Perceived Caring Climate, Empathy, and Student Social Behavior in High School Bands

Susana M. Lalama

*University of Miami, susielalama@gmail.com*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_dissertations](https://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_dissertations)

Recommended Citation


[https://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_dissertations/1340](https://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/oa_dissertations/1340)

This Open access is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at Scholarly Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Repository. For more information, please contact repository.library@miami.edu.
UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI

PERCEIVED CARING CLIMATE, EMPATHY, AND STUDENT SOCIAL BEHAVIOR IN HIGH SCHOOL BANDS

By

Susana M. Lalama

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the University of Miami in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Coral Gables, Florida

December 2014
A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

PERCEIVED CARING CLIMATE, EMPATHY, AND STUDENT SOCIAL
BEHAVIOR IN HIGH SCHOOL BANDS

Susana M. Lalama

Approved:

Don D. Coffman, Ph.D.
Professor of Music Education

Carlos R. Abril, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Music Education

Stephen F. Zdzinski, Ph.D.
Professor of Music Education

Brian T. Powell, D.M.A.
Assistant Professor of Instrumental Performance

Joshua Diem, Ph.D.
Clinical Assistant Professor of Teaching and Learning

M. Brian Blake, Ph.D.
Dean of the Graduate School
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Caring – the ability to listen, empathize, and be moved by the feelings of another person – is an important quality of human relationships. Caring in education involves the valuing of the students, their capabilities, interests, and learning styles. It also involves the caring attitudes of the teachers and the overall school environment. Experts believe that caring is needed in education in order to guide the moral and social development of students (Noddings, 1988).

Noddings (2005) believes that when teachers model, encourage, and convey caring behaviors, students in turn simulate those behaviors. By promoting a caring climate, students can learn to care and develop empathy for others (Fry & Gano-Overway, 2010). With bullying and other negative behaviors often the center of education discussions, developing empathy and caring behaviors is vital for students to coexist peacefully in and outside of the classroom. When teachers encourage, monitor, and guide their students to practicing prosocial behaviors, social behaviors can have positive outcomes.

High school bands can foster a caring community for students and teachers because of the group-oriented performance goals. Typically chosen as an elective in high school, band participation provides students with a sense of belonging and builds connected feelings to each other and to the program (Abril, 2013; Adderley, Kennedy, & Berz, 2003; Laine, 2007; Melton, 2004). Band students are required to work together in large ensemble performance settings. The collaborative group effort and the collective
performance goals strengthen the band community. Battistich, Solomon, Watson, and Schaps (1997) suggest that building a caring community creates feelings of connectedness with others, which provides students with a sense of attachment, belonging, and safety. Music participation in secondary schools provides adolescents with opportunities to develop musical and nonmusical skills that can benefit their overall well-being.

Teachers are in a position to influence social outcomes of their students. Band directors are in a special position because they are able to monitor student social behavior over several years due to the multiple-year nature of the course (Carter, 2011). The present study explored the connections between the caring climates found in high school bands and how that affected students’ social behaviors. This chapter will discuss the various components of developing adolescent caring relationships and is divided as follows: Caring in Schools, Social Context of Bands, Foundations of Care, Empathy, and Social Behaviors (positive and negative—specifically bullying). The final segment of this chapter contains the Need for the Study, Purpose of the Study, Limitations, Delimitations, and Definitions.

**Caring in Schools**

The entire school community should exhibit a caring environment in order to have the best opportunity to develop psychologically, emotionally, and socially stronger students (Battistich & Hom, 1997; Battistich et al., 1997). For the school community to demonstrate a caring atmosphere, caring needs to occur in the classroom. At its root, caring begins with a relationship between teacher and student.
The teacher-student relationship is an influential relationship, which is formed for the purpose of creating change in one or both parties (Deiro, 1996). Central points of an influential relationship are change, growth, or learning. Healthy influential relationships are planned and imbalanced; the change-agent (e.g., teacher) holds more power than the change-target (e.g., student). Once the relationship has reached the point of no further change (e.g., graduation), it stops being an influential relationship (Deiro, 1996). Furthermore, the teacher must understand the ethical parameters of the asymmetrical assignments given in the influential relationship. Teachers are expected to be more mature and keep students’ needs as a priority. Altering an influential relationship into an expressive-emotional relationship (e.g., one of friendship, love, or romance) violates ethical standards and becomes inappropriate and unhealthy (Deiro, 1996). For the purpose of this study, teacher-student relationships discussed are referred to as healthy, appropriate, influential relationships.

When teachers establish and maintain healthy influential relationships with their students, care affects the school community. Genuine caring teachers positively affect academic effort and achievement in children (Edgar, 2012; Fraser & Walberg, 2005; Ladd, Birch, & Buhs, 1999; Pianta, Nimitz, & Bennett, 1997; Wentzel, 1997). Students also tend to have fewer discipline problems, have higher educational goals, and have increased interests in school (Murdock, 1999; Murdock & Miller, 2003). Some studies suggest that the power of positive teacher-student relations on educational outcomes can supersede that of family and friends (Ladd et.al, 1999; Pianta et al., 1997). Research also suggests that teaching with care and emotion results in better student learning and socialization (Gray, 1986) and raises levels of social behaviors and cooperation in
classroom activities (Nieto, 2000). Especially for students in historically underachieving groups, developing a caring environment helps create a sense of belonging that is necessary for positive outcomes (Alder, 2002; Howard, 2002). Even within communities that are deficient in care, individual teachers who are empathic listeners and trustworthy mentors can facilitate student resilience and achievement (Rolón-Dow, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999). Ultimately, caring teachers can diminish the negative behaviors of some potential “at-risk” students (Bondy, Ross, Gallingane, Hambacher, & Elyse, 2007).

With problems of under-age delinquency, violence, bullying, and other antisocial behaviors, children and adolescents need social and emotional development within formal education. A lack of positive adult relationships can result in children being raised by their social surroundings (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Schools become the primary source for social development. Television, music, and social media experiences are additional sources that influence social attitudes and behaviors, but social development thrive from interactions found in schools. Studies have found strong connections between students’ negative sense of the school community and delinquent behavior. Students’ who exhibited positive sense of the school community were less likely to be associated with negative and antisocial behavior (Battistich & Hom, 1997).

Classrooms can seem impersonal (Goodlad, 1984). Ancient Greek education was originally guided with one-on-one teacher-student relationships. Studio music teachers model the one-on-one teaching situation to optimize student learning. Public school teachers are limited in one-on-one time with students because of large class sizes and limited periods (Goodlad, 1984). Teachers may intend try to develop trusting relationships with their students, but are forced to prioritize curricular demands and
standardized tests over the development of these relations (Noddings, 2005). Although aesthetic care (caring that is perceived solely for the purpose of academic success) is important for student achievement, truly understanding the student and caring for their overall well-being, authentic care, is a stronger form of care where students best respond (Noddings, 2005). Authentic care goes that extra step in understanding why the student is behaving the way they do (academically or socially). Perhaps knowing if there are problems at home or among friends. Authentic care communicates stronger to students (Noddings, 2005).

