2012

Smiley face symbols: students' reactions as a function of a professor's request to meet

Alyssa A. Radford
Eastern Kentucky University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.utc.edu/mps>

Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Radford, Alyssa A. (2012) "Smiley face symbols: students' reactions as a function of a professor's request to meet," *Modern Psychological Studies*: Vol. 17 : No. 2 , Article 15.
Available at: <https://scholar.utc.edu/mps/vol17/iss2/15>

This articles is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals, Magazines, and Newsletters at UTC Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Modern Psychological Studies by an authorized editor of UTC Scholar. For more information, please contact scholar@utc.edu.

Smiley Face Symbols: Students' Reactions as a Function of a Professor's Request to Meet

Alyssa A. Radford
Eastern Kentucky University

Abstract

The college years are a period during which students transition from a parent-oriented environment to one in which they take greater responsibility for their personal and social development. Nonetheless, parents remain a lasting influence on children during these years. Attachment theorists have examined the degree to which attachment history with parents influences ones later interpersonal relationships and perceptions of others. For example, college students' attachment styles influence how they interpret a professor's request to meet (Perrine & King, 2004). The present research examined how securely and insecurely attached students differ in their reactions to a professor's written request to meet when a smiley-face symbol is included in the request. Students imagined that they had received a poor exam grade in Dr. Smith's math class. They viewed a picture of the first page of the exam with either the note "Please see me" or "Please see me ☺" in red ink. Results showed that students had more positive reactions to the note with the smiley face than to the note without the smiley face and securely attached students had more positive reactions to both notes than insecurely attached students. These results suggest that college professors can influence how offers of help are interpreted by different students, and can easily encourage more students to seek help with the simple addition of a smiley face.

Keywords: smiley, face, smiley face, symbols, request, reactions

Introduction

The teacher-student relationship is a key predictor of academic performance (Marín, 2011). In an effort to develop this relationship, college professors may write "Please see me" on a student's paper with the genuine intentions of providing extra help or discussing important information. However, students may not perceive such notes as they were intended, and their responses to professors' written requests tend to vary. Thus, can certain factors make a difference in how students feel about professors' written requests? The present study explored whether students' attachment styles and/or the context of a professor's written request "Please see me" influenced students' reactions to the request.

Both educators (Bennett, Mohr, BrintzenhofeSzoc, & Saks, 2008) and psychologists (Larose, Bernier, Soucy, & Duchesne, 1999; Perrine, 1999; Perrine & King, 2004) have proposed that attachment theory may offer a useful framework for understanding students' perceptions of college professors and their behaviors regarding interacting with them. The first research examining links between attachment history and relationships was based on Ainsworth's (1973) three attachment categories of secure, ambivalent, and avoidant. Bartholomew and Horowitz (1994) followed up on Ainsworth's research and developed a four-category attachment model by combining the levels of positive and negative image of self with the levels of positive and negative image of others. Image of self refers to the belief that one is, or is

not, worthy of love and support. Image of others refers to the belief that other people are, or are not, trustworthy, available, reliable, and accepting. The four attachment categories as derived by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) are secure (positive model of self and others), preoccupied (negative model of self and positive model of others), and two avoidant categories: fearful (negative model of self and others) and dismissing (positive model of self and negative model of others).

Research suggests that college students' attachment styles during childhood influence their interpersonal relationships during adulthood. For example, Shaver & Brennan (1992) examined associations between college students' attachment styles and major personality traits. Students completed an attachment style questionnaire and the NEO Personality Inventory in order to examine their romantic relationships. The NEO-PI assesses five global traits: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness. Eight months later, a subset of the subjects was randomly assigned to complete several relationship outcome measures. Students with secure attachment styles were found to be less neurotic (unlikely to experience anxiety, unpleasant emotions, and disturbing emotions), more extroverted (likely to prefer social interactions and experience positive emotions), and more agreeable (more trusting) than students with insecure attachment.

In a study similar to Shaver & Brennan (1992), Hazan & Shaver (1987) examined romantic love as an attachment process among college students. Students completed a love-experience questionnaire as well as an attachment style and an attachment history questionnaire. Self-descriptive items and items concerning relationships with others were included to measure aspects of students' mental models about others. Secure students described their most important love experience as being happy, friendly, and trusting, and were likely to believe that people are generally well-intentioned and good-hearted. Insecure individuals characterized their most important love relationship by fear of closeness and emotional highs and lows. They reported that they were often misunderstood and that one must be skeptical when dealing with other people.

