td>
<td>6.93 (1.84)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immature</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>6.25 (2.59)</td>
<td>6.69 (2.83)</td>
<td>6.17 (3.05)</td>
<td>6.90 (2.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>3.85 (2.48)</td>
<td>5.72 (3.23)*</td>
<td>5.38 (3.19)</td>
<td>4.80 (3.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected by peers</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>6.35 (2.30)</td>
<td>7.13 (2.53)</td>
<td>6.93 (2.52)</td>
<td>6.80 (2.44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>5.95 (2.61)</td>
<td>6.26 (2.74)</td>
<td>6.17 (2.90)</td>
<td>6.13 (2.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shy/Withdrawn</td>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>5.50 (2.44)</td>
<td>6.97 (2.50)*</td>
<td>6.17 (2.70)</td>
<td>6.77 (2.42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>4.80 (2.59)</td>
<td>5.41 (3.19)</td>
<td>5.07 (2.99)</td>
<td>5.33 (3.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
were coded with a 0 for an answer which indicated that the participant did not report the problem portrayed in the vignette and a 1 for an answer that indicated that the participant did report the problem portrayed in the vignette. These data were then analyzed by calculating confidence intervals for proportions of dichotomous data (see Fig. 23). All the proportions for the problem types fell above the 50% guess rate except for the girl actor for the underachiever problem type. These data indicate that the vignettes on the video depicted what they were intended to depict since the majority of the participants reported seeing the problem type that was portrayed on the video.
Fig. 23: Confidence intervals for main thing seen in the vignettes by the participants.
CHAPTER 5
SUPPLEMENTAL STUDIES

In addition to the main research project I also conducted two supplemental studies - a classification study and a multidimensional scaling study. These investigations were conducted to further describe and corroborate the problem types used in the main study.

Study 2

The purpose of the classification study was to determine the validity of the videotape vignettes as representations of Brophy and Rohrkemper's (1981) problem types (Appendix A). It is important in a study such as this to determine whether the videotape vignettes represent the problem type constructs that they are intended to represent. Most of the previous attribution research described in the literature use written vignettes which are able to portray only part of the information important to the attribution process and is perhaps less problematic when attribution research is concerned with success and failure in achievement situations. However, the research reported here attempts to extend attribution theory to problem classroom behavior. Problem classroom behaviors often involve elements that are difficult, if not impossible to depict clearly in a short, written vignette. For example, how can tone of voice, facial expressions, posture, or physical location be portrayed clearly with an economy of words? A viable solution to this dilemma chosen for this research was to portray the vignettes on videotape using actors who were the same age and grade as the student participants in the study.

However, the use of videotape vignettes creates its own problems. It is difficult to portray some problem types briefly on video without providing a strong inferential bias. For example, it is difficult to portray underachievement without adding dialog that refers to ability or effort information in the context of less than optimal academic performance. Yet if such dialog were added to make the vignette unambiguous, it is likely that the nature of the attributions
regarding the problem type would be highly constrained by the information communicated by the dialog. A teacher commenting, "Salesh, I know from the scores on your ability tests that you are very capable of doing a good job on your school work, yet you don't put much effort into the work" is most likely going to result in causal attributions to effort.

This study presents data that will help determine the extent to which the videotape vignettes represent the problem types that they were designed to represent. This was accomplished by having teachers view the 24 vignettes and indicate which of the 12 problem types the vignettes portray.

Method

Participants. The participants consisted of the 20 teachers who remained after the random sample for Study 1 was selected from the original pool of 42 teachers who volunteered for participation in the study. Two teachers were unable to participate in the study due to time constraints.

Instrument. Participants were given a list naming the 12 problem types and definition of each problem type (see Table 19). A response sheet consisted of a list of the names of the actors in the vignettes (see Table 20) followed by a short line for recording the problem type.

Procedures. Participants were given the option of viewing all 24 vignettes on one of three different days. Participants were given the sheet defining 12 types of behavior problems (recall that there were 2 vignettes for each problem type) and allowed a few minutes to become familiar with the terms and the definitions. Then, the first vignette was shown on the video. Participants were given a few moments to reflect on what they saw, to peruse the definitions of the problem types, and to record their responses. The participants had the option of using the problem more than two times, since the instructions did not state otherwise. This procedure was repeated for each of the remaining vignettes. The data consisted of the participants' choices of problem
1. **Failure syndrome.** These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

2. **Perfectionist.** These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so the they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

3. **Underachiever.** These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

4. **Low achiever.** These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

5. **Hostile aggressive.** These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

6. **Passive aggressive.** These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

7. **Defiant.** These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

8. **Hyperactive.** These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

9. **Short attention span/distractible.** These children have short attention spans. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.
10. **Immature.** These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

11. **Rejected by peers.** These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

12. **Shy/withdrawn.** These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.
In this study you are asked to view the vignettes on the video. After you have viewed each vignette, you are asked to identify the problem type by referring to the descriptions provided and placing the number of the problem type beside the name of the student exhibiting the problem behavior in the vignette.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignettes</th>
<th>Problem type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meagan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abinesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mera</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salesh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
types for each of the 24 vignettes. The data analysis consisted of calculating the frequency of participants' choices of problem types and determining confidence intervals for each vignette.

**Results**

The confidence intervals for 19 of the 24 vignettes fell above the guess rate of 2. The 5 exceptions were for the boy actors for underachiever, low achiever, and shy/withdrawn and the girl actors for low achiever and shy/withdrawn (see Fig. 24). The guess rate of 2, rounded up to the nearest whole number, is obtained by considering that for each vignette the number of participants who could be expected to guess the problem type correctly purely by chance. This figure would be $1/20$ (the number of problem types) of the number of participants in this study which was 20.

**Study 3**

The data from study 2 indicate that 19 of the 24 vignettes portray the problem types in such a manner that teachers could reliably classify them. Nonetheless, only half of the vignettes were correctly classified by more than half of the teachers who participated in Study 2. These results are somewhat more reasonable and indicate the difficulty in developing clear videotape representations of the 12 problem types described Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981).

An additional question remains as to the extent to which the 12 problem types can be clearly differentiated from each other. For example, while the boy actor for the perfectionist problem type was reliably classified as representing the perfectionist type, 9 teachers thought that this vignette represented the failure syndrome problem type. This confusion might have been the result of inadequate scripts, poor acting, observer bias, or a variety of other potential sources of confusion. Alternately, it might be the case that perfectionistic problems are conceptually and/or behaviorally similar to failure syndrome problems in the classroom. It is in regard to this last possibility that Study 3 was conducted.
fig. 24 classification results
This study employs multidimensional scaling techniques to determine the "hidden structure" (Kruskal & Wish, 1978) of the 12 problem types. This research method was used in order to identify relationships among the 12 problem types and to represent these relationships graphically.

**Method**

**Participants.** The participants for this study consisted of 28 graduate students in Education. The students, who were enrolled in two different classes, were drawn from the full range of graduate programs in instructional and counseling psychology, curriculum, administration, and higher education.

**Instrument.** Multidimensional scaling data is often collected by presenting participants with stimuli in pairs and asking them to judge the degree to which the pairs of stimuli are similar or dissimilar. The instrument in this investigation consisted of 66 pairs of problem types with the accompanying definitions each with a scale of 100 (similar) - 0 (not similar) (see Multidimensional Scaling Study, Appendix E). These pairs were produced by matching each problem type with all other problem types. The number of pairs is calculated by the formula N(N-1)/2. The order of problem types listed in each pair was randomized and presented in the same order for all participants.

**Procedures.** The participants were asked to read the definitions of a pair of problem types and circle a number on the scale representing the degree to which they thought the pairs of problem types were similar or dissimilar. The participants were allowed as much time as needed, however, all participants finished the task within one hour. The data were analyzed by calculating mean similarity ratings for the 28 raters who participated in the study. These 66 means were then entered into the ALSCAL program in order to provide a multidimensional scaling solution.
Results

The mean similarity ratings are reported in Table 21. A two dimensional multidimensional scaling solution was extracted from these means. The results yielded a Kruskal formula 1 stress factor of .169 (Kruskal & Wish, 1978) and an $R^2$ of .815. Ideally, the stress value should be lower, since this stress is such that a third dimension could be extracted. However, Kruskal and Wish also state that with as few as 12 stimuli, it is only a possibility that a third dimension could be determined. The $R^2$ of .815 is robust enough that these dimensions adequately represent the relatedness among the 12 problem types.

Kruskal and Wish (1978) describe two procedures for interpreting multidimensional data. The first procedure is the dimensional procedure which involves looking for "lines in space, possibly at right angles to each other, such that the stimuli projecting at opposite extremes of a line differ from each other in some easily describable way" (p. 31). It is also possible to rotate the dimensions, but when doing so, the projections change drastically. The distances between the points in the configuration do not change however. The second procedure is the neighborhood interpretation which involves looking for structures in which regions of the space may have similar or shared characteristics. Kruskal and Wish (1978) do not place one method of interpretation over the other; they take a more eclectic view when they state, "use any means at your disposal to understand as much of the data and results as possible. Thus a neighborhood interpretation can be used to supplement and clarify the dimensions rather than to compete with them" (p. 45). Both the dimensional and neighborhood interpretations were used to interpret the results of this study.