While establishing positive one-to-one relationships with large amounts of students may seem like a daunting task, extraordinary teachers are able to facilitate interactions through a positive caring climate. Building caring teacher-student relationships promotes healthy social and emotional growth for students (Deiro, 1996). Research indicates that the presence of caring teachers is a factor that contributes to a positive school performance (Nieto, 2000). To be cared for is a universal human need (Noddings, 2005), and schools are in a position to foster caring climates.

**The Social Context of High School Bands**

High school band is an academic, artistic, and social medium for students. The band environment allows the music teacher the opportunity to influence students musically, personally, and socially (Adderley et al., 2003; Lamkin, 2003; Robinson, 1997). Bands generate a social environment through a web of relationships between individual students, sections (subgroups arranged by instrument, experience, grade level, talent, etc.), the teacher(s), and the music (Edgar, 2012). Students of different grade
levels are mixed into the band and required to work together toward common performance goals. The longer the student musicians work and perform together, the stronger their social bonds (Hodges & Haack, 1996). These social bonds can provide foundations of acceptance, identification, and social belonging for high school band members.

The social climate of these ensembles is important to each member, and provides many with an outlet that they might not have had to meet others from within the larger school setting, or to form relationships away from the home environment that assist them in negotiating the often turbulent high school years. (Adderley et al., 2003, p. 204).

Bands can provide students opportunities to develop personal characteristics important to society such as responsibility, commitment, perseverance, self-discipline, self-confidence, and social skills (McClung, 2000). Among the social skills, development of empathic abilities, patience, tolerance, and acceptance of others are important for positive human interactions. Some experts agree that music classrooms should provide a positive social environment for optimal student development (McClung, 2000; Hourigan, 2009). Cooperation, collaboration, communication, positive peer interactions, responsibility, gratitude, dependability, and impulse control are some examples of social skills learned in band (McClung, 2000). Band teachers are the primary contributors for creating and monitoring the environment suitable for musical, psychological, and social development of their students.

The social connections band students form with each other, and their band teacher differs from other high school courses because of the collaborative group goals, the multiple years of participation, the mixed grade levels (Adderley et al., 2003), and for some programs, the extra hours spent outside of school (Laine, 2007). Perhaps music
itself is the common ground for forming close teacher-student relations, but there is something special found within high school bands that allow students to feel ‘at home’ (Adderley et al., 2003).

Student leaders can be helpful in running a successful band program while also practicing prosocial behaviors (Criss, 2010). While student leaders can often display positive behaviors, one study found some student leaders in a high school band using their authority to practice bullying behaviors on fellow band students (Melton, 2004). In the case of Robert Champion, the Florida A & M University drum major who died after traditional hazing rituals, negative social behaviors dominated the band bus and no one stopped the negative acts (Alvarez & Brown, 2011). Other times, student leaders have used coercive behaviors to get other students to musically perform better (Abril, 2013; Melton, 2004). Although some student leaders act in aggressive ways with intentions of bettering the band or because they thrive on displays of power, it appears that unsupervised students are capable of taking positions and shifting them to negative behaviors (Melton, 2004). High school bands that use student leaders are capable of fostering caring climates that promote prosocial behaviors, but training, execution, and supervision of student leader behaviors merits further research.

Foundations of Care

According to Noddings (2005), caring in its most basic form is relational; it is a connection or encounter between two people. In order for caring to occur, both the carer (e.g., teacher) and the cared-for (e.g., student) must contribute to the relation. If either party fails to complete the caring relation, a caring relationship does not exist. For
example, if the teacher tries hard to care, yet the student does not perceive the teacher’s care, there is no caring relationship because both parties did not contribute to the giving and receiving of care.

In education, caring teachers take a personal interest in students as individuals, are empathic toward students’ feelings, and are intent on listening and responding to students’ concerns. Through modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation, these behaviors are fundamental to caring in order to facilitate mutual understandings (Noddings, 2005). When teachers care, they take the students’ situations as if they were their own. Noddings describes this attention as engrossment, a full receptivity of seeing, hearing, and feeling what the other tries to convey. The engrossment may last only a moment, but is essential to start a caring relationship. Engrossment leads to motivational displacement, which is the motive energy flowing toward the other party’s needs or projects. Engrossment and motivational displacement momentarily capture the carer’s consciousness for the needs of the cared-for. Meanwhile, the consciousness of the cared-for is consumed with reception, recognition, and response. Once the cared-for receives and acknowledges that they have been cared-for, the caring relation is complete.

This asymmetrical relationship (also found in influential relationships) is necessary because the cared-for is not able to assume some of the responsibilities that carers provide (Noddings, 2005). While the relationship has the carers undertaking all of the giving, carers are able to receive too. Teachers as carers benefit by watching their students learn, grow, and mature in each encounter they experience, thus building a stronger bond with the student. “An attitude of warm acceptance and trust is important in all caring relationships” (Noddings, 2003, p. 65). The caring relationship can have
profound effects on the classroom; students are more likely to do things for people they like or trust (Noddings, 2005). Conversely, when carers consistently give, and the cared-for do not perceive the caring or do not positively respond, teachers suffer a loss of energy and begin to burn out (Noddings, 2005).

Caring without action is perceived as focusing on a feeling instead of the person. The person on the receiving end must feel cared-for, not just told that they are cared for. The ability for the carer to listen attentively and to respond as positively as possible are the hallmarks of caring (Noddings, 2005). Teacher responsiveness captures an ideal solution for the cared-for.

Care is deeply rooted as a feminine behavior. Historic gender roles typically have women as mothers and men as warriors. Although men have evolved from hunter-gatherers and warriors, these roles have been embedded in literature, political history, sports, controlling views of science, academic contests, hierarchical structure of school districts, and competition for grades (Noddings, 2002). Meanwhile, women have maintained the childbearing role while more recently acquiring more masculine roles such as scientists and doctors. Despite these stereotyped roles, Noddings believes everyone has the responsibility to care, regardless of sex.

Caring comes from either ethical or natural efforts. Ethical caring is described as what should be done, or I ought to (Noddings, 2003). Natural care is a moral unsolicited attitude that does not require an ethical effort, often related to maternal instincts as mothers care for their child. Natural caring is stronger than ethical caring, but both are acceptable for education. The heart of Noddings’ theory of care is prioritizing the other.
While it is important for the teacher-student relationship to establish caring, it is equally important for teachers to help students learn the capacity to care (Noddings, 2005). German philosopher Martin Heidegger (1962) proclaims that “care is inevitable; all aware human beings care” (Noddings, 2005, p. 18). Teachers are in a position to influence students by caring for them. The different levels of care take time to develop, but through modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation, the student-teacher relationship will develop, along with caring and learning to care. Skills for nurturing are not automatic for everyone, but by providing a model of care and options for students to partake in behaviors and activities that instill care, students develop psychologically, emotionally, and socially. Students learn through their social surroundings, which includes teachers.