The results of Shaver & Drennan (1992) as well as Hazan & Shaver (1987) suggest that students with different attachment styles perceive others and their intentions differently. This is of ample importance when considering the professor-student relationship. Several authors have noted that positive professor-student interactions are integral to student achievement and success (Marín, 2011; Sanchez, Rejano, & Rodriguez, 2001; Wood & Turner, 2011). Marín's (2011) research is representative of these studies. He stated that students who talk with their professors outside of class and seek their assistance are more likely to be academically successful than students who do not. Furthermore, Sanchez et al. (2001) maintained that students' personalities play a greater role in their academic success than their intelligence. Thus, it follows that professors should take different personality traits into consideration when interacting with and addressing their students.

Although research on how students' attachment styles affect their perceptions of professors' requests to meet is scarce, a few recent studies have addressed this topic. For example, college students viewed a picture of the first page of a returned exam with no grade and a professor's note that read "Please see me" written in red ink. Students pretended that they had scored poorly on the exam. Compared to students with secure attachment styles, students with insecure attachment styles had more negative first reactions and more negative emotional reactions to the note, and were less likely to believe that the professor wanted to help them. Fearful students, male students, and students with lower GPAs were more likely to ignore the professor's note (Perrine, 2004).

In a study similar to Perrine (2004), Perrine and King (1999) examined students' reactions to a

professor's request for a meeting as a function of the clarity of the request and students' attachment styles. Students imagined that a professor had written the note "Please see me" or "I would like to help you understand this material. Please see me" on an exam on which they had scored poorly. They also viewed a picture of the first page of a returned exam with no grade and the note written in red ink. The short note elicited more negative emotional and cognitive reactions than the long note in both securely and insecurely attached students. Compared with securely attached students, insecurely attached students had more negative emotional reactions to both notes (Perrine & King, 1999).

In summary, the previous research indicates that students' perceptions of others are influenced by their attachment styles. Additionally, insecurely attached students tend to have more negative emotional reactions than securely attached students to a professor's written request even when the professor makes his or her intentions for the request clear. However, does the context of a professor's written request play a role in influencing students' perceptions and reactions? Specifically, can including a smiley-face symbol along with written requests influence how students feel about such requests?

The present research examined how securely and insecurely attached students differ in their reactions to a professor's written request to meet when a smiley-face symbol is included in the request. It was predicted that students would have more positive reactions to a professor's note with a smiley face than to a professor's note without a smiley face. It was also predicted that securely attached students would have more positive reactions to both notes than insecurely attached students. These predictions were based on previous findings that an ambiguous note from a professor requesting a meeting with a student caused students to react more negatively than did a more specific note (Perrine & King, 2004). Pairing a smiley-face symbol with a written request may help convey the positive intentions of the professor and help clarify the professor's intent.

Method

Participants

Participants were 120 undergraduate psychology students (84 females and 36 males) from Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) who volunteered to participate in a study described as "Opinions about Professors' Notes." About 72% of participants had a GPA of 3.0 or higher. Age was not recorded. Students

received credit for participating in order to fulfill course requirements. Everyone was treated according to the American Psychological Association (APA) guidelines for the ethical treatment of research participants.

Materials

Perceptions of notes. Participants were randomly assigned to read a control note with a smiley face ($n=60$) or an experimental note without a smiley face ($n=60$). See Appendix A. To increase ecological validity, a picture of the first page of an exam with one of the notes written in red ink appeared below the scenario description. In order to allow participants to form their own opinions about what constitutes a “poor grade,” a grade was not included on the exam. In previous research using this paradigm (Perrine, 1999), reactions did not differ as a function of professor’s gender. Thus, this variable was not manipulated.