Using the dimension interpretation, the X-axis could be classified as a degree of volition, that is, most of the problem types falling along this axis tend to differentiate overt volitional behavior to covert or withdrawn behavior. The Y-axis could be classified as that of focus where the focus seems to shift from academic to social behaviors. Rotation of the axes
Table 21: Matrix of mean similarity ratings for the 12 problem types.
do not change the directionality of the dimensions. I also considered a neighborhood interpretation (Figure 25) in which the problem types were clustered. Problem types #5 (hostile aggressive), #7 (defiant), and #8 (hyperactive) and could be classified as the 'defiant' neighborhood since these three problem types all indicate some degree of defiance. Problem types #9 (short attention span/distractible) and #10 (immature) both indicate some degree of immaturity and restlessness and therefore could be classified as the 'immature' neighborhood. Problem types #6 (passive aggressive), #11 (rejected by peers), and #1 (failure syndrome) all include some form and degree of rejection, either by others as in rejection by peers and failure syndrome or by themselves as in passive aggressiveness and could be classified as the 'rejection' neighborhood. Problem type #1 (failure syndrome) also lies close in distance to problem types #3 (underachiever) and #4 (low achiever) and these three problem types all indicate some form and degree of failure and therefore could be classified as the 'failure' neighborhood. Problem types #2 (perfectionism) and #12 (shy/withdrawn) are quite distant from each other and all the other problem types and therefore are not included in any of the neighborhoods.

**General Discussion**

The purpose of the second study was to investigate the accuracy of Brophy and Rohrkenper's (1981) problem types. The results indicate that most of the problem types were correctly chosen by the participants when they saw the vignettes. The difficulty in choosing the correct problem type for the vignettes might be due to the fact that several of the problem types were difficult to depict on video. Because of the nature of some of these problems, considerable background information is necessary to clearly depict them. For example, depicting the differences between underachievement and low achievement requires information about prior academic performance. Similarly, shy/withdrawn behavior is
MDS configuration Fig. 25
exemplified by the absence of behavior; this is very difficult to portray clearly in a brief 10-20 second video scene.

The purpose of the third study was to investigate the differentiability of Brophy and Rohrkemper's (1981) problem types, that is, the degree to which the problem types are different from each other. The results indicate that the problem types generally are different from each other, although the clusters indicate that there are some similarities as well. The relatedness of the problem types in these clusters are based on an interpretation of the problem type definition.
The correlations reported in Table 3 indicate that the participants in this study judge covariation among the three causal dimensions somewhat differently. Aggregating across the groups, it appears as though locus and stability are rated independently of each other. The aggregated correlation is only -.07 and none of the correlations disaggregated by role (teacher or student) or gender (male or female) is statistically significant, although a number of them are negative. The correlations between stability and controllability are all negative and the aggregated correlation, while statistically significant, is of modest magnitude. Thus, there is some reason to believe that these participants view more stable causes of classroom disruptive behavior to be somewhat more uncontrollable (or conversely, uncontrollable causes are more stable). There is a small, positive relationship between locus and controllability such that more internal causes of classroom disruptive behavior are rated as more controllable. When this correlation is disaggregated for the subsamples, it is clear that the male teachers represent this relationship most strongly (r=.82).

These results are consistent with Weiner’s (1986) review of the independence of these three perceived dimensions in the attribution of causes of success and failure in achievement settings. Weiner reviewed the evidence for covariation among these three dimensions in an effort to demonstrate that, while empirically covarying, the dimensions are theoretically separate. In the data reported here, there is sufficient independence among these three dimensions to investigate relationships between the separate dimensions and the 12 problem types manipulated in the vignettes.

**Main Effects**

The review of the research suggested that there would be a significant main effect for role in the perception of the three causal dimensions. In particular, I anticipated that teachers
would consider the problem classroom behaviors to be more internal, stable, and controllable than would students. However, I did not anticipate finding main effects for gender of participant. While neither of these factors proved to have a significant main effect on the ratings of the causal dimensions, there was a significant interaction between these two factors on the MANOVA. This significant interaction was found only on the subsequent ANOVA for controllability. An examination of the means showed that the effect could be attributed to the discrepancy between female students, who rated the causes of these problem types to be more controllable than female teachers.

Weiner (1986) speculated that females might attribute success to unstable causes and failure to stable causes. However, in reviewing the work of Deaux (1984) and Frieze and her colleagues (Frieze, Whitley, Hanusa, & McHugh, 1982; McHugh, Freize, & Hanusa, 1982), Weiner added that such a simple model of females' causal ascriptions might be insufficient. There is reason to believe that the type of task on which success and failure occurs and the situation in which the task takes place might influence gender differences. However, these speculations concerned stability ascriptions, not controllability, since much of the research studying gender differences in attributions investigate the locus and stability dimensions. Two studies that did investigate controllability for success and failure arrived at opposing conclusions. Rogers (1980) found significant interactions of both age and gender with effort, a controllable attribution (Weiner et al., 1979). On the other hand, no significant gender differences for controllability were found for success and failure in other research (Parsons et al., 1982). At this point there is little theoretical basis for explaining the gender X role interaction in the attribution of controllability ascriptions to these problem types. It could be speculated that the female teachers tend to view these problems as being the result of a constellation of forces beyond the control of the children portraying the problem types, whereas the female students considered the children to be more culpable or blameworthy.
The question remains as to why the male teachers and students did not differ in the same way as did the females.

I also hypothesized that the gender of the actor in the vignette would influence ratings in that the participants might consider the boy actors to be more external in locus, less stable in problem behavior, and to have less control over their behavior than the girl actors. This hypothesis was based partly on the research by Licht et al. (1985) and Bond and Deming (1982) and the research cited above by Deaux (1984) and Frieze et al. (1982). However, while the gender of the actor main effect was not significant, gender of actor did prove to have an impact on causal ascriptions by way of an interaction between gender of actor and problem type. I will interpret these interactions later.

There were significant main effects for problem type on all three causal dimensions. Post hoc analyses indicated significance for locus and controllability only. On both of these causal dimensions, peer rejection is viewed as being the result of causes which are external and uncontrollable. On the other hand, the high ends of the dimensions (internal and controllable) were anchored by defiant and passive aggressive problem types. The extremes of the distributions of problem types were exactly the opposite for the stability dimension. The lowest mean was for passive aggressive and the highest was for rejected by peers. (The differences in the controllability dimension must be interpreted with caution because, while the omnibus F-ratio for the problem type main effect was significant, the Scheffe test did not reveal any statistically significant pairwise differences.) Thus, while passive aggressive and defiant problem behaviors are seen to be internal and controllable, they are also viewed as unstable. Conversely, peer rejection is seen as relatively more external and uncontrollable while also being relatively more stable.

These interpretations of the problem type main effects must be tempered by an interesting and somewhat enigmatic finding. An inspection of the magnitude of the means for
the 12 problem types on the 3 causal dimensions reported in Tables 1-12 reveals that, on locus and controllability, the means for 11 of the problem types fall above the scale midpoint (the item midpoint is 5-see Appendix A - and there are 3 items per dimension). These 11 problem types are viewed generally as being internal and controllable. The only mean that falls below the scale midpoint is for rejected by peers. On the other hand, for stability, all of the means for the 12 problem types fall below the midpoint; these participants consider all of these problem types to be unstable.

**Actor by Problem Type Effects**

As mentioned above, the gender of the actor X problem type interaction was statistically significant for all three dimensions. The student and teacher observers in this study viewed perfectionism to be more internal, more stable, and more controllable for the girls than for the boys. Put differently, when girls are perfectionists, it is because of causes which are within themselves, relatively stable, and under their control. Perfectionism in boys, however, is the result of external causes which are unstable and uncontrollable. These views are consistent with general beliefs that elementary grade girls tend to be more concerned about the quality of work than boys (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974).

When boys are rejected by their peers, this problem is viewed as more stable than when girls are rejected. When it comes to controllability, girls are viewed to have more control over passive aggressive and immature problem behaviors, while boys have more control over shy/withdrawn and, as discussed above, perfectionist problem behaviors.

**Role by Problem Type Effects**

Although the MANOVA yielded a significance of .06 for the role X problem type interaction, a level which normally would not be interpreted, I chose to interpret the role X problem type interaction since the interactions on the ANOVAs were significant for the locus and controllability dependent variables. Although there was no significant role main effect, it is
interesting to note that role did interact with problem type. In other words, role did have a significant effect on certain types of classroom behavior problems. These results are consistent with the findings that role is an important factor in attribution theory in other situations (Covington & Omelich, 1979b; Covington, Spratt, & Omelich, 1980). Furthermore, in this research role implies a developmental focus as well since teachers and students operate at different levels of development by virtue of age and education. Significant differences in development have been found in several studies described earlier in which a major finding was that causal schemata or belief structures are dependent on an individual's level of maturity and experiences in the situation (Frieze & Snyder, 1980; Maas et al., 1978; Nicholls & Miller, 1985).

In reviewing the results of the analyses, it is evident that there are differences among those problem types which have their bases in academic performance, interpersonal behavior, or personal characteristics as well as locus and controllability. For locus, the teachers considered the passive aggressive, defiant, immature, and rejected by peers problem types to be more internal than did the students. While both teachers and students attribute these problem behaviors to social and/or personal causes (see Tables 23, 24), teacher participants tend to consider these causes to originate from within the student whereas student participants consider the causes to originate from the student's environment or external sources. The female students also attributed immature behavior to personal causes and personal causes were also more prevalent for the female teachers. The students considered the failure syndrome, low achievement, short attention span/distractible, and shy/withdrawn problem types to be more internal than did the teachers. While both teachers and students attribute these problem behaviors primarily to academic causes (see Tables 23, 24), student participants consider these causes to originate from within the student whereas teacher participants consider the causes to originate from the student's environment or external.
sources. Female students also attributed failure syndrome to personal causes while both female students and female teachers attributed shy/withdrawn behavior to personal causes. These results on the locus dimension verify the findings of Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981). Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) state that teachers are ultimately responsible for the behaviors that occur in their classrooms and therefore have some degree of ownership of these problems. However, they found that teachers typically considered the causes of problem classroom behaviors to be external to themselves; typically problem behaviors are caused by factors internal to the student. In other words, students are seen as causing the problem behaviors in classrooms.