Forming a network of caring adults is important for student growth (Noddings, 2005). Schools currently are not designed to foster immersed caring and moral development the way Noddings describes in her vision. Noddings suggests that the school curriculum should be redesigned and organized around themes of care: care for self, for intimate others, for strangers, for nonhuman animals, plants, and earth, for the human made world, and for ideas. Noddings also states that to develop optimum relationships, the student should be with the same teacher for three to six years. A complete curriculum transformation focused on students’ well-being would be substituted for the academic standards already in place. Educators, administrators, and policy makers would need to reframe the primary responsibility of teachers to include making healthy connections with students (Noddings, 2005). While this transformation seems highly unlikely because of competitive international pressures to dominate in math and science,
individual teachers can make the difference in their classrooms by providing caring environments for their students to learn and model.

**Empathy**

Caring requires experiencing an emotional connection with another person. Experiencing or understanding another person’s emotional state is known as empathy. Empathy is a basic form of social communication that can occur among different contexts among people (Feshbach, 1997).

Empathy has been linked by theory or research to have a regulatory effect on aggression; a motivating effect on prosocial behaviors such as generosity, cooperation, helping, and other altruistic actions; a facilitating effect on communication and social relationships; and an organizing role in development and adjustment (Feshbach, 1997, p. 35).

Although in some people empathy may seem to be an automatic primitive process, “for most, it is a consequence of learning, socialization experiences, and social interaction” (Feshbach, 1997, p. 35).

Empathy is defined as an emotion, but scholars have shown that empathy can be divided into two abilities: affective empathy, the ability to experience the emotions of others, and cognitive empathy, the ability to comprehend the emotions of another (Feshbach, 1997; Hogan, 1969). Noddings (2002) uses the term sympathy to relate to the affective capability of experiencing the emotion of another. Jolliffe and Farrington (2006) felt that sympathy gave a different definition, one of feeling *for* the person and not *with* the person. Feshbach (1997) also suggests that sympathy entails feelings of sorrow or concern *for* others, which differs from empathy. Empathy is experiencing and understanding *with* another’s feelings, thoughts, or attitudes.
(www.oxforddictionaries.com). Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the term empathy was defined as the ability to experience (affective) and understand (cognitive) emotions of others.

Empathy and the acquisition of empathy are components of social and emotional development, and have demonstrated relationships with social behaviors (Eisenberg, 2005; Gano-Overway, 2013). Experts suggest that empathy is a motivator for engaging in prosocial behaviors because it requires a desire to help another person (Eisenberg, 2005). Similarly, a lack of empathy may be associated with negative behaviors. Feshbach (1997) suggests that if someone were able to understand or feel another person’s negative emotion, he would be less inclined to continue with the negative behavior. Succinctly, if a person can empathize and relate to other humans’ emotions, then he should have less negative behavior toward others. Conceptually, caring climates—which require empathy—encourage people to consider others’ feelings and engage in caring behaviors themselves (Noddings, 2005, Battistich et al., 1997).

**Social Behaviors**

According to Social Learning Theory, the external environment contributes to one’s behaviors (Bandura & Walter, 1963). Children learn from adults and from their peers and will often mimic behaviors (positive or negative) to achieve their goals. Experts have noted a decrease in opportunities to bond with positive adult role models because of the modern, fast paced, geographically mobile lifestyles (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Deiro, 1996; Karam, 2006). Teachers are in a position to influence student behaviors and can
positively do so by creating positive learning environments (Battistich et al., 1997; Battistich & Hom, 1997).

**Positive Behaviors.** Bonding with positive adults (referring to adults who are law abiding citizens who respect the social norm) has been identified as an important protective factor for shielding children against the influence of adverse behaviors (Brook, Brook, Gordon, Whiteman, & Cohen, 1990). Some experts agree that prosocial bonding with adults is essential for social and emotional development (Brook et al., 1990). With fewer positive adults actively involved in building positive relationships with adolescents (Bronfenbrenner, 1986), teachers are in the position to rebuild “the network of supportive, caring adults needed by young people” (Deiro, 1996 pg. 7).

Research suggests that creating a caring environment could inform positive behaviors for students. Prosocial behaviors are defined as intentional acts to help or benefit another person such as helping, sharing, and cooperating (Warden, Cheyne, Christie, Fitzpatrick, & Reid, 2003). Emphasis of these behaviors is rooted in early elementary school because children are taught and encouraged to play nicely together, help the teacher, share toys, and take turns (Pianta et al., 1997; Ladd et al., 1999). While these behaviors are the basis of early schooling, they are seldom mentioned after elementary school. Some teachers refer to teaching morals as the *hidden curriculum* or *character education* because of the inference to learning how to “get along” with others (Johnson, 2006; Noddings, 2005). If teachers were to focus education concepts of getting along, respect, helping, cooperating, and sharing throughout education, then students might mimic the prosocial behaviors.
Prosocial behaviors can be embedded in the activities and practices of high school bands (McClung, 2000). High school band students typically are choosing to continue participation in the band program for varying reasons such as musical, social, or entertainment purposes. The opportunity for high school bands to form family-like camaraderie among the network of student members is great for fostering a sense of belonging (Abril, 2013; Adderley et al., 2003; Laine, 2007; Melton, 2004). Band students typically have been participating in band for multiple years and have been working together with their classmates toward ensemble performance goals. While studies have found some bullying behavior among the students’ resilient commitment to their goals (Abril, 2013) and abuse of student leadership power (Melton, 2004), positive feelings and strong commitment toward band are still present. If band students have prosocial behaviors in band, then perhaps those behaviors will transfer when the students outside of band.

**Bullying Behaviors.** Negative behaviors can be common among adolescents. As friendships develop among small groups of students, cliques can form. Adolescent cliques can be problematic because some unsupervised groups tend to use bullying, teasing, or other negative dominating behaviors to establish and maintain the clique leader’s power (Adler & Adler, 1998). With high school bands having webs of student interactions, it becomes a daunting task for the band teacher to supervise all student behaviors at all times. Varying levels of hazing behaviors exist in groups (including band) that the teacher may not be aware of and can lead to social, emotional, or psychological problems for the students (Melton, 2004). Therefore, addressing adolescent
negative behavior such as teasing and bullying, is critical for students’ healthy social and emotional growth.

Bullying is defined as repeated aggressive acts over time that are intended to harm another person, and that are perpetrated by a person who has more power than the victim (Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus, 1993; Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Examples of bullying behaviors include picking on others, teasing, hitting, or ostracizing someone from the group. The extent of direct (physical), indirect (psychological), or relational (social) bullying in high school bands is unknown, but studies have documented more than 30% of American students were involved in bullying at some point in the school year (Nansel et al., 2001). Victims of bullies suffer from anxiety, loneliness, depression, and suicidal thoughts (Olweus, 1993). Studies have also demonstrated a link between school bullies and adults being physically abusive or having criminal records (Olweus, 1993). The school community, and society at large is at risk if bullying behaviors are not intercepted and corrected.

Bullying is a subset of aggression (Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Olweus, 1993) and is typically thought of as overt physical aggression associated with boys (Olweus, 1993). Research tends to focus on overt bullying behaviors that cause physical harm, however, indirect and relational bullying behaviors such as teasing, verbal threats, and social manipulations have less attention in research but are more common in schools (Olweus, 1993). For the purposes of this study, bullying behaviors was used to include all behaviors (direct, indirect, or relational) that are intentionally negative for the purpose of socially, psychologically, or physically harming another individual(s).
Need for the Study

An important quality for teachers to possess and convey is that they genuinely care about their students (Deiro, 1996; Noddings, 2005). Teachers who foster caring relationships promote prosocial behaviors that can help students adapt to the school environment (Battistich & Hom, 1997; Battistich et al., 1997). With current problems of bullying behaviors among adolescents, creating a caring environment that fosters prosocial behaviors is important for individual students, schools, and for society at large (Olweus, 1993).