After reading a scenario, participants reported their reactions to the note by responding to the Perceptions of Professor’s Note Questionnaire. See Appendix A. They rated their initial reaction on a scale of 1 (*extremely negative*) to 6 (*extremely positive*). On a scale of 1 (*definitely not*) to 6 (*definitely yes*), they rated how anxious the note made them, their emotional reactions to the note (offended, pleased, embarrassed, angry, grateful, stupid, afraid, feel like a failure), their likelihood of ignoring the note, their cognitions regarding why Dr. Smith wanted to see them (to help me, to scold me, cares about my grade, to find out why I did poorly on the exam, has ideas that could help me get a better grade next time), their likelihood of going to see Dr. Smith, and their likelihood of going to see Dr. Smith again if he/she was not available on their first attempt.

Scales

A positive emotion scale was created by summing the following items: pleased and grateful, with a possible range of 2–12, Cronbach’s Alpha = .71. A negative emotion scale was created by summing the following items: offended, embarrassed, angry, stupid, afraid, and feel like failure, with a possible range of 6–36, Cronbach’s Alpha = .84. A positive cognition scale was created by summing the items help me, cares about my grade, find out why I did poorly on exam, and has ideas to help my grade, with a possible range of 4–24, Cronbach’s Alpha = .84. There was only one item related to negative cognition: wants to scold me.

Participants reported their overall GPA in the intervals of less than 2.0; 2.0-2.4; 2.5-2.9; 3.0-3.4; and 3.5-4.0. They also reported their gender. The

questionnaires participants received differed only in terms of which note they contained. Most questions were taken from Perrine and King (2004); the item about anxiety was created for this study.

Attachment style. Participants were classified into one of four attachment styles using the Attachment Questionnaire (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991). See Appendix B. The RQ is an instrument adapted from Hazan and Shaver’s (1987) descriptions of how people typically feel in love relationships. Hazan and Shaver developed their scale by translating Ainsworth’s (1973) three infant attachment categories of secure, ambivalent, and avoidant into terms appropriate for adult relationships. The RQ is based on more recent research that a four-category model may be more sensitive. It consists of four short paragraphs describing the four attachment patterns (secure, preoccupied, dismissing, and fearful). Following the procedure suggested by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994), participants indicated the extent to which each paragraph described them on a scale of 1 (*not at all like me*) to 6 (*very much like me*). They then indicated the one paragraph that best described them.

Procedure

Participants came to a laboratory in groups of one to six. Folders containing a consent form, the questionnaire about perceptions of a professor’s note, the Attachment Questionnaire, and a debriefing sheet were placed at every other seat on a table. Participants were asked to sit at a spot containing a folder. See Appendix C for a script of the instructions read to participants. Participants completed the attachment questionnaire last in order to avoid sensitization effects and because asking personal questions first may have caused them to withdraw from the study. Participants were given as much time as necessary to complete the questionnaires. They were debriefed before they left the laboratory.

Results

The percentage of participants in each attachment category was as follows: Secure 32%, dismissing 21%, fearful 32%, and preoccupied 15%. The three insecure styles were combined to form a single insecure category (68%). Data were analyzed via SPSS using the General Linear Model (GLM) function. The dependent variables were analyzed separately. In each analysis, smiley-face condition, attachment style, and gender were entered as independent variables. It was predicted that students would have more positive reactions to a professor’s note with a smiley face than to a professor’s note

without a smiley face and that securely attached students would have more positive reactions to both notes than insecurely attached students. These predictions were supported. There were statistically significant main effects for both smiley face, $F(1, 116) = 61.68, p = .00, \eta^2 = .35$, and attachment, $F(1, 116) = 7.80, p = .01, \eta^2 = .06$, on first reactions to the note. Students who saw the note with the smiley face had more positive first reactions ($M = 3.35, SD = 1.25$) than students who did not see the note with the smiley face ($M = 1.80, SD = .80$), and securely attached students had more positive first reactions to both notes (regardless of the smiley face ($M = 3.00, SD = 1.36$)) than insecurely attached students ($M = 2.38, SD = 1.23$).