For controllability, teachers considered the shy/withdrawn problem type to be controllable while students considered this behavior to be uncontrollable. While both teachers and students attributed this problem behavior primarily to academic causes, female teachers and students also attributed this behavior to personal causes more so than male teachers and students. Students considered the perfectionist, low achiever, hostile aggressive, and hyperactive problem types to be controllable, whereas teachers considered these behaviors to be uncontrollable. Perfectionism and low achievement were both attributed primarily to academic causes although perfectionism was also attributed to personal causes. While students attributed hostile aggressive and hyperactive behaviors to social and personal causes with social causes being stronger for the female student, teachers attributed these behaviors primarily to social causes. These results varied from those of Brophy and Rohrkemper (1981) who found that student owned problem behaviors included perfectionism, low achievement, rejection by peers, and immaturity; teacher owned problem behaviors included underachievement, hostile aggressiveness, passive aggressiveness, and defiance; and, shared ownership of problem behaviors included failure syndrome, hyperactivity, short attention span/distractibility, and shy/withdrawn behaviors. Their
controllability results covaried with ownership (student, teacher, shared) of problem behaviors. They found that teachers considered students exhibiting student owned problem behaviors as unable to control their behaviors and therefore not responsible for their behaviors. Teachers' attributions concerning shared ownership of problem behaviors were more mixed in that they considered students less likely to control their behaviors than to be able to control them. Students who presented teacher owned problem behaviors were considered by teachers as able to control their behaviors and thus were seen as blameworthy. The controllability results of this research did not differentiate among the three types of ownership of problem behaviors.

**Role by Actor by Problem Type Effects**

Although the MANOVA yielded a significance of .06 for role X actor X problem type interaction, again a level which normally would not be interpreted, I interpret the role X actor X problem type interaction here since the interactions on the ANOVAs were significant for the locus and controllability dependent variables. The results of role by problem type changed considerably when the gender of the actor interacted with these two variables, that is, attributions of both teachers and students are made according to whether the actor was a boy or girl. These results may be more consistent with those of Bond and Deming (1982), although they discussed attributions as they reflected stereotypic "sex-appropriate" tasks or behaviors. For locus, teachers considered perfectionism and underachievement to be more internal for the female actors than for the male actors and passive aggressive to be more internal for the male actors than the female actors. The teachers tended to attribute perfectionism and underachievement to academic and social causes while they attributed passive aggressiveness to social and personal causes. These results also exemplify the effect that teacher expectations have about the causes of classroom behaviors and that teachers do tend to differentiate their views of students. These results can be further corroborated by other
research which has been conducted in the area teacher expectations of students participating in classroom events, routines, and behaviors (Brophy, 1985; Weinstein, 1989; Marshall and Weinstein, 1984).

Marshall and Weinstein (1984) have studied and described complex interactions in classrooms. They describe an interactional model dealing with various classroom factors which affect students' self-evaluations. These factors include task structure, locus of responsibility in learning and evaluation, motivational strategies, and quality of relationships between the teacher and the students. They conclude that the existence of complex interactions has several implications. Looking at only one or two dimensions of the classroom at a time represents only a small part of what actually happens in classrooms, and if these dimensions are taken out of context, they may distort the reality of the classroom as a whole. The meaning of aspects of the classroom structure and process, in the context of the whole classroom, may be lost to the observer focusing on discrete variables. The use of social comparisons in providing students information about their own ability should be minimized because most of these comparisons are negative in nature. They advocate the development of a self-evaluation process based on their interactional model.

Weinstein (1989) also discusses student motivation and achievement and students' views of self-fulfilling prophecies. She concludes firstly, that students are observers of teacher behaviors. They are aware of their interactions with the teacher and also the interactions their teacher has with others, especially in regard to achievement levels. Secondly, she states that students reported classroom differences in degree of differential teacher interactions with the high and low achievers. Thirdly, Weinstein (1989) states that, in classrooms where differential teacher treatment did take place, students' identification of this treatment proved to be associated with and predictive of students' academic and social competence. Lastly, she concludes that there is strong evidence for consistency of teacher expectations as well as
individual and developmental differences in students' awareness of and response to teacher expectations in the classroom.

Brophy (1985) discusses and describes research regarding teachers' expectations in academic achievement and goals and motives for socialization of students with behavior problems. He describes specifically an investigation of how teachers deal with the hostile aggressive student. He states that attributions held by teachers regarding students' personal characteristics and classroom behavior determine beliefs and expectations about the potential for change, thereby leading to expectations about the success teachers can expect for their attempts at socialization of students with behavior problems. He concludes, "the findings presented here on teachers' role definitions, attributions, and specific motives for dealing with hostile aggressive students illustrate how teachers' expectations (and associated attitudes and beliefs) affect their behavior in the area of socialization in addition to the area of instruction. Unfortunately, they also illustrate the same phenomenon found in studies on achievement expectations: undesirable effects of negative expectations appear to be more frequent and more powerful than desirable effects of optimistic expectations" (p. 211). He believes that teachers' socialization attempts will be greatly enhanced if they change their expectations (determined largely by teachers' attributions about the causes of problem behavior) about the change in behavior.

For controllability, both teachers and students considered perfectionism to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors and attributed this problem behavior primarily to academic causes. Teachers considered underachievement to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors whereas, students considered underachievement to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors. While the teachers attributed underachievement to academic and personal causes, students' causal ascriptions for underachievement were more even across the three domains.
Teachers considered hostile aggressiveness to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors, whereas, students considered hostile aggressiveness to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors. Both teachers and students attributed hostile aggressive behavior to social and personal causes. Both teachers and students considered passive aggressiveness to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors. While teachers attributed passive aggressive behavior to social and personal causes, male students attributed this behavior primarily to social causes and female students causal ascriptions were more even across the three domains.

Teachers considered defiant behavior to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors and attributed this problem behavior to personal causes. The students considered hyperactive behavior to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors and attributed this behavior to social and personal causes. Short attention span/distractible behavior was considered to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors by the teachers and they attributed this problem behavior to academic causes. Both teachers and students considered immature behavior to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors and both groups attributed this problem behavior primarily to social causes, although female teachers and female students also attributed this behavior to personal causes. Teachers considered the rejection by peers to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors and attributed this problem behavior to social causes. Students considered shy/withdrawn behavior to be more controllable for the female actors than for the male actors and attributed this problem behavior to academic causes.

The results for controllability, then, indicate that teachers consider underachievement, defiance, and rejection by peers to be more controllable for female actors than for male actors and that hostile aggressiveness and short attention span/distractibility are more controllable for
the male actors. Students, on the other hand, consider underachievement to be more controllable for the male actors than for the female actors and hostile aggressiveness to be more controllable for the female actors. They also consider hyperactivity to be more controllable for the male actor and shy/withdrawn behavior to be more controllable for the female actor. Both teachers and students consider perfectionism to be more controllable for the female actor than for the male actor and passive aggressiveness and immaturity to be more controllable for the male actors. These results follow the general stereotypic beliefs (Clarizio & McCoy, 1976) that girls tend to have more control over their overt, acting-out behavior than boys who tend to have little control over their overt behaviors. Furthermore, these results also tend to indicate that stereotypically, girls have more control over behaviors which have affective overtones such as rejection by peers and shy/withdrawn.

Summary

At the end of chapter 2, I posed three questions for this investigation which are reviewed here. The first question asked whether role was a significant factor in the locus, stability, and controllability dimensions regarding the kinds of attributions teachers and students made about the 12 problem classroom behaviors. The results indicated that there was no significant difference in the overall ascriptions made by teachers and students, although role did interact with actor and problem type. The second question asked whether gender of the participants was a significant factor in the locus, stability and controllability dimensions regarding the attributions made. The results again indicated that male and female participants did not provide significantly different overall causal ascriptions. However, there was a significant role by gender interaction for controllability indicating that female students believe that problem behaviors are more controllable than do the female teachers. The third question asked whether the gender of the actor in the video vignettes had a significant effect on the responses made by teachers and students (role) and males and females (gender of
participants) regarding causal attributions in the framework of the locus, stability, and controllability dimensions. The results indicated that there were significant differences for locus and controllability and that these results varied across role and gender of the participants.

**Future Research**

Further research is warranted in the investigation of attributions in problem classroom behaviors since there are still conflicting results from the studies cited in this paper. Furthermore, studies investigating the causal ascriptions made by participants needs to be replicated.