Education experts and philosophers agree that it is important to teach students how to care (Noddings, 2005). Most of care learning comes from modeling a caring environment, but with dialogue, practice, and confirmation, caring behaviors can be instilled in everyone. Teachers can shape students social behaviors if they are able to develop positive one-to-one relationships with their students that embody trust and respect (Deiro, 1996; Johnson, 2006; Noddings, 2005).

Adolescents often associate themselves with friends and peer groups of similar interests. School groups like band allow students the opportunity to gain a sense of belonging and identity with people of similar interests. The social connections that some band members feel with each other and with the teacher can have profound effects on their lives (Adderley et al, 2003; Hoffman, 2008; Lamkin, 2003; Nagel, 1999; Robinson, 1997). High school band is a group that can harbor caring environments well. Exploring the connections between caring band environments and student social behaviors has not been investigated.
Older adolescents are often overlooked when it comes to collecting data on changes in behaviors. Perhaps researchers prefer to study younger students with hopes of catching the formation of negative behaviors, however it still leaves students in high school with unresolved problems as they head into adulthood. Research on caring classroom environments has focused primarily on children and pre-adolescence (Ladd et al., 1999; Pianta et al., 1997). Some research begins to explore early adolescent behaviors in middle schools (Ravizza, 2005; Schlichte, Stroud, & Girdley, 2006; Wentzel, 1997, 1998) because of the typical transitional struggles of social, emotional, and overall identity crises, however older adolescents’ social behaviors are overlooked and are in need of exploration. These students are closer to adulthood in which their behaviors as future parents, voters, and workers will affect society.

The present study examined the connections between perceived caring climate and student social behaviors found in high school bands. Existing research on caring environments found in schools have dealt with minority populations (Alder, 2002; Fowler, Banks, Anhalt, Der, & Kalis, 2008; Howard, 2002; Lewis, Ream, Bocain, Cardullo, & Hammond, 2012; Rolón-Dow, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999), with children or pre-adolescents (Ladd et al., 1999; Pianta et al., 1997), and mostly with qualitative case study designs. While the case studies are important for understanding what teachers do to convey care to their students, findings are difficult to generalize. The quantitative studies that have explored caring environments and student behaviors in education investigated from a school’s climate perspective (Battistich & Hom, 1997; Battistich et al., 1997), which is less specific to teachers and classroom environment. The present study took the perceived caring climate of a particular class that uses consistent collaborative teacher-
student interactions, and examined student social behaviors in band. There is a lack of research in music education and caring climates.

Sports and physical education researchers have begun to explore the influences that caring climates can have on student social behaviors. Gano-Overway (2013) explored the relationships between caring climate, empathy, and social behaviors in middle school physical education classes. She also investigated the differences in the hypothesized model among boys and girls, and examined bullying prevalence within physical education classes. Her hypothesized model presents how perceived caring climate directly influences both cognitive and affective empathy and prosocial and antisocial student behaviors. Using structural equation modeling, Gano-Overway’s final model found that caring climate, mediated through empathy, showed significant positive effects through cognitive empathy, which led to effects on prosocial behaviors. Caring climates negatively predicted antisocial behavior, like bullying, and all findings were invariant across gender.

This study is based on Gano-Overway’s (2013) study with modifications to the design and some measures to accommodate high school band classes. There are commonalities between bands and team sports, such as group-oriented goals, work ethics, and the teaching and mentoring of students’ social, emotional, and psychological development (Criss, 2010). Creating and maintaining positive teacher-student caring relationships is fundamental in all of education and can be fostered in a group setting like high school band.
Purpose

Caring climates that foster prosocial behaviors are necessary for building positive adolescent social behaviors. The more students are able to empathize, the greater the chance of diminishing negative social behaviors and increasing positive social behaviors. Positive caring relationships are necessary for a more peaceful society, and high school bands are groups in which students can learn and develop caring and prosocial behaviors.

The purpose of this study was to explore the connections among caring, empathy, and student social behavior in high school bands. Students and teachers competed the Band Climate Questionnaire that measured caring climate, empathy, and social behaviors (both positive and negative) in band. The following research questions guided the study:

1. How do perceived caring climate, cognitive empathy, and affective empathy influence student social behaviors (positive and negative) in band?

2. To what extent do perceptions of caring climates differ by teacher attributes (gender, years of teaching experience, years teaching at present school), student attributes (gender, ethnicity, instrument, years of band participation, victimization), school elements (school size, socioeconomic status), and band program elements (band size, band success)?

Limitations

There were a few limitations to this study. First, teachers and their students self-selected into the sample; this was not a random sample of band teachers and students from a given population. Results from the study cannot be generalized though they may offer suggestions with implications for practice. In addition, the time when the
questionnaire was conducted was at the beginning of the school year, when most high schools are heavily engaged in marching band activities. Student participants may have answered the items with the marching band setting in mind. Every school has different rules and expectations for marching band. For example, some school band programs may require all band students participate in marching band, while other schools may have a volunteer marching band. Regardless of band set up, marching band perceptions may influence how students perceive the caring climate of their band experiences.

**Delimitations**

Participants were limited to Miami Dade County Public Schools whose band directors were members of the Florida Bandmasters Association. Participation was further limited to those directors who volunteered for the study, followed by their students who then volunteered.

**Definitions**

The following terms were used throughout the study with these definitions:

*Aesthetic Care* – teacher caring that is primarily centered on student performance and academic success (Noddings, 2005).

*Authentic Care* – teacher caring that embraces their students as individuals in a nurturing and mutually respectful manner; truly understanding the student and caring for their overall well-being (Noddings, 2005).

*Bullying Behaviors* – behaviors over a period of time that are intentionally negative for
the purpose of psychologically or physically harming another person (Olweus, 1993).

*Caring Climate* - the extent to which individuals perceive a particular setting to be interpersonally safe, supportive, and capable of being valued and respected (Gano-Overway, 2013).

*Empathy* - the ability to experience (affective) and understand (cognitive) emotions of others (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006).

*In Band* - any activity, rehearsal, or class where the teacher is present and in charge of the band students.

*Negative Behaviors* – see definition for Bullying Behaviors.

*Positive Behaviors* - as intentional acts to help or benefit another person such as helping, sharing, and cooperating (Warden, Cheyne, Christie, Fitzpatrick, & Reid, 2003).