Concerning anxiety, there was a statistically significant main effect for smiley face, $F(1, 112) = 10.74, p = .00, \eta^2 = .09$, and a marginally significant main effect for gender, $F(1, 112) = 3.71, p = .06, \eta^2 = .03$. There was also a three-way interaction of smiley face by gender by attachment, $F(1, 112) = 3.99, p = .05, \eta^2 = .03$. Students who saw the smiley face were less anxious than students who did not see the smiley face, and regardless of the smiley face, males were less anxious than females. Regarding the interaction, students who saw the smiley face were less anxious than students who did not see the smiley face. However, this difference was larger for secure males than for insecure males, but was also larger for insecure females than for secure females. In other words, the smiley face was less effective at reducing anxiety for insecure males and secure females. See Table 1.

Regarding negative emotions (offended, embarrassed, angry, stupid, afraid, and failure), there were statistically significant main effects for both smiley face, $F(1, 112) = 5.71, p = .02, \eta^2 = .05$, and gender, $F(1, 112) = 4.72, p = .03, \eta^2 = .04$. Students who saw the smiley face reported more negative emotions ($M = 2.88, SD = 1.16$) than students who did not see the smiley face ($M = 3.63, SD = 1.14$), and females reported more negative emotions to both types of notes ($M = 3.46, SD = 1.20$) than males ($M = 2.76, SD = 1.09$).

Regarding negative thoughts about the meeting request (Dr. Smith wants to scold me), there was a significant main effect for smiley face, $F(1, 116) = 5.80, p = .02, \eta^2 = .05$. The group that saw the note with the smiley face was less likely to think that Dr. Smith wanted to scold them ($M = 2.22, SD = 1.30$) than the group that did not see the smiley face ($M = 2.90, SD = 1.40$). There was also a marginally significant main effect for attachment, $F(1, 116) = 3.39, p = .07, \eta^2 = .03$. Securely attachment students were less likely ($M =$

$2.21, SD = 1.42$) than insecurely attached students ($M = 2.72, SD = 1.35$) to think that Dr. Smith wanted to scold them, regardless of the smiley face.

In regard to positive emotions (pleased and grateful), there was a statistically significant main effect for smiley face, $F(1, 116) = 16.70, p = .00, \eta^2 = .13$. Students who saw the note with the smiley face reported more positive emotions ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.28$) than students who saw the note without the smiley face ($M = 1.87, SD = .99$).

In relation to positive cognitions (Dr. Smith wants to help me, cares about my grade in this class, wants find out why I did poorly on the exam, and has ideas that could help me get a better grade next time), there were statistically significant main effects for smiley face, $F(1, 112) = 6.60, p = .01, \eta^2 = .06$, and attachment, $F(1, 116) = 16.70, p = .00, \eta^2 = .13$, and there was a three-way interaction of smiley face by gender by attachment, $F(1, 112) = 3.99, p = .05, \eta^2 = .03$. Students who saw the note with the smiley face reported more positive cognitions ($M = 4.80, SD = .94$) than students who saw the note without the smiley face ($M = 4.47, SD = 1.09$), and securely attached students had more positive cognitions about the note ($M = 4.78, SD = .93$) than insecurely attached students ($M = 4.57, SD = 1.06$). Regarding the interaction, the smiley face had little influence on insecure females' positive cognitions. However, for insecurely attached males, securely attached males, and securely attached females who saw the note with the smiley face, these students reported more positive cognitions than the same groups of students who saw the note without the smiley face. See Table 2.

In regard to ignoring the note, there was a significant interaction between attachment and gender, $F(1, 112) = 5.18, p = .03, \eta^2 = .04$. Securely attached males reported that they would be more likely than insecurely attached males to ignore the note, regardless of whether the note contained a smiley face. However, securely attached females reported that they would be less likely than insecurely attached females to ignore the note, regardless of whether the note contained a smiley face. See Table 3.

Discussion

It is not uncommon for college professors to write "Please see me" on students' papers in a desire to help them understand course material and improve their performance. However, students' interpretations of professors' notes requesting to meet vary greatly, and they may not react in the ways professors expect. This is troublesome because students who do not

communicate regularly with their professors are less likely to be up-to-date on course material and to succeed than students who monitor their course performance with their professors (Wood & Turner, 2011). The present findings suggest that many students may avoid seeking help from their professors for fear that they will be perceived as academically inadequate or “stupid.” However, for students who saw the smiley face, “Please see me” was interpreted as an offer of help on behalf of the professor. Thus, professors may be able to encourage more students to seek help by pairing a smiley-face symbol with their requests to meet.