There were some other problems in this study as well. The activity was too long for one sitting for the students. Some students became bored or tired toward the end of the exercise, complaining that the questionnaire was too long. This problem would account for the attenuation and perseveration which was evident on the last two questions of the questionnaire. Some teachers complained also that the assignment was long; however, it must be remembered that they completed the exercise after school, after a full day of teaching. Some of the participants had some difficulty in accurately describing some of the problem types on the video. This problem was corroborated by the results from classification study (Study 2). In future studies, some of the vignettes need to be depicted more accurately on the video in order that participants are able to describe the problem types more readily. Also, it would be more palatable to conduct the investigation in more than one sitting for students to avoid contamination due to attenuation and/or perseveration and for the teachers to avoid fatigue. Although it is preferable to allow the participants to provide the causal ascriptions that come to mind, future research in this area might consider including a list of possible causal ascriptions in the directions from which to choose, since many of the causal ascriptions given by the participants seemed outlandish, vague.
Summary

A great deal of research has been conducted in attribution theory concerning the attributions for success and failure in academic achievement contexts. More recently, this work has been extended to other tasks and contexts, such as cheating and interpersonal behaviors. There has been less attention to the causal attributions for classroom disruptive behaviors that were described in this study. These findings have important implications for classroom management and related activities such as school counseling. The implications could include the application of attribution theory as well as reattribution skills training to classroom management courses and texts. The significant role X gender effect suggests that female teachers and female students view problem classroom behaviors differently. Some classroom management problems might be avoided if these two groups would recognize each others attributions in regard to causes of problem classroom behaviors and to be more accepting of each other's different attributions. This difference in perspective also has implications for counseling since teachers might hold quite different attributions for the causes of the problems, whereas students might ascribe quite different attributions for the same behavior. Such differences might be at the root of disputes which spill out of the classroom and into the school counsellor's office. Furthermore, the actor by problem type interaction indicates that both teachers and students regard significant differences in some classroom behavior problems depending on the gender of the student exhibiting the problem. This finding has implications in regard to the issue of differential treatment for students exhibiting problem behavior, and, therefore, for classroom management. To sum up the relation between an attributional analysis of problem classroom behavior and its implications for instruction and counseling, I quote Brophy (1985), "at present, most teachers are ill-informed about factors influencing development and change in personal characteristics and interpersonal conduct, so they are prone to misattribution, superstitious learning
(overgeneralizing from specific experiences or individuals), searching for quick-fix answers to complex problems that have evolved over long periods, thinking in terms of reacting to problems after they occur rather than in terms of preventing these problems from occurring in the first place, and all of the other mistakes that occur during trial and error learning conducted without a significant knowledge base" (pp. 211,.212).
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APPENDIX A
**Problem types and vignettes.**

A. *Failure syndrome.* These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

1. Teacher looks up to see Rory dawdling instead of beginning the assignment.
   
   Teacher: "Come on Rory. I'd like you to get started on this assignment."
   
   Rory: "But this work is too hard."
   
   Teacher: "I know you can do it, Rory."
   
   Rory: "No I can't."
   
   Teacher: "Try it anyways, please."
   
   Rory: "I said that it's too hard. I can't do it!"

13. Various students are handing in their work including Maria.
   
   Maria: "There it is, Sir, finished."
   
   Teacher: "Thank you, Maria. Did you get them all done this time?"
   
   Teacher quickly glances over the work and sees that she has skipped many items and looks back at Maria.
   
   Teacher: "You left some out again. You seem to get frustrated and then you tend to give up."

B. *Perfectionist.* These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

5. The class is finishing up some pictures and some students have handed in their pictures.
   
   Teacher: "Irene, are you finished with your picture yet?"
   
   Irene: "Not yet, I made some mistakes on my first two pictures."
   
   Teacher: "You've had a full 45 minute class to do it and some students are finished."
   
   Irene: "I know, but I want to make the best picture I can."
17. The teacher is conducting a class discussion. He notices that Harald seems to be sure of the answer and decides to call on him. Harald looks attentive in class as the teacher asks questions about the lesson.

Teacher: "Harald, can you give us the answer to question 3?"

Harald turns white and says (clearly upset), "I uh, I uh, I don't really want to answer. I'm not sure if I'm right. I think it's 25.5."

Teacher: "I'm sorry, Harald, that is incorrect. You looked as if you were sure you knew the answer."

C. Underachiever. These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

9. All the students in the class are working at seat work.

Teacher: "Salesh, it seems that you try to get out of doing your work quite often."

Salesh: "I forgot, Sir. I got busy doing something else."

Camera fades out and fades back in to Salesh who is making an airplane. The teacher looks up and sees Salesh making the paper airplane instead of working.

Teacher: "Salesh, you're wasting time again. Last time you said this wouldn't happen again."

Salesh: "Oh, I forgot. I'm sorry Sir. It won't happen again. I promise."

21. The teacher is teaching a lesson in adding decimal numbers. While the teacher teaches the lesson, Jennifer turns to students on either side of her to make remarks and now she has a conversation with several friends.

Jennifer converses with several students around her.

Teacher: "Jennifer, your constant chattering is taking the other students from their work and yours doesn't get done either."

The camera fades out. The camera fades in with students handing in their seatwork.

Jennifer hands in her work and the teacher asks, "Did you get them all right, Jennifer?"

Jennifer: "No, but this is good enough."
Problem Types and Vignettes - cont.

D. Low achiever. These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

12. The teacher is at the front of the room reviewing some social studies facts. Phillip is looking attentively at the teacher and the teacher notices this and feels that Phillip will know the answer to the next question.

   Teacher: "Phillip, can you tell us what the ten provinces are?"
   Phillip looks puzzled at the teacher and obviously was lost in thought.
   Phillip (after a 3 second pause): "I, uh, I don't know, Sir."
   Teacher: "I'm sorry Phillip, I thought for sure you knew the answer this time."

24. The teacher has just assigned some seatwork and looks over the class. He sees that Lupin is upset.

   Teacher: "Lupin, what's the matter? Is something wrong?"
   Lupin: "I can't do this work. It's too hard."

E. Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

14. A scuffle has started and the teacher looks up from his desk and sees Tyler at Philip's desk punching him and shouting at him. Philip is holding up his arms.

   Tyler (shouting): "You did so! I saw you!" Philip continues to ward off the blows and the teacher comes over to stop the scuffle.
   Teacher: "Tyler, it seems that you frequently start fights and usually they're over nothing. Philip has not been in a fight yet this year. This one has me really puzzled. I will speak to both of you later."
Problem Types and Vignettes - cont.

2. The teacher is standing by his desk and several students come to his desk and are excitedly telling him something. Christina is standing in the doorway of the classroom.

   Teacher: "Whoa! What has happened?"
   Marilyn: "Christina beat up Jenny!"
   Ria: "Yeah, and she took Jenny's lunch money!"
   Maria: "This isn't the first time that Christina has taken money from other kids, either."
   Elise: "Yes, I've seen her do this before."
   Christina looks down and shuffles her feet.

6. Passive aggressive. These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs:

   - subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

18. The class is about to go for P. E. and the teacher is giving instructions while Mera is drawing a picture.

   Teacher: "Class, please line up for gym."
   All students follow the instruction except Mera.
   Teacher: "Come on Mera. I asked everyone to line up for gym."
   Mera looks up in the direction of the line, and then continues with her drawing.
Problem Types and Vignettes - cont.

G. **Defiant.** These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

10. The students in the class are working on their assignments, however, Julie is fooling around with her ruler and eraser.

Teacher: "Julie, if you don't finish your work, you will have to stay in at recess."

Julie: "I won't stay in!" Julie sulks for the rest of the period.

The camera fades out and then fades back in on the teacher at the front of the room.

Teacher: "O.K. class, it's time for recess."

Julie jumps up from her seat and heads for the door.

Teacher: "Julie, you have to stay inside to finish your assignment."

Julie: "No, I don't!" She continues for the door.

22. Greg has been squirting other students with a squirt bottle.

Teacher: "Greg, please bring the squirt bottle to me. You know we don't allow squirt guns or squirt bottles in the school."

Greg: "No! It's mine. You have no right to it!"

Teacher (more emphatically): "Greg, I'm waiting. Bring the squirt bottle to me!"

Greg remains defiant, folds arms, becomes somewhat angry.
Problem Types and Vignettes - cont.

H. Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurs out answers and comments; often out seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

15. Steven notices that his desk is wobbly. He begins to wobble his desk and he notices that this makes noise. He wobbles the desk more vigorously making a great deal of noise. Everyone in the class looks at Steven.
    Teacher: "Steven, you are constantly disrupting the class with your noise. It seems that you have a lot of difficulty sitting still."

3. The class is working on art projects.
    Shanti: "Oh, no!"
    Teacher: "What's happened?"
    Shanti: "Jenny came by my desk and knocked my sculpture off my desk!"
    Jenny: "I didn't mean it! Honest! I was just going back to my desk."
    Teacher: "Jenny, you seem to be constantly moving around the room bothering other people. Please stay in your desk."

I. Short attention span/distractible. These children have short attention spans. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

7. The teacher is having a class discussion during social studies. Abinesh is distracted and stares out the window.
    Teacher: "Abinesh, what is your opinion about this statement?"
    Abinesh continues to stare out the window.
    Teacher: "Abinesh! This is the third time that you seem to be distracted."
Problem Types and Vignettes - cont.

19. Teacher is distributing a worksheet to the class. All the students in the class begin to work on the assignment, including Sasha. After a couple of minutes the teacher sees Sasha staring out the window distracted.

Teacher: "Sasha, you are looking out the window again. What caught your attention?"

Sasha looks bewildered.

J. Immature. These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

11. Tony is at the teacher's desk and says something to the teacher, loud enough for everyone to hear.

Tony: "Sir, I just heard some boys use some very bad language."

Teacher: "Thank you for telling me Tony, however, other students will think you are tattling again. I wonder if that is the reason why you seem to have trouble getting along with the other students."

23. Marina often loses her belongings and today she is looking for her hat. She goes to the teacher.

Marina (whining): "Sir, I can't find my hat. Have you seen it?"

Teacher: "No, I'm sorry, Marina ."

Marina (still whining): "Can you help me find it, Sir? Please?"

Other students around him are smirking and make remarks about her.