*Teacher-student relationship* – healthy, appropriate, influential relationships between teachers and students.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

This chapter reviews literature that pertains to caring climates and student behaviors found throughout education. Research in teacher-student caring relationships and overall caring climate of the classroom is relatively new, with most work spanning less than 15 years. Research designs have varied but qualitative methods have predominated. Literature involving student social behavior, mostly bullying, has been extensive for more than half a century and has focused primarily on younger students (elementary and middle school). However, adolescence is a period of “greater risk than any other in terms of academic failure, violence, and health-compromising behaviors, and it is recognized more and more as a period of tremendous opportunity for establishing the skills and values needed for adult life” (Wolfe, Jaffe, & Crooks, 2006, pg. 14). Adolescents need education and skills that promote healthy relationships for positive behaviors (Wolfe et al., 2006). This review of literature was divided into ten sections regarding social behaviors of adolescents and aspects of care in education as follows: (a) student behaviors (negative and positive), (b) empathy, (c) perception of care, (d) teacher practices for administering care, (e) caring climate on school motivation and adjustment, (f) caring climate on academic outcomes, (g) caring climate on social outcomes, (h) caring climate in relation to culture and urban settings, (i) caring climate in music education, and (j) measuring caring climate. Finally, a conclusion and findings related to the design summarize and emphasize the need for the study.
**Student Behaviors**

**Negative Behaviors with a focus on Bullying.** Negative social behaviors in schools, particularly bullying, are increasingly being recognized as an important problem affecting the well-being and social development of students. Experts agree that bullying, intentional negative behaviors over a period of time for the purpose to psychologically or physically harm another person, can be carried out by an individual or a group, and the bullied can also be a single individual or a group (Olweus, 1993). However in the context of schools, the target typically has been a single student harassed by a group of two or three other students through indirect bullying (e.g., teasing, name-calling, ostracizing, manipulation of friendships, etc.).

Eisenberg and Aalsma (2005) reviewed and highlighted research in bullying and peer victimization and found that up to three quarters of young adolescents experience some type of bullying (e.g., name calling or public ridicule) and one-third have reported coercion or inappropriate touching (Juvonen, Nishina, Graham, 2000). Victims of bullying have reported increased rates of depression, suicidal thoughts, and loneliness (Nansel et al., 2001). Bully victims also had positive correlations with peer rejection, and negative correlations with peer acceptance (Perry, Kusel, & Perry, 1988). Victims have also been associated with lower grades, absenteeism, and a dislike for school (Juvonen et al., 2000). Olweus (1998) longitudinal study followed former school bullies and found an increase in criminal behavior (Olweus, 1993). Sixty percent had one conviction by age 24, and more than 35% had three or more convictions.

Prevalence of bullying in schools has had varying levels of incidences. Olweus found that 15% of students in Norway were involved in bullying behaviors; nine percent
were victims, 7% were bullies, and almost 2% were both. In the United States, Nansel and colleagues (2001) found nearly 30% of students reported moderate or frequent involvement in bullying, 13% as a bully, 10.6% as a victim, and 6.3% as both. The frequency of bullying was higher among middle school students and among males, as opposed to high school students and females, which supports previous results (Olweus, 1993). An earlier American study also found that males tend to be more involved in direct bullying behaviors (e.g., physical and verbal attacks) and females tend to be involved in more indirect bullying behaviors (e.g., spreading rumors, slander, manipulation of friendships, etc.) (Perry et al., 1988). However, harassment and non-physical behaviors (e.g., words and gestures) were the most common form of bullying amongst males and females.

Juvonen, Graham, and Schuster (2003) explored how bullying and being bullied affected the overall health of predominantly Latino and African American sixth grade students from 11 middle schools. Bullies had the most discipline problems, but enjoyed being the center of social attention. Contrastingly, victims were socially marginalized and as a result, emotionally distressed. Reports indicated that the students associated with both being bullies and victims were the most troubled group. These students displayed the highest levels of problems in conduct, school, and peer relationships.

To summarize, bullying can come from various school setting (urban or rural), age groups (elementary or secondary), and through a diversity of cultures and ethnicities. The amount of bullying behaviors reported have varied as studies report from nearly 30% of American students experience bullying to some degree (Nansel et al, 2001) up to 75% of students experiencing bullying behavior (Demeray & Malecki, 2003). Bullying is
genderless with most common types are indirect bullying (Olweus, 1993), with recent addition of cyber bullying (Wang, Iannotti, & Nansel, 2009). While bullying is not the only form of negative social behavior found during adolescence or in schools, for the purpose of this study, negative social behaviors will be limited to bullying behaviors.

Positive Behaviors. Research on positive student social behaviors in schools typically is from prevention or intervention programs for schools with bullying and other antisocial, aggressive, or delinquent problems. Positive or prosocial behaviors are encompassed in caring for others such as helping, sharing, and cooperating to benefit someone else. Prosocial education is an approach or strategy that focuses on “promoting and teaching nonacademic, emotional, social, moral, and civic capacities that express character and develop increasing autonomy, responsibility, sense of connectedness, sense of self, and sense of purpose” (Higgins-D’Alessandro, 2009, pg. 4). As children progress into adulthood, the development of these life skills depends on the their supportive environments, including schools. Prosocial education uses socialization processes such as building and maintaining respectful and trusting relationships, cooperating with others through activities, building positive norms and expectations, and taking perspectives of others to understand values and personal responsibilities (Higgins-D’Alessandro, 2009). Researchers suggest that empathy is positively related to prosocial behaviors and negatively related to antisocial behaviors (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). Empathic behaviors will be discussed in the next section, however, it is important to understand that empathy affects how individuals treat one another.

Positive social behavioral research in education typically comes in form as a resolution for bullying problems. Dan Olweus is a pioneer and expert in bullying
behavior with extensive research conducted in Europe. Some of his longitudinal studies have helped to develop bully prevention programs for schools and have shown positive results: nearly “30%-70% reduction of student reports of being bullied and bullying others, significant reductions in student reports of general antisocial behaviors, improvements in classroom order and discipline, and more positive attitude towards school-work and school” (Juvonen et al, 2000, pg. 89). The core of Olweus’ intervention program deals with in-depth communication at all levels: school, classroom, and individuals (Olweus, 1993). Establishing and maintaining behavioral expectations that involve students helping each other to succeed is important for maintaining positive attitudes. Olweus recommends that teachers monitor social behavior, especially during break time, and intervene only where there is a suspicion that bullying is taking place.

Another study used a quasi-experimental design to determine the effectiveness of a bully prevention program titled The Violence Prevention Program (Orpinas, Horne, & Staniszewski, 2003). The program was developed between school personnel and university consultants and required modification of the school environment, the education of the students, and teacher training. Teachers worked in groups to create core values for the school and established “The Five Bee’s” for the school to implement: be respectful, be responsible, be honest, be ready to learn, and be your personal best. Teachers also developed the “Two put-ups for each put-down” as a consequence for students caught verbally calling other students names or teasing. The teacher would remind the student to be respectful and then ask the student to say to positive things about the student being teased. The goal was to provide a positive nurturing environment, as central to other prevention programs (Olweus, 1993). Students were asked to complete a survey during
the spring of 1998 and again spring of 1999 to evaluate the program by self-report of bullying behaviors. Results found 40% reduction of aggression and 19% reduction of being a victim among younger students. Older elementary students (third through fifth grade), had a 23% reduction in victimization, but found no significant differences in aggression.