The results concerning attachment style showed that regardless of whether the notes contained a smiley face, insecurely attached students had more negative first reactions, more negative thoughts regarding why the professor wanted to see them, and were more likely to believe that the professor wanted to scold them than securely attached students. Taken together, these findings support previous research showing that insecurely attached students had more negative first reactions to notes written by a professor and were less likely to believe that the professor wanted to help them than securely attached students (Perrine & King, 2004).

The finding that securely attached students had more positive beliefs than insecurely attached students about why the professor was requesting to see them also supports previous research suggesting that securely attached students are likely to believe that others are well-intended and good hearted (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Insecure students’ negative beliefs about the intentions of the professor and their belief that the professor wanted to scold them is consistent with previous findings that insecure people are skeptical about dealing with others (Hazan & Shaver, 1987), and that insecure students are less agreeable and trusting than secure students (Shaver & Brennan, 1992).

In the present study, students had no previous relationship with the professor. Yet, attachment was a significant factor in influencing their expectations about the notes and what they believed to be the intentions of the professor. These findings echo previous results suggesting that different attachment styles formed during early relationships are factors in influencing college students’ relationship experiences and expectations about others (Hazan & Shaver, 1987; Shaver & Brennan, 1992). Thus, through their past experiences of support with specific attachment figures, students may develop a set of beliefs, attitudes, and expectations about others that occurs when others exhibit their willingness to help.

Gender was an influential factor concerning anxiety, negative emotions, and positive thoughts. Regardless of which note they saw, males were less anxious and experienced fewer negative emotions than females. Even when insecurely attached females saw the smiley face, they tended to experience negative feelings, and the smiley face had little effect on their positive thoughts. Furthermore, securely attached males were more likely than insecurely attached males to ignore both notes, a finding warranting detailed examination in future research.

This study opens the way to many opportunities for future research. For example, it would be beneficial to learn how students react when professors verbally request meetings while smiling and using other pleasant facial expressions and body language. Future research could examine if this approach is effective in decreasing insecure students’ negative reactions to professors’ requests to meet. It would also be interesting to see if students’ levels of perceived support are related to their perceptions of the note with the smiley face.

In the present study, the notes that students saw were written in red ink, a color that many students associate with negativity. Previous research examining students’ reactions to professors’ notes also used notes written in red ink (Perrine, 1999; Perrine & King, 2004). Future researchers could examine how professors’ notes written in various colors affect students’ reactions and perceptions. Furthermore, researchers could explore students’ reactions to professors’ notes when a course other than mathematics is referred to. Because of many students’ dislike of mathematics, a poor grade in that type of course may elicit different reactions than a poor grade in a different course.

Many college courses cover a large amount of difficult material. This coupled with students’ lack of professional knowledge about the curriculum may be overwhelming at times. Thus, it is essential that they establish supportive relationships with their professors and seek help when they experience difficulties. Not only will acquiring help from professors allow students to understand material more easily, but it is also likely to increase their conscientiousness and motivation about their performance in classes. This, in turn, will produce better study habit sand increased class attendance, leading to better grades, higher GPAs, and ultimately, decreased failure rates.

The ways in which attachment style influences college students’ help seeking behaviors suggests that the student-professor relationship is similar to parental

relationships (Larose et al, 1999). Thus, students' interactions with professors may activate attachment schemas that influence their thoughts and behaviors. For this reason, professors who write notes on students' papers in efforts to encourage them to seek help should

recognize that students may not interpret those notes as they intended. The findings of this study suggest that professors can better convey their desire to help with the addition of a smiley face to their notes.