Ria: "Marina is a sissy."

Shanti: "Teacher's pet can't find her hat."

Marina becomes upset.
Problem Types and Vignettes - cont.

K. Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

4. Meagan is going to several girls asking them to play with her.
   Meagan: "Come on, come and play this game with me.
   Marina, Denetia, and Filitsa ignore Meagan and continue talking among themselves.
   Meagan: "Aw come on, please come and play this game with me. Please?"
   Marina pulls the game out of Meagan's hands.
   Marina, Denetia, and Filitsa then play the game but exclude Meagan.
   Meagan: "Hey, come on! It was my idea. You can't leave me out. It's not fair!"
   Marina, Denetia, and Filitsa continue to ignore Meagan and start playing the game.
   Meagan: "Come on, it's not fair!"
   Meagan gives up and slinks off, rejected again.

16. The teacher has divided the class into groups to work on projects.
   Teacher: "O. K. class, please go into your groups for project work."
   Students move around to get into their groups.
   Members of Aaron's group (loud enough for everyone to hear):
     "Man! Why does Aaron have to be in our group! I don't like him."
     "I don't either. There's nothing good at his house."
     "His school work is not very good. We won't get as good a mark as we would without him."

L. Shy/withdrawn. These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

8. The teacher is walking around the room checking seatwork progress.
   Teacher: "Elise, how many questions have you done?"
   Elise keeps her eyes lowered and says nothing.
   Teacher: "Elise, I asked you how many questions you had done."
   Elise keeps her eyes lowered and still says nothing.
   Teacher: "It sure is hard to get you to answer a question, Elise."
Problem Types and Vignettes - cont.

20. The teacher is leading a discussion. Everyone in the class is listening, including Michael. The teacher notices that Michael is watching him and decides to call on him.

Teacher: "Michael."

No response. Wait 3 seconds.

Teacher: "Well, Michael, what do you think about Maria's statement?"

Michael looks startled at the question. He had been daydreaming.

Teacher: "I'm sorry, Michael. Were you daydreaming again?"
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions.

Causal Ascriptions

Academic

- Ability
  a little slow
  acceptance of low achievement
  actually does bad work
  already understands lesson
  can't do the work
  can't grasp the concept
  consistently slow to do any work
  could maybe not have done that
  could not answer direct question
  did not have a suitable answer
  didn't know how to do it
  didn't know the answer
  didn't understand the work
  didn't understand work
  difficulty with subject area
  does not understand
  doesn't know how to do the work he was supposed to be doing at that time
  doesn't know much
  doesn't know the work too well
  doesn't learn fast
  doesn't think he can do it
  doesn't understand
  doesn't understand math
  dumb
  everyone does better than him
  gifted
  had to think too long
  has problems doing work
  he just isn't smart
  heard it before and knows it
  lack of ability to comprehend subject material
  lack of academic skills
  lack of background skills
  lack of intelligence
  lack of skills
  lack of understanding
  lack of understanding of assignment
  language problems
  learning
  learning difficulty
  learning disability
  learns through manipulative/concrete better than abstract
  may need extra reinforcement
  maybe needs help
  need another way of learning
  needed help
  needs help
  needs more help
  not able to do the work
not enough success experiences
not learning well
poor language skills may make him reluctant to try
problem with understanding
saying the wrong answer
school work is not very good
she needs help all the time
she should get help
she was behind in work
she was confused
she wasn't getting good grades
she's a slow drawer
she's given the message that she is incapable of completing the test properly
she's not smart enough
she's not that capable
she's too slow
should be helped
slow worker
stupid
stupidity
stupidness
thought to be stupid
too many failures
weak subject

- Effort

a slow worker
avoid being told off for not working hard enough
boredom
desire to do well outstrips her abilities
determined to produce quality work
didn't do that question
didn't do that question
didn't get help
didn't have the work done
didn't try hard enough
disinterested
doesn't attempt challenging work
doesn't do anything
doesn't do his best
doesn't do homework
doesn't feel she has to do all the questions to pass
doesn't like to think
doesn't study
doesn't study or do homework
doesn't think
doesn't try hard enough, so doesn't understand
doesn't use his time properly
doesn't want to try
doesn't work
excuse for not doing it
has been told work not up to par
he doesn't do anything
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions - cont.

- he doesn't pull his weight
- he should study more
- incomplete work handed in to teacher
- is doing the best he can
- lack of initiative
- lack of motivation
- lack of participation
- lazy
- lets others do work for him
- likes to do things quickly, sometimes not properly
- likes to take her time
- needs a break from the subject
- not doing work
- not finishing work
- not getting questions finished
- not interested in other project
- not motivated to do work
- not putting enough effort into it
- not trying
- not trying hard enough
- not working
- overachiever (wants A's)
- overworking
- poor work habits
- procrastinates
- procrastinating
- quits too easily
- refuses to attempt work because of difficulty
- satisfied with minimal effort
- she didn't get the questions done
- she didn't study
- she doesn't get things done
- she doesn't try or care
- she doesn't try to get the work right
- she gives up too much
- she hasn't done any work
- she quits too soon
- she ran out on her problem
- she should try harder
- she should try to do her best in 45 min.
- she wants to do well
- she wants to get a good mark on her picture
- she wants to put in effort
- she was just thinking about the test
- she's trying to think
- should at least try it
- student trying to be better than she is
- to do her best
- trying to collect her thoughts for the test
- trying to get out of work
- trying to pull up her mark
- trying too hard
- underachiever
uninterested
unmotivated
unorganized
unprepared for the test
wanted to do better than he can
wanted to do the best picture she could
wanted to finish sentence
wants teacher's help
wastes time
work poorly organized
works slow and meticulous

- Task
answering questions throws the person off
lessons are too easy
she thinks work is too hard
the work is too hard
unclear directions
wording of the question
work load inappropriate to his ability
work not at student's level
work too difficult
work too easy

- Expectations
doesn't expect to be asked so doesn't bother studying
expected to behave the way he does by the teacher
finishing work is more important than gym
fulfills teachers' expectations
I know I'm dumb
low expectations of self
low level of expectation
parental pressure
parents come down hard when it comes to school work
parents' expectations
pressure to answer
self-fulfilling prophecy
she deserved it
teacher has poor expectation
teacher has set expectations
teachers' expectations
thinks he can't do it, so he won't

- Inattentiveness
busy thinking about something else and is not focused on his work
can't concentrate
completing something for another teacher
concentrating on something else
daydreaming
daydreaming about something good
did not listen to the teacher
didn't hear the teacher
distracted
distracted by personal thought
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions - cont.

distracted by talking
does not listen to people
doesn't listen
doesn't pay attention in class
easily distracted
got caught doing something else
greater concerns to think about
hadn't been listening
has a great imagination, he escapes
hasn't got a clue what is happening
he likes to daydream
he should listen to his teacher
he wanted to get other stuff done
he's being distracted
he's too busy doing other things
ignored the teacher
inattention
lack of concentration
lack of listening skills
lives in a dream world
looked at something else and is quiet
may have seen something outside to focus on
maybe thinking about a girl or friends
mind on greater concerns
more important problems at home
needed time to think
not doing what class is doing
not listening
not paying attention to the teacher
not paying attention when work was taught
not up to anything
off-task
other concerns of more importance
other things on his mind
out to lunch
pays more attention out the window
pays more attention to play than to school work
she doesn't pay attention
she is worried about something
she was thinking about recess
she's not paying attention to the lesson
short attention span
something else on her mind
thinking about something
thinking about something
too busy doing his homework
too busy with friends to concentrate on work
too much on her mind
wanted to be outside playing instead of working and straining his brain
wanted to look out the window
wants to be somewhere else (not interested)
wants to go outside
wasn't paying attention
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions - cont.

wasn't paying attention to the test

- Insecurity (Shy, Embarrassment)
  afraid of challenge
  afraid of failing
  afraid of getting in trouble if lost hat is not found
  afraid of poor grade
  afraid to give the correct answer
  afraid to try
  avoidance
  avoidance - low ability
  avoidance of making a mistake
  avoiding P. E.
  bolstering poor self-image
  can't stay by himself
  didn't want to appear stupid, so lied
  didn't want to risk incorrect comment
  does not want to be noticed
  doesn't believe in himself
  doesn't know the full answer and unwilling to take a chance on a few
  doesn't want to be embarrassed
  doesn't want to risk making a mistake in front of peers
  doesn't wish to appear weak or dumb in front of peers
  embarrassed
  embarrassed about self
  embarrassed about something in gym
  embarrassed at doing a bad thing
  embarrassed at public speaking
  embarrassed because she hasn't done many questions
  embarrassed to hand it in
  embarrassment at own economic status
  failure syndrome
  fear of failure
  fear of rejection by teacher and other students
  fear of success
  fear of testing situation
  fears embarrassment
  good enough syndrome
  has a hard time coping
  intimidated/scared of teacher
  lack of academic successes and has given up
  lack of confidence
  lack of confidence in ideas
  lack of self-assurance
  looking for teacher/adult approval
  low self-concept
  low self-esteem
  low self-image
  need to feel powerful
  needs reinforcement
  needs to prove himself tough
  not sure of answer
  not talking
Not very independent
Not wanting to show off work
Reluctance to answer
Self-conscious
She was scared of trying in case she failed
She's shy
Thinks it's too hard without even asking for help
Thinks she's dumb, so she gives up
Unsure of content
Wants to go home

Social

- Social skills
  Cheats at games
  Control of the students and teacher
  Controlling his peers
  Criticisms
  Didn't stand up for his reputation
  Didn't stick up for himself
  Dislike of peer
  Dislikes people
  Doesn't answer anyone
  Doesn't fit in with the others
  Doesn't get along with peers
  Doesn't get on with students
  Doesn't have friends
  Doesn't know how to make friends
  Doesn't like talking
  Doesn't like the other student
  Fink
  Friendlessness
  Has always been a doormat
  Has value attached to social life
  He doesn't like the kids
  He isn't popular
  He says weird things about others
  He tried too hard to like people
  He wants to be like the other kids
  He was dumb to start a fight
  Ignores people
  Importance of peer group vs. academics
  Involvement with peer group
  Is untalkative
  Isolated
  Kept bugging other kids to play a game with her
  Lack of communication
  Lack of social skills
  Left out
  May hang out with a gang
  No control over the actions of others
  No friends
  No one likes her
  No-one likes him
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions - cont.