Rodkin and Hodges (2003) posed four questions to consider when implementing prevention programs as an attempt to understand how bullies, victims, teachers, and parents fit into the context of school settings. How do bullies fit into their peer ecologies? How do victims fit into their peer ecologies? How can teachers impact bullying and victimization? How can parents impact bullying and victimization? Of the four areas, the teacher section reviewed literature pertaining to the importance of teacher awareness of aggressive behavior (Olweus, 1993), variations of classroom management styles that set the behavioral tone (Roland & Galloway, 2002), and creating a warm environment (Chang, 2003). If teachers were unaware of social dynamics of their students, implementing prevention programs bring resistance and possibly worsen bullying behaviors (Rodkin & Hodges, 2003).

**Empathy**

Empathy has been defined as the ability to experience and comprehend the feelings of others. Within this definition, empathy has affective and cognitive components. Affective empathy is described as the capacity to *experience* the emotions of another (Bryant, 1982), and cognitive empathy is the capacity to *comprehend* the emotions of another (Hogan, 1969). Defining and interpreting empathy, as well as
methods of measuring empathy have varied throughout empathy research (Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987). While empathy experts have debated whether empathy is an affective or cognitive construct, or both (Strayer, 1987), the study of empathy has been linked with social behaviors and is considered an essential component of moral and social development (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006).

The study of empathy directly affects behavior, including caring. Jolliffe and Farrington (2004) questioned the results between cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and behavior based on effect size in a meta-analysis. Results found a moderate effect size between empathy and negative behavior that was stronger for cognitive empathy and for younger people. However the relationship disappeared when controlling for socio-economic status.

Jolliffe and Farrington (2006) later developed the Basic Empathy Scale to determine how empathy related to behaviors and personal qualities. Both factors of empathy, cognitive and affective, were confirmed and females scored higher than males on both components of empathy. Results also found that empathy positively correlated with intelligence (females only), extraversion (cognitive empathy only), neuroticism (affective empathy only), agreeableness, conscientiousness (for males only), and openness. Empathy was also positively correlated to parental supervision and socioeconomic status. Adolescents who demonstrated prosocial behaviors of helping victims of bullying had high levels of empathy (cognitive and affective).

Other experts have studied and discussed the relationships between empathy and prosocial behaviors (Eisenberg, 2005; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987). Eisenberg (2005) suggests that empathy is a motivator for prosocial behavior because it requires the
understanding (cognitive empathy) and desire to help another person. Roberts and Strayer (1996) also found positive correlations between empathy and prosocial or altruistic behaviors. Feshbach (1997) suggests that if a person were able to understand or feel another person’s emotions, he would be less likely to act in a negative or antisocial way toward that person. These studies conflict with earlier research that found no relationship between empathy and prosocial behaviors (Underwood & Moore, 1982). However, Eisenberg and Miller (1987) re-analyzed the studies using method of measuring empathy to organize the research. Findings suggest low to moderate positive relations were found between empathy and prosocial behaviors.

Research has found negative correlations between empathy and negative social behaviors. Cohen and Strayer (1996) found that conduct-disordered teenagers in a residential assessment and treatment center for adolescents had lower levels of empathy compared to students without conduct disorders. Additionally, relationships existed between the conduct-disordered adolescents with lower empathy levels and antisocial or aggressive behaviors. Several studies found connections between low empathy levels and negative social behaviors (Fry, Gano-Overway, 2010; Gano-Overway, 2013). While methods of measuring empathy have varied (e.g., picture/story assessment, self-report on questionnaire, or self-report in simulated experimental situations), there appears to be a connection between empathy and behavior. These connections have been most consistent in questionnaires, however it should be noted that age of participants helped determine consistency of connecting behavior because adults and adolescents were given questionnaires (Eisenberg & Miller, 1987).
The Lovett and Sheffield (2007) analysis of 17 studies between affective empathy and aggressive or delinquent children and adolescent behaviors found different results than Cohen and Strayer (1996). Reports indicate conflicting findings, even when using parallel measures, that there was no consistent relationship between empathy and aggression in children. However, Lovett and Sheffield did report consistent negative relationships found between empathy and aggression among adolescents.

Gender has also been investigated as a component of empathy with girls exhibiting higher levels of empathy compared to boys (Cohen & Strayer, 1996; Krien, 1996). Webster (2012) added exposure to media violence in his study with gender and empathy in adolescence. Results were consistent with previous research and found empathy mean scores higher in females than in males, but media violence was not a predictor of empathy formation.

A different study explored gender and empathy among African American adolescents and found contrasting results with gender. Although students who displayed higher levels of empathy exhibited higher levels of prosocial behaviors, results suggest that African American male adolescents had higher levels of empathy compared to females in the sample (McMahon, Wernsman, & Parnes, 2006). This was the only study found that displayed males having higher levels of empathy compared to females.

Empathy has been explored in connections with prosocial behaviors, antisocial behaviors, gender, and race. While the study of empathy is not new (e.g., Murphey, 1937), definitions, methodology, and results of empathy studies have had varying conclusions. Experts have agreed that empathy is an integral part of many components of psychology including contemporary developmental, social, personality, and clinical
psychology (Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987), all of which directly affect school-aged students.

**Perceptions of Care**

Defining student perceptions of teacher caring behaviors was important for the literature review. Fedderson (2007) examined 67 middle school students’ essays in search of descriptions of a caring teacher, and two themes emerged. A caring teacher understands the student as a whole person with social, emotional, and academic needs. They also pleasantly promote growth and development that result in gains of self-confidence. Students also described a caring teacher as one who is knowledgeable about the subject, manages the classroom well, and exhibits self-control. These student definitions and themes recur throughout the literature review on caring teacher behaviors.

Rogers (1991, as cited in Hayes, Ryan, Szeller, 1994) found similar definitions from fourth graders. Students responded to an open-ended questionnaire regarding how they perceive teacher caring. Results found that students perceived teacher caring through their words of praise, advising, listening, concern for the individual, understand, making school fun, providing a safe environment, interesting curriculum, and by helping with schoolwork.

Using some of these definitions of how students perceive teacher caring, several studies emerged exploring the teacher-student relationship. Hayes, Ryan, & Szeller (1994) explored sixth grade student perceptions of what it is like being cared-for by teachers and how interpretations may be dependent upon gender, ethnicity, family structure, or socioeconomic level. Two hundred and eight students identified caring
teacher behaviors in an essay and 11 concept groups emerged, five of which were similar to Rogers (1991): responded to the individual, helped with academic work, encouraged success, provided good subject content, and encouraged positive feelings. The authors found that the above five concepts, along with “counseled students,” were deemed the most important to students’ perception of care from teachers. Ethnicity appeared to influence student perceptions of care because African American students valued “encourage positive feelings and success” and “helped with academic work,” whereas European American students valued “responded to the individual” and “provided good humor.” Differences in student gender responses were not significant, however, percentage difference for concept groups of “avoided harshness” and “managed class well” were apparent with females valuing the former and males the latter. Teacher awareness of student differences is important to maximize for social and emotional growth.

Caring behaviors were also defined through teacher perceptions. Fox’s (1999) dissertation used a mixed design to explore college professors’ perceptions of teacher caring. While research in this area has focused on student perceptions of care, similar themes emerged when teachers were asked to define caring behaviors: academic care, interpersonal care, instructional care, and self-care. A fifth theme emerged as a combination of academic, instructional, and interpersonal care labeled tensional care, which encompassed typical institutionally based roles of the instructor, or based on relationships with the students.