References

- Ainsworth, M. D. (1973). The development of infant-mother attachment. In B. Caldwell & H. Ricciuti (Eds.), *Review of Child Development Research* (vol. 3). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, L. M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(2), 226-244.
- Bennett, S., Mohr, J., BrintzenhofeSzoc, K., & Saks, L. (2008). General and supervision-specific attachment styles: Relations to student perceptions of field supervisors. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 44(2), 75-94.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Conceptualizing romantic love as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Larose, S., Bernier, A., Soucy, N., & Duchesne, S. (1999). Attachment style dimensions, network orientation, and the process of seeking help from college teachers. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, 16(2), 225.
- Marín, S. M. (2011). Student perspectives on the university professor role. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 39(4), 491-496.
- Perrine, R. (1999). Please see me: Students' reactions to professor's request as a function of attachment and perceived support. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 68(1), 60-72.
- Perrine, R., & King, A. (2004). Why do you want to see me? Students' reactions to a professor's request as a function of attachment and note clarity. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 73(1), 5-20.
- Sanchez, M., Rejano, E., & Rodriguez, Y. (2001). Personality and academic productivity in the university students. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 29(3), 299.
- Shaver, P., & Brennan, K. (1992). Attachment styles and the 'Big Five' personality traits: Their connections with each other and with romantic relationship outcomes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 18(5), 536-545.
- Wood, J., & Turner, C. S. (2011). Black males and the community college: student perspectives on faculty and academic success. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 35(1-2), 135-151.

Table 1*Means and Standard Deviations for Anxiety as a function of Smiley Face, Attachment, and Gender*

Group	Attachment	Gender	Mean	SD
Smiley	Secure	Females	4.25	.97
		Males	3.13	1.36
		Total Secure	3.80	1.24
	Insecure	Females	4.33	1.20
		Males	4.06	1.00
		Total Insecure	4.23	1.12
	Total Sec/Insec	Females	4.31	1.12
		Males	3.75	1.19
		Total Smiley	4.08	1.17
Not Smiley	Secure	Females	4.69	1.25
		Males	5.00	1.41
		Total Secure	4.78	1.26
	Insecure	Females	5.20	1.16
		Males	4.29	1.60
		Total Insecure	5.05	1.27
	Total Sec/Insec	Females	5.06	1.19
		Males	4.58	1.51
		Total Not Smiley	4.97	1.26
Total Smiley/Not	Secure	Females	4.48	1.12
		Males	3.85	1.63
		Total Secure	4.26	1.33
	Insecure	Females	4.85	1.24
		Males	4.13	1.18
		Total Insecure	4.64	1.26
	Total Sec/Insec	Females	4.74	1.21
		Males	4.03	1.34

Table 2*Means and Standard Deviations for Positive Cognitions as a function of Smiley Face, Attachment, and Gender*

Group	Attachment	Gender	Mean	SD
Smiley	Secure	Females	5.23	.69
		Males	4.97	.75
		Total Secure	5.13	.70
	Insecure	Females	4.69	1.02
		Males	4.58	1.00
		Total Insecure	4.64	1.00
	Total Sec/Insec	Females	4.87	.95
		Males	4.71	.93
		Total Smiley	4.80	.94
Not Smiley	Secure	Females	4.27	.92
		Males	4.75	1.31
		Total Secure	4.40	1.02
	Insecure	Females	4.69	1.02
		Males	3.54	1.22
		Total Insecure	4.50	1.19
	Total Sec/Insec	Females	4.58	1.00
		Males	4.04	1.35
		Total Not Smiley	4.47	1.09
Total Smiley/Not	Secure	Females	4.73	.94
		Males	4.88	.96
		Total Secure	4.78	.93
	Insecure	Females	4.69	1.01
		Males	4.26	1.16
		Total Insecure	4.57	1.06
	Total Sec/Insec	Females	4.70	.98
		Males	4.49	1.12

Table 3*Means and Standard Deviations for Ignoring the Note as a function of Attachment and Gender*

Group	Attachment	Gender	Mean	SD
Total Smiley/Not	Secure	Females	1.16	.47
		Males	1.62	1.19
		Total Secure	1.32	.81
	Insecure	Females	1.42	.95
		Males	1.17	.49
		Total Insecure	1.35	.85
	Total Sec/Insec	Females	1.35	.84
		Males	1.33	.83

Appendix A

Perceptions of a Professor's Note Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS: Please imagine the following:

- You are in Math 105, taught by Dr. Smith.
- This is the first class you have taken with Dr. Smith and you have heard nothing about this professor.
- The first exam is returned to you. **You have received a poor grade.**
- Dr. Smith writes a note on your exam which says: *"Please see me." (In Red Ink)*

Exam 1: Dr. Smith

Please answer the following questions

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS. Please be honest.