- no-one talks to her or cares how she feels
- not accepted by others
- not accepted that her reply is inappropriate in the classroom
- not belonging to the group
- not cool like his friends
- not having friends
- not popular
- not popular
- not talking
- ostracized
- ostracized by peers
- poor peer relationships
- poor social status with peer group
- prefers people to school work
- problems with friends
- rejection by other students
- reputation problem
- she hates people
- she is not with the "in" crowd so they treat her like she was a nobody
- she isn't liked
- she should try to get along with the kids
- she tried hard to get kids to play with her
- she wanted other kids after her
- should be himself
- should hang around with other kids
- should have asked nicely first
- shy - doesn't like talking to the teacher
- social outcast
- social problem
- swearing
- tattle-tale
- the other three boys are close friends
- trying to fit into a group
- trying to get friends the wrong way
- unaccepted by peers
- unpopular
- unwanted in group
- wanted to be with friends
- wanted to play
- wants friends
- wants help from the wrong people
- wants to be accepted by peers
- wants to get friends
- withdrawal

- Others' behaviours
- a girlfriend
- allowed to get away with this behaviour
- another student could have drawn her attention outside
- asked for help and everyone called her names
- bad lesson
- because somebody used bad language
- being 'set up' by the teacher
being compared to other students
being picked on
belittled in front of peers
classmates
confrontation causes withdrawal as defense
confrontational approach by teacher
didn't think her teacher was fair
falling out with strong personality in the class who turns others against him
feels he's pushed too hard
felt picked on
friends were dumb
friends were playing a joke
game being taken away from her
girls
girls don't like her
he's tired of being bullied
her classmates say she's a terrible worker and she believes it
her friends were geeks
her peers don't believe her
her teacher
his friends
his group
ignored by others
is being pushed into taking the money
is the girls
it was a dare from the other kids
kids broke the game
kids don't like him
knocked down too many times
lack of peer acceptance
lack of understanding by the teacher
left out of projects and class activities
maybe Phillip was bugging Tyler
mean friends
message [from a friend] was important
no definite deadline or consequences if late
no-one understands
nobody paid attention to her
not enough teaching of skills
not getting help
other children were jealous
other girl was a baby
other kids bug her
other kids should have let her play
other student distractions
other student picking on her
other students antagonize him
others discriminate against him
peer pressure
peers tattle-taling
peers trying to control her by false accusations
people are bugging him and he pays attention to them
perceived by students as favouritism
poor group selection
poor selection of student to answer the question
poor worker seeking some positive reinforcement and being shot down again
pressure from the teacher
put-downs by teacher, peers, and parents
rejected by peers because he's not considered good enough
rejection
rejection by peers
rejection by students
rejection caused by something Meagan did previously to this situation
scapegoating
she didn't want to because people were probably bugging her
she feels pushed
she is not liked by the others
she was being rejected
somebody said something rude
someone stole his lunch
stupid teacher questions
teacher admonishes inappropriately
teacher bothering her about it
teacher dislikes her
teacher doesn't listen
teacher doesn't want to deal with the problem
teacher embarrassed her
teacher fails to encourage
teacher might treat him as teacher's pet - a role he doesn't want
teacher not monitoring class behaviour
teacher picks on her
teacher putting him down for incorrect work
 teased by classmates
 teasing by peers
 the kids don't like him
 the other girls
 the other kids around him make him nervous
 the other kids don't like her
 the others
 unclear directions
 unfair teacher
 work not taught in a way that Lupin can understand
 work poorly taught
 wrong approach by the teacher

- Home factors
  bad home life
  cultural aspects
  family problems
  family problems
  home problems
  lack of parental support
  maybe her parents bad-mouthed the teacher
  maybe his parents are tough with him and he takes his anger out on other
    people
  neglected
must get A's to be accepted at home
needed money--had no lunch
needs money to buy food
no parents
nobody at home works
parents abuse her
parents always fighting
parents always let him have his own way
parents give her no discipline
parents let her be sassy
parents may have told him it's O. K. to fight
parents may not spend much time with him, so he seeks attention elsewhere
parents told her to always help and go to a teacher when in trouble
parents told him to tell when someone did something bad
parents treat him wrong
poor family
poor home
poor home environment
poor home situation
poor parenting
poverty
problems at home
problems with parents
too much smothering at home and can't face up to own shortcomings
troubled family
underprivileged

- Distracting behaviours (Attention-getting, Impulsiveness, Hyperactivity)
  act cool for the class
  acting like a child
  acting silly
  acting strange
  active nature
  ants in his pants
  antsy
  attention-seeking
  being a smart-aleck
  being stupid
  books were pushed off desk deliberately
  bothering other people
  brought something [squirt bottle] to school which was unacceptable
  can't keep his hands to himself
  "caught in the act"
  causes a scene
  causes trouble
  could not stay still
  defiant for attention
  disrupting class
  disrupting other student
  disturbing the class
  does stupid things
  dropped books
  dumped books on the floor on purpose
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions - cont.

excessive energy
feels he has to show-off
feels the need to talk
fidgety
foolish behaviour
get the teacher mad
goofing off
goofing off for friends
goofy behaviour
he was being a pest
he was playing dumb
he's looking for trouble
hyperactive
impulsive behaviour
is playing around
is playing with his desk and disturbing the class
just likes to be an imp
likes to disturb
likes to move around the room
likes to wander
looking for attention
needs attention from peers and teacher
no friends and wanted attention
noisemaking
not staying in her desk
others were talking, so he was distracted
playing around because he thinks he's tough
problem sitting still
roamer
seeks peer recognition
she saw something
she talks too much
she wanted attention in a bad way
she wanted people to notice her
she wants too much attention
she wasn't doing her art and was talking to others
she's trying to annoy the teacher
shouldn't have dumped his books
takes her time to settle down
talkative
talking at inappropriate times
thought he was being funny
tired of sitting down all day
to get a reaction
trying to act dumb
trying to be funny
trying to impress someone (girl)
trying to make people laugh
Tyler bugging the other kid
wandering around the room
wanted approval of peers
wanted everyone to look at him
wanted teacher's approval
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions - cont.

wanted to distract other kids
wanted to talk
wanted to talk to her friends
wanting acceptance
wants attention
wants attention
wants interaction with peers
wants teacher to acknowledge her
wants to be class clown
wants to become teacher's friend
wants to bug others
wants to show off
was attracting everyone

Personal

- Physical characteristics
  accident prone
  allergic to something
  awkward
  bad day
  clumsy
  clutsy
  deaf
  didn't hear
  drunk
  fatigue
  feeling unwell
  has to go to the bathroom
  hearing problem
  high on something
  hungry
  isn't feeling well
  lack of athletic ability
  lack of coordination
  lack of sleep
  medical - 'petit mal'
  menstruation
  mute
  nervous epileptic
  puberty
  she has been sitting all day
  spaced out - drugs
  tired

- Personality characteristics
  [thought] highly [of herself]
  a wimp
  absent-minded
  acting smart
  attached to the teacher
  baby
  being an idiot
being an idiot
being bad
being cool
bossy
builds his esteem of himself
childish
conceited
could be a mean guy
crazy
doesn't have much patience
failure syndrome
feels 'above' the others
feels it's his responsibility to tell
forgetful
good citizen
goody-goody two shoes
greed
habit
has a problem of some kind
have his own way
he should not promise
he tells a lot
he's being foolish
he's mouthy
is impatient
kleptomania
liar
likes getting people into trouble
likes to cause trouble
likes to do whatever he wants
likes to steal
likes to use excuses
likes trouble
live up to "goof" reputation
makes and breaks promises
makes problems
maybe lying so she won't get in trouble
mischievousness
mislead teacher
needs male attention
needs reassurance
not being patient
not popular
personality conflict
personality problem
picky
possessiveness
power trip
role
said it [daydreaming] wouldn't happen again
scorns weaker kids
self-conscious about her athletic abilities
she feels she's special and they'll wait for her
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions - cont.