Lee and Ravizza (2008) explored pre-service teacher perceptions of teacher caring in physical education classes and two themes emerged: pedagogical care and
interpersonal relationships. Pre-service teachers were interviewed and described pedagogical care frequently. They were most concerned with tailoring lessons to meet students’ diverse needs, and being accountable for student learning. Pre-service teachers also reported barriers in developing caring relationships with students as lack of time, the physical education teacher specialist status, and tension between care and control. Factors reported that facilitated care were caring role models, exposure to diverse educational settings, and sense of professionalism. Pre-service teachers felt it was their professional duty to establish a caring environment for their students.

Defining caring behaviors by students, teachers, and pre-service teachers has been explored by describing teacher behaviors. While certain groups such as gender, ethnicity, and teacher/student perception can respond differently to varying teacher caring behaviors, fundamental behaviors of helping, respecting, and listening were consistent in the research. Caring in education entails promoting self-confidence and social, emotional, and psychological growth and overall wellbeing of the students.

**Teacher Practices For Administering Care**

Teaching contains emotion. According to Hargreaves (1998), good teaching is charged with positive emotion. After interviewing 32 middle school teachers and principals from four districts who exhibited care and emotion in their classrooms, several themes emerged centered around emotional care that effective teachers conveyed. While the paper argued about policy and the need for educational reform, Hargreaves agrees with Noddings (2005), developing interpersonal bonds and understanding students should be at the core of education.
When teacher-student relationships are strong, students tend to confide in their teachers and ask for advice (Bergin & Bergin, 2009). Caring teachers often accept the mentor role and provide guidance for their students without having ‘formal’ training in counseling services. A qualitative study of 18 elementary teachers from five demographically diverse schools assumed the counselor role and found benefits in this role (Teed, 2002). Students confided in their teachers with problems of divorce, blended families, lack of parenting, drug and alcohol abuse, violence, sexual abuse, disabilities, and medical problems. Teachers are responding to the non-academic needs of their students by assuming the counselor role. Of the 18 teachers, not one had received in-service or pre-service training in counseling, yet students came to them for counseling advice because they felt a caring and trustworthy person in their teacher. Compared to veteran teachers, younger teachers with less experience had more difficulty addressing student problems. This finding was similar to Philippo (2010) qualitative study of high school teachers assuming counselor roles developed through student-teacher relationships.

Developing the student-teacher relationship is about getting to know the student. Edgar’s (2012) case study explored a caring music teacher’s motivation to take on a counselor role for her students. Ms. J mostly taught African American students whose social and emotional problems were greater than any music class. Edgar vividly describes the student situations (e.g., sexual abuse, parents shot in front of them, and unstable parents). When Ms. J was asked why she wanted to help her students with these nonmusical challenges, her response was “if not me, then who?” (Edgar, 2012). Ms. J embraced the culture of her students and adapted it through her music class. She actively
listened to her students and provided positive responses that were in the best interest of her students. She was also aware that she was not a counselor, and would refer cases she was not able to handle to appropriate personnel, but she knew her students would go to her first before the counselor because of the attachment developed through trust, respect, and care already established. Ms. J provided a caring climate for her students and assumed a larger role because she cared and was able to convey it.

An ethnographic study found one teacher who views caring as a power of morality. Noblit (1993) became part of a teacher-centered general elementary classroom and found this particular caring teacher conveyed caring differently. Caring was not about democracy; instead caring was an ethical use of power. Pam (the teacher) defined caring as a moral authority. She believed that caring in teacher-student relationships was not reciprocal because children are not “equal conversational partners – they must be socialized to this end, and their teachers are expected to be significant socialization agents” (p. 27). Noblit was humbled by his experience working with Pam because it challenged the knowledge he developed throughout his career, and witnessed and experienced caring in a different way.

Noblit’s conclusion of caring not being about democracy contradicts other studies in the same area of teacher care. Agne (1992) compared 88 expert teachers and 92 novice teachers and found that superior teachers preferred democratic flexible styles, non-moralistic attitudes, and close personal relationships with students. Results conclude that the caring environment is part of the chain of academic and social achievement.

It is apparent that teacher practices and style for administering care vary. A qualitative study explored teacher practices of establishing caring relationships with
students (Deiro, 1996). Six secondary caring teachers were interviewed on their ability to establish one-to-one caring relationships with their students in middle and high school settings. Building effective connections with students, and developing one-to-one relationships, was rooted in getting to know the students. Some researchers suggest that establishing one-to-one time in secondary schools is limiting because of the short periods of time that students get to interact with their teacher (Goodlad, 1984; Johnson, 2006). Despite conflicting opinions, Deiro (1996) found six main strategies for bonding with students: Creating one-to-one time with students, using appropriate self-disclosure, having high expectations, networking with family, build a sense of community among students, and use rituals and traditions within the classroom. Research also suggests that listening to students is a key to strengthening one-to-one positive student relationships (Noguera, 2007). Not all teachers will convey caring behaviors similarly. Bae’s (2011) ethnographic multi-site case study explored sixth grade middle school physical education classes, and all three teachers conveyed caring behaviors to their students differently.

Johnson (2006) interviewed six teachers who were similar in age, ethnicity, and race, teaching in New York or Massachusetts. Johnson had worked with these teachers in the past as either intern clinical teacher or coworkers. Throughout their interviews, teachers reported the importance of getting to know the students to develop positive teacher-student relationships. Secondary school teachers found this challenging because of the limitations the school year presents with brevity of classes and large class sizes. Student interaction was also important for many teachers because it provided opportunities to encourage prosocial behaviors. “They really have to help each other to do certain tasks. They can’t do it alone” (p. 29). A different teacher stated,
The objective is to somehow get them to coexist…I’d like them to have some sense of working together to accomplish what they need to, of not being in it for themselves. I want the kids to find the connections to each other. (p. 37)

Excerpts from Johnson’s interviews convey the importance of establishing a caring climate through teacher and student interaction. Students need caring classroom climate for positive social outcomes.

Griffin (1998) explored the concept of building school community, but placed the scene within a classroom. The purpose was to investigate how middle school teachers created a caring community within their urban classrooms. Qualitative data took the form of field notes, formal and informal observations, and teacher and student interviews. Teachers were able to form caring communities within their classrooms by setting high expectations, using appropriate self-disclosure, and personal acknowledgement, which was similar to other caring teacher practices (Johnson, 2006).