1. In general my first reaction to Dr. Smith's note *"Please see me"* is:

1	2	3	4	5	6
Extremely Negative					Extremely Positive

2. Dr. Smith's note makes me feel anxious.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Definitely No					Definitely Yes

Please continue on next page

3. When I read Dr. Smith's note "Please see me ":

		Definitely Not				Definitely Yes	
A.	I am Offended	1	2	3	4	5	6
B.	I am Pleased	1	2	3	4	5	6
C.	I am Embarrassed	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.	I am Angry	1	2	3	4	5	6
E.	I am Grateful	1	2	3	4	5	6
F.	I feel Stupid	1	2	3	4	5	6
G.	I am Afraid	1	2	3	4	5	6
H.	I feel like a Failure	1	2	3	4	5	6
I.	I Ignore the note	1	2	3	4	5	6

4. I believe that Dr. Smith wants to see me because:

		Definitely Not				Definitely Yes	
A.	Dr. Smith wants to help me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
B.	Dr. Smith wants to scold me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
C.	Dr. Smith really cares about my grade in this class.	1	2	3	4	5	6
D.	Dr. Smith wants to find out why I did poorly on the exam.	1	2	3	4	5	6
E.	Dr. Smith has ideas that could help me get a better grade next time.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Please continue on next page

5. I will go to see Dr. Smith.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Definitely					Definitely
No					Yes

6. If Dr. Smith is not in the office the first time, will you try again?

1	2	3	4	5	6
I tried once, I					I will try as
will not try again					often as necessary

7. What is your current overall GPA?

Less than 2.0	—	
2.0	--	2.4 ———
2.5	--	2.9 —
3.0	--	3.4 —
3.5	--	4.0 —

8. What is your Gender?

Male	—
Female	—

Code # _____

Appendix B

Attachment Questionnaire

Instructions: Please rate the extent to which each paragraph describes you.

- (A) **I am comfortable without close emotional relationships. It is very important to me to feel independent and self-sufficient, and I prefer not to depend on others or have others depend on me.**

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not At All					Very
Much Like Me					Like Me

- (B) **I am somewhat uncomfortable getting close to others. I want emotionally close relationships, but I find it difficult to trust others completely, or to depend on them. I sometimes worry that I will be hurt if I allow myself to become too close to others.**

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not At All					Very
Much Like Me					Like Me

- (C) **I want to be completely emotionally intimate with others, but I often find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I am uncomfortable being without close relationships, but I sometimes worry that others don't value me as much as I value them.**

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not At All					Very
Much Like Me					Like Me

- (D) **It is relatively easy for me to become emotionally close to others. I am comfortable depending on others and having others depend on me. I don't worry about being alone or having others not accept me.**

1	2	3	4	5	6
Not At All					Very
Much Like Me					Like Me

Instructions: Please choose the **one paragraph that best** describes you.

A _____ B _____ C _____ D _____

Appendix C

Verbatim Instructions to Participants

Hello. My name is Alyssa Radford and I am a sophomore psychology major and music minor. I appreciate each of you for choosing to participate in this study. In front of you is a folder. Please open it, take out the first paper, and turn it over. This is the consent form. I would like to start by reading it to you. (Read consent form). Are there any questions? (Address any questions).

For this study, you will be completing two questionnaires. Your responses are anonymous, so do not put your name on the questionnaires. Instead, please write your five digit research ID code in the blank at the top of the first page of each questionnaire. Now take out the next set of stapled papers in the folder, turn them over, and read the story with me. (Read scenario to students). Please see the note that the professor has written and complete the questions regarding how that note makes you feel. Please sit quietly when you are done and wait for further instructions. (Allow participants time to complete the questionnaire about perceptions of a professor's note).

Now please take out the next set of stapled papers in the folder, turn them over, write your five digit ID code in the blank at the top of the first page, and complete the questionnaire. As before, please sit quietly when you are done and wait for further instructions. (Allow participants time to complete the Attachment Style Questionnaire).

The last paper you have is a debriefing sheet. Please take it out and turn it over and I will read it aloud. (Read debriefing sheet). Does anyone have any questions about this study? (Address any questions). Once again, thank you for participating in this study. Everyone is free to leave.