- Attitudinal
  a problem child
  attitude problem
  attitude problems in school
  avoiding P. E.
  bad attitude
  defeatist attitude
  did not care about education
  did not want to do the work
  didn't care for school
  didn't want to do the work
  didn't want to learn
  didn't want to understand the work
  disinterested
  dislikes task
  she gets interested in dumb things fast
  she has no patience
  she hates everybody
  she should be nice and not take stuff that don't belong to her
  she wanted the money
  she wants to go the easy way
  she wants to show people she can do good
  she was too good for the others
  she's a bossy person with a temper
  she's being a smart mouth
  she's being dumb
  should find his problem
  snob
  snobby
  soft spoken
  some real personal problems, e.g., laziness, temper, physical cleanliness
  stealing
  steals answers off people
  street kid
  stubborn
  teachers' pet
  thinks he's the best
  treats the teacher like a friend her age
  trying to be better than others
  trying to be macho
  trying to be teacher's pet
  trying to ingratiate self with teacher
  trying to please the teacher
  unambitious
  wanted everyone to like him
  wanted to be popular or noticed
  wanted tough reputation
  wants her own way
  wants teacher to like her
  wants to be liked by someone
  wants to be on the teachers "good" list
  wants to be superior to students
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions - cont.

does not like homework
does not want to participate
doesn't care
doesn't care about her grades
doesn't care about school
doesn't care about school work
doesn't have a positive attitude
doesn't like assigned work
doesn't like being bullied
doesn't like doing work
doesn't like it
doesn't like questions
doesn't like school
doesn't like school work, so doesn't study
doesn't like the class
doesn't like the other kid
doesn't like the particular activity
doesn't like the teacher
doesn't like the things he does
doesn't like to do the test
doesn't like to participate
doesn't really care
doesn't want to do her work
doesn't want to give an answer
doesn't want to go to gym
doesn't want to learn
"good enough" syndrome
gotten away with this before
hate work
hates changing for gym
hates gym
hates his teacher
hates school
he doesn't like that language
he was sick of working
her attitude
indifference
indifference to her achievement
lack of commitment
lack of esteem for the teacher
lack of interest
lack of interest in subject
lack of participation
lack of respect
liked the teacher
low level of concern
Lupin hates work
Madison Avenue
may not like group work
Meagan walked off
negative
no desire to grow
not concerned about school
not doing what she's told
not liking school
not liking the work
not wanting to do the work
poor attitude
poor attitude toward school
prejudice
pretending to not hear when she doesn't want to
she doesn't like tests
she doesn't want to get all sweaty
she should answer
she's being ignorant
she's sulking
thinks she's dumb so she gives up
thinks that his work is too hard
uncaring attitude
uninterested in academics
wants to go home

- Aggressiveness (Insolent, Defiant, Antagonistic)
  acting tough
  aggressiveness
  angry when told to do something
  antagonistic
  asserting himself and wants attention
  back-talking brat
  beating girls and taking money
  bully
  criticizing Aaron
  defiance of authority
  defiant
  didn't like people bossing her around
  didn't think it was right for it to be taken away
  direct disobedience
  dislikes teacher
  doesn't obey anyone
  doesn't obey the teacher
  drawing teacher purposefully into the situation
  fighting
  fighting the system, all adults
  getting back at someone
  getting even
  hates authority figures
  he [student] thinks it's wrong to take it away
  he didn't want to give the squirt gun
  he should do what the teacher says
  he should have settled it outside
  he's a fighter
  he's looking for trouble
  insolent
  is not doing what she is told
  mad at the teacher
  no respect for authority
Thesaurus of causal ascriptions - cont.

not doing what he's told
not doing what she's told
physical assertion
physical response to problems
power struggle
power trip
refusal to cooperate
refusal to follow directions
refuses to attempt work because of difficulty
refuses to go to gym
resents authority
retaliation for other students' non-acceptance of her
revenge
rude to the teacher
sassing back at the teacher
she beats up people
she didn't want to stay in
she does bad things
she likes to beat up other kids
she wanted to be on top of everyone
she wanted to have her own way
she's mean
stands up to the teacher
student refusing to answer
testing authority
testing authority and winning
think tough
thinks she overpowers teachers
wanted something belonging to someone else
wanted to be tough
wanted to go outside not doing work
wanted to keep the spray bottle
wants his rights to play with it

- Emotional
  a bad day and she was very upset
  afraid
  angry
  anxious
  bad mood
  bad temper
  being angry at someone
  can't face reality
  disturbed
  easily discouraged
  easily frustrated
  emotional problems
  emotional stress
  feeling picked on
  feels isolated
  feels left out
  frustrated because work is too difficult
  frustrated with work
frustration
frustration with inability to cope
hates being reprimanded in front of peers
hatred
he had a mental problem
he was mad
he was upset
he's anxious
he's mad at something
hot tempered
hurt
jealous of Phillip never being in a fight
jealousy
lonely
mad because no one likes her
may be angry at someone and needs to take his anger out at someone
ostracized
pride in her work
she's lonely
stress
unhappy
upset and if she talks, she'll cry
upset at being ignored
upset because of personal problems

Situational
[squirt bottle] cost a lot
[squirt bottle] took a while to find
being Italian
books fell off desk accidentally
child missed the first lesson
desk too small
dropped pencils on floor
inadequate work area
just moved into the area
knocked it [sculpture] over by mistake
location of the two students in the class
lull in the classroom
noisy classroom
not getting punished
overcrowded classroom
she couldn't find her hat
too much on desk
APPENDIX C
Table 22: Means and standard deviations for locus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Teacher</td>
<td>18.87</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Student</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Male</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Female</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 2</td>
<td>19.27</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Male</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Female</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor X role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 1</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 2</td>
<td>18.97</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 2</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>19.12</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 1, actor 2</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 2</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 2</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 1</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>19.07</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 2</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22: Means and standard deviations for locus - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>19.85</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>17.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>21.65</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>18.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>19.95</td>
<td>22.55</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>16.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2</td>
<td>19.88</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>19.45</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>18.43</td>
<td>19.83</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 22: Means and standard deviations for locus - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>role X actor X problem</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>23.05</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>20.85</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 1</td>
<td>20.54</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>19.64</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>20.44</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>19.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>17.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>22.70</td>
<td>21.20</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>23.30</td>
<td>18.60</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>15.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22: Means and standard deviations for locus - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>17.74</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>20.26</td>
<td>21.16</td>
<td>20.26</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>19.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>19.30</td>
<td>19.80</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>18.65</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>20.45</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>18.15</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>17.10</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

role 1 - teacher  role 2 - student  gender 1 - male  gender 2 - female  actor 1 - boy actor  actor 2 - female actor
A - Failure syndrome  B - Perfectionist  C - Underachiever  D - Low achiever  E - Hostile aggressive  F - Passive aggressive
G - Defiant  H - Hyperactive  I - Short attention span/Distractible  J - Immature  K - Rejected by peers  L - Shy/Withdrawn
Table 23: Means and standard deviations for stability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Teacher</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Student</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Male</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Female</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 2</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Male</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Female</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor X role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 1</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 1</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 2</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 2</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 1, actor 2</td>
<td>11.51</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 2</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>10.94</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>12.33</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1, actor 2</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 2</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 2</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Means and standard deviations for stability, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role X problem</td>
<td>role 1</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X problem</td>
<td>role 1, gender 1</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2</td>
<td>12.95</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>10.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Means and standard deviations for stability - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>role X actor X problem</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 1</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>11.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>12.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 1</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>11.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>12.28</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>9.97</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>11.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>11.77</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>11.57</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>11.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>12.87</td>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>11.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>12.80</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Means and standard deviations for stability - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role 1, Gender 1, Actor 1</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>11.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>12.32</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>9.74</td>
<td>12.58</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>12.05</td>
<td>11.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>12.25</td>
<td>10.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>11.55</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>9.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>5.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

role 1 - teacher
role 2 - student
gender 1 - male
gender 2 - female
actor 1 - boy actor
actor 2 - female actor

A - Failure syndrome
B - Perfectionist
C - Underachiever
D - Low achiever
E - Hostile aggressive
F - Passive aggressive
G - Defiant
H - Hyperactive
I - Short attention span/Distractible
J - Immature
K - Rejected by peers
L - Shy/Withdrawn
Table 24: Means and standard deviations for controllability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Standard Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Teacher</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Student</td>
<td>18.95</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Male</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Female</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>5.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 2</td>
<td>17.14</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2</td>
<td>19.89</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - Male</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>4.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - Female</td>
<td>18.52</td>
<td>4.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor X role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 1</td>
<td>19.14</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 2</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 2</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.44</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 1, actor 2</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 2</td>
<td>18.76</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.92</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>17.12</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>17.17</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1, actor 2</td>
<td>18.19</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1, actor 2</td>
<td>17.93</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 2, actor 2</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 2</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24: Means and standard deviations for controllability - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>17.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>21.32</td>
<td>21.08</td>
<td>20.49</td>
<td>17.01</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>19.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role X gender X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>16.85</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>22.25</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>18.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2</td>
<td>16.55</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>20.20</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>17.40</td>
<td>14.10</td>
<td>15.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>17.71</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>21.11</td>
<td>20.84</td>
<td>19.61</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>18.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor X problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24: Means and standard deviations for controllability - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>role X actor X problem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, actor 1</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>21.85</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>19.35</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>17.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>16.15</td>
<td>18.05</td>
<td>20.35</td>
<td>22.85</td>
<td>18.45</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>17.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, actor 1</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>23.10</td>
<td>21.15</td>
<td>21.23</td>
<td>17.41</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>13.77</td>
<td>18.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>18.36</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>22.26</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>15.03</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>gender X actor X problem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>20.03</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>18.37</td>
<td>20.83</td>
<td>20.07</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>19.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>role X gender X actor X problem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 1, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>19.60</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>20.10</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>20.50</td>
<td>22.40</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>18.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actor 2</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>18.70</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>22.10</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>20.70</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>17.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24: Means and standard deviations for controllability - cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 1, actor 1</td>
<td>17.37</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>17.53</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>23.74</td>
<td>20.79</td>
<td>19.47</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>16.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 1</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>19.74</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>14.68</td>
<td>20.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 2</td>
<td>19.70</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>21.95</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>22.90</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>21.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role 2, gender 2, actor 2</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.80</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>20.55</td>
<td>21.10</td>
<td>19.75</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>21.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

role 1 - teacher
role 2 - student
gender 1 - male
gender 2 - female
actor 1 - boy actor
actor 2 - female actor
A - Failure syndrome
B - Perfectionist
C - Underachiever
D - Low achiever
E - Hostile aggressive
F - Passive aggressive
G - Defiant
H - Hyperactive
I - Short attention span/Distractible
J - Immature
K - Rejected by peers
L - Shy/Withdrawn
Table 25: Frequencies of causal ascriptions for each problem type by role - teachers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others' behaviors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home factors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracting behaviors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical characteristics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality characteristics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A: Failure syndrome
- D: Low achiever
- G: Defiant
- J: Immature
- B: Perfectionism
- E: Hostile aggressive
- H: Hyperactive
- K: Rejected by peers
- C: Underachiever
- F: Passive aggressive
- I: Short attention span/Distractible
- L: Shy/Withdrawn
Table 25: Frequencies of causal ascriptions for each problem type by role - students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ascriptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others' behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracting behaviors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical characteristics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Failure syndrome  D Low achiever  G Defiant  J Immature
B Perfectionism    E Hostile aggressive H Hyperactive K Rejected by peers
C Underachiever    F Passive aggressive I Short attention span/Distractible L Shy/Withdrawn
Table 26: Frequencies of causal ascriptions for each problem type by gender - males.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others' behaviors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home factors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracting behaviors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical characteristics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality characteristics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Failure syndrome  D Low achiever  G Defiant  J Immature
B Perfectionism  E Hostile aggressive  H Hyperactive  K Rejected by peers
C Underachiever  F Passive aggressive  I Short attention span/Distractible  L Shy/Withdrawn
Table 26: Frequencies of causal ascriptions for each problem type by gender - females.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem type</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascriptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inattentiveness</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insecurity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others’ behaviors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distracting behaviors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical characteristics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality characteristics</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Failure syndrome  
B. Perfectionism   
C. Underachiever    
D. Low achiever     
E. Hostile aggressive  
F. Passive aggressive   
G. Defiant  
H. Hyperactive  
I. Short attention span/Distractible 
J. Immature  
K. Rejected by peers  
L. Shy/Withdrawn
Multidimensional scaling study

Problem Student Types
Multi-Dimensional Scaling Study

Demographic Information:

Sex: M _____ F _____

Occupation: __________________________

Experience (years): ___________________

Degree(s): __________________________

Field of study: ______________________
There are twelve problem types which occur most commonly in regular classrooms. The problem types include: failure syndrome, perfectionist, underachiever, low achiever, hostile aggressive, passive aggressive, defiant, hyperactive, short attention span/distractible, immaturity, rejected by peers, and shy/withdrawn.

The purpose of this study is to determine the degree of similarity or dissimilarity between pairs of problem types, and, in so doing, investigate the validity of these problem types. Is failure syndrome uniquely different from perfectionism? Or, is hostile aggressive uniquely different from defiant? This research will attempt to answer these types of questions.

Directions: Below you will find pairs of problem student types with their definitions and indicators. Study the pairs of problem student types and indicate the degree to which they are similar or dissimilar by circling a number on the scales after each pair of problem student types. Please see the sample items below.

Sample items:

Grace. Beauty or charm of form, movement, or expression.
Poise. Balance, stability; ease and dignity of manner.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Insolent. Boldly disrespectful; impudent.
Obsequious. Much too willing to serve or obey; fawning.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Beer. An alcoholic, fermented drink made from malt and hops.
Wine. The fermented juice of grapes, used as an alcoholic beverage

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Thank you for participating in this study.
Problem Student Types
Multi-Dimensional Scaling Study

Failure syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

Perfectionist. These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

Perfectionist.

Underachiever. These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

Defiant. These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.
Perfectionist. These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Immature. These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Failure syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

Underachiever. These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Immature. These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

Shy/withdrawn. These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Underachiever. These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

Passive aggressive. These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar
Multidimensional scaling study - cont.

Failure syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

Low achiever. These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

Low achiever. These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

Passive aggressive. These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

Perfectionist. These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so the they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

Shy/withdrawn. These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

Failure syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar
Perfectionist. These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

Immature. These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

Defiant. These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Failure syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

Passive aggressive. These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar
Underachiever. These children do a minimum to just “get by”. They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

Short attention span/distractible. These children have short attention spans. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Perfectionist. These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Passive aggressive. These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

Immature. These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Failure syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar
Multidimensional scaling study - cont.

**Low achiever.** These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

**Shy/withdrawn.** These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

**Passive aggressive.** These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

**Short attention span/distractible.** These children have short attention spans. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

**Failure syndrome.** These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

**Perfectionist.** These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so the they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

**Low achiever.** These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

**Underachiever.** These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to schoolwork; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

**Shy/withdrawn.** These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.
Passive aggressive. These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

Defiant. These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

Immature. These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

Failure syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

Perfectionist. These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar
Multidimensional scaling study - cont.

Low achiever. These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

Underachiever. These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to schoolwork; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

Failure syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

Failure syndrome. These children are convinced that they cannot do the work. They often avoid starting or give up easily. They expect to fail, even after succeeding. Signs: easily frustrated; gives up easily; says "I can't do it".

Shy/withdrawn. These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.
**Defiant.** These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

**Rejected by peers.** These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

**Perfectionist.** These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

**Defiant.** These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

**Passive aggressive.** These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

**Rejected by peers.** These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

**Hostile aggressive.** These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

**Hyperactive.** These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.
Multidimensional scaling study - cont.

*Low achiever.* These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

*Short attention span/distractible.* These children have short attention spans. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

**Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar**

*Perfectionist.* These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so the they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/fearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

*Underachiever.* These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

**Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar**

*Passive aggressive.* These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

*Shy/withdrawn.* These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

**Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar**

*Underachiever.* These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

*Low achiever.* These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

**Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar**
Multidimensional scaling study - cont.

**Defiant.** These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

**Short attention span/distractible.** These children have short attention span. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

**Perfectionist.** These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/tearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

**Passive aggressive.** These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

**Short attention span/distractible.** These children have short attention span. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

**Immature.** These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

**Perfectionist.** These children are unduly anxious about making mistakes. Their self-imposed standards are unrealistically high, so they are never satisfied with their work (when they should be). Signs: too much of "perfectionist"; often anxious/tearful/frustrated about quality of work; holds back from class participation unless sure of self.

**Short attention span/distractible.** These children have short attention span. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar
Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

Passive aggressive. These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

Underachiever. These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to schoolwork; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

Defiant. These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

Shy/withdrawn. These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.
Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

Short attention span/distractible. These children have short attention span. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

Underachiever. These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

Defiant. These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.
Multidimensional scaling study - cont.

Short attention span/distractible. These children have short attention span. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

Shy/withdrawn. These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Underachiever. These children do a minimum to just "get by". They do not value schoolwork. Signs: indifferent to school work; minimum work output; not challenged by schoolwork; poorly motivated.

Immature. These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Low achiever. These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

Shy/withdrawn. These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar
Low achiever. These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

Defiant. These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Hostile aggressive. These children express hostility through direct, intense behaviors. They are not easily controlled. Signs: intimidates and threatens; hits and pushes; damages property; antagonizes; hostile; easily angered.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Low achiever. These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

Immature. These children are immature. They have poorly developed emotional stability, self control, self care abilities, social skills, and/or responsibility. Signs: often exhibits behavior normal for younger children; may cry easily; loses belongings; frequently appears helpless, incompetent, and/or dependent.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Hyperactive. These children show excessive and almost constant movement, even when sitting. Often their movements appear to be without purpose. Signs: squirms, wiggles, jiggles, scratches; easily excitable; blurts out answers and comments; often out of seat; bothers other children with noises, movements; energetic but poorly directed; excessively touches objects or people.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Shy/withdrawn. These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

Similar -100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar
Multidimensional scaling study - cont.

Short attention span/distractible. These children have short attention span. They seem unable to sustain attention and concentration. Easily distracted by sounds, sights, or speech. Signs: has difficulty adjusting to changes; rarely completes tasks; easily distracted.

Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Low achiever. These children have difficulty, even though they may be willing to work. Their problem is low potential or lack of readiness rather than poor motivation. Signs: difficulty following directions; difficulty completing work; poor retention; progresses slowly.

Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Passive aggressive. These children express opposition and resistance to the teacher, but indirectly. It often is hard to tell whether they are resisting deliberately or not. Signs: subtly oppositional and stubborn; tries to control; borderline compliance with rules; mars property rather than damages; disrupts surreptitiously; drags feet.

Defiant. These children resist authority and carry on a power struggle with the teacher. They want to have their way and not be told what to do. Signs: 1) resists verbally; a) "You can't make me ..."; b) "You can't tell me what to do ..."; c) makes derogatory statements about teacher to others; 2) resists non-verbally; a) frowns, grimaces, mimics teacher; b) arms folded, hands on hips, foot stomping; c) looks away when being spoken to; d) laughs at inappropriate times; e) may be physically violent toward teacher; f) deliberately does what teacher says not to do.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Rejected by peers. These children seek peer interaction but are rejected, ignored, or excluded. Signs: forced to work and play alone; lacks social skills; often picked on or teased.

Shy/withdrawn. These children avoid personal interaction, are quiet and unobtrusive, and do not respond well to others. Signs: quiet and sober; does not initiate or volunteer; does not call attention to self.

Similar - 100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0 - Not Similar

Thank you for participating in this study.