A different middle school qualitative study explored student perceptions of teacher care in physical education classes (Ravizza, 2005). Twenty-eight student participants were categorized into low, average, and high skill levels in physical education class. After formal and informal interviews and observations, the students felt that there were multiple opportunities for teachers to convey care. Students described teacher caring along dimensions of pedagogy, content, and interpersonal skills. The researcher determined the factors that facilitated caring were the nature of the physical education class, planned activities, and flexibility in teacher expectations. Barriers to care were class size, length of individual time with the teacher, and the role of the teacher. Additionally, caring physical education teachers seemed to create positive student attitudes about the class.
High school adolescents participated in a study that explored bridges and barriers for understanding perceptions of student-teacher relationship (McHugh, Horner, Colditz, & Wallace, 2013). Three focus groups from three different urban high schools across the country with diverse cultural representation discussed the importance of developing positive teacher-student relations. Students reported that caring was when teachers got to know their students and set high expectations. Barriers for establishing caring relationships were stereotypes and judgmental comments. One student stated, “I got to know my teacher well because I had them for two years.” This comment alludes to lack of time and large classes that many teachers and students have mentioned in other studies (Deiro, 1996; Goodlad, 1984; Johnson, 2006; Ravizza, 2005). However, the concept of developing teacher-student relationship over multiple years is feasible in some subject areas, and is a typical practice of secondary school bands.

Fraser and Walberg (2005) discussed the *Questionnaire on Teacher Interaction* (QTI), an instrument designed to investigate teacher-student relationships. The QTI has been translated into several languages and used over the world with similar results. Establishing and maintaining positive teacher-student relationships have shown significant advantages for positive student outcomes (both academically and socially). Positive teacher-student relationships are a worthwhile goal in education. With a large portion of the research on caring teacher-student relationships being qualitative, Fraser and Walberg (2005) suggest using the QTI with qualitative research to gain further understanding of teaching styles and practices that convey care.

Summarizing teacher practices of caring behaviors is not easy because of the various methodological approaches, and various cultures and personal teaching beliefs.
Students can perceive teacher caring relationships differently from their teachers based on their culture (discussed in more detail later in the review). However, the consensus among teachers seems to be that developing positive teacher-student relationships is the key to caring. The qualitative studies described in this section give great insight as to the perceptions of teacher behavior and practices that exhibit care. Whether it is taking the time to get to know each student, being flexible to meet students’ needs, or appropriate self-disclosure, teachers have reported that the invested time to develop relationships is important for student growth.

**Caring Climate on Motivation and School Adjustments**

Creating positive caring environments can change students’ attitudes about school. Wentzel’s (1997) longitudinal qualitative study examined middle school students’ (sixth through eighth grades) perceptions of pedagogical caring on motivation for school. Middle school students who felt their teachers cared showed positive motivational academic and social outcomes, even in the presence of distress.

A different study explored middle school students perceptions of classroom support related to motivational outcomes such as interests and social goal pursuit (Wentzel, Battle, Russell, & Looney, 2010). More than 350 middle school students, grades six through eight, were asked to complete a survey of student opinions regarding classroom experiences (including expectations for positive social behaviors). Results found that social support differs as a function of the student’s sex, grade, teacher, and classroom. Perceptions of motivational outcomes also differed as a function of source of
support. Middle school student motivation is relational and is dependent on their surrounding relationships.

An earlier study explored middle school students’ supportive relationships (parents, peers, and teachers) in relation to school outcomes, both academic and social (Wentzel, 1998). Sixth grade students ($N = 167$) were surveyed, and results found that peer support was a predictor of prosocial goal support, parent support predicted school related interests and goal orientations, and teacher support predicted school interests and social responsibility of goal pursuits.

Adjusting to school expectations and behaviors could be problematic for some students. Baker (2006) found that children experiencing behavioral or learning problems displayed poorer school outcomes and were unable to benefit from a close teacher relationships compared to peers without problems. This outcome conflicts with other studies that suggest that students who are at-risk benefit from caring teachers (Rolón-Dow, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999). However, Baker (2006) found that positive relationships existed between students with developmental vulnerabilities and close teacher relationships. These students were at a significant advantaged compared to students without the close teacher relationship and the same vulnerabilities.

Howes, Phillipsen, and Peisner-Feinberg (2000) also explored child-teacher relationships and the effects on student school adjustments from preschool to kindergarten. Results found gender to be a contributing factor as girls had greater and closer teacher-student relationships than boys.

Caring teacher-student relationships seem to affect how students feel and adjust to class and school. Regardless of age, adjusting to school academic and social demands can
be difficult for students, especially those with behavioral or learning problems (Baker, 2006). Although Baker’s (2006) findings differ, the other studies have found that when students perceive a caring relationship with their teacher, it appears to have positive effects on their interests and motivation in class and school (Wentzel, 1997, 1998). Student motivation for school appears to be influenced by their social support and overall environment, however mixed results furthers future investigation.

**Caring Climate on Academic Outcomes**

As students become adjusted to school, their comfort level and confidence is often an indicator of academic outcomes. There are several stories, articles, and studies that allude to the impact teachers have on students’ lives. Bergin and Bergin (2009) describe how attachment influences school success. Attachment is a “deep and enduring affectionate bond that connects one person to another across time and space” (p. 142). Attachment is the basis of teacher-student caring relationships. When children feel attached, it provides them with a sense of safety, ability to explore freely, and forms the basis for socialization. Secure attachment is associated with higher grades and standardized test scores, greater emotional regulation, social competence, and willingness to take on challenges (self-confidence). These effects tend to have a stronger impact on students of high-risk delinquent behavior or academic failures. If students feel care from their teachers and school community, perhaps academic and social outcomes may be positive.

Self-efficacy was also important to Lewis and colleagues (2012) as they investigated caring classroom environments in relation to math self-efficacy and
achievement of Hispanic elementary students. Researchers considered the language
barriers students of Hispanic origin could face and found that a teacher’s care bolstered
self-efficacy, which in turn bolstered math performance of *English Language Learners*.
When teachers reinforce the “can-do” attitude in students, it helps with their academic
performance.

Relationship-driven teaching style was the core of conveying care to students.
Schlichte and colleagues (2006) investigated students at risk of failing standardized tests
in secondary schools. Specifically looking at reading standardized tests, students in
programs that fostered care and development of teacher-student relationships did better in
school and on standardized tests needed to graduate.

A closer look at the effects of teacher-student relationships predicting academic
and social outcomes can be found in kindergarten research. Ladd, Birch, and Buhs (1999)
were interested in the relationship between the kindergarten child and the environment
model of early school adjustment. Ten trained researchers observed 200 kindergarten
students during the first ten weeks of school. Among other results, stressful aspects of
student-teacher relationships, and relationships among students adversely affect student
performance and participation. Providing a caring environment where students feel care
from the teacher and students is vital for social and academic achievement among

Academic outcomes are of primary concern to education policy makers
(Noddings, 2005, 2013). Caring teachers affect academic effort and achievement of
students as seen in elementary schools (Ladd et al., 1999; Lewis et al., 2012; Pianta et al.,
1997), and middle schools (Ravizza, 2005; Schlichte et al., 2006; Wentzel, 1997, 1998).
Caring teachers also impacted Hispanic students self-efficacy specific to math performance (Lewis et al., 2012). There appears to be a connection between teacher caring and student academic performance.

**Caring Climate on Social Outcomes**

Caring classroom environments has been linked to social behavior (Fraser & Walberg, 2005). An earlier study explored the relations between teaching with care and socialization. Gray (1986) found that building strong teacher-student caring relationships enhanced students’ self-confidence and self-esteem and encouraged cooperative learning and play. Accepting the students “as is” was important for the five elementary school teacher participants. Students tend to imitate their adult models, and the importance of teaching acceptance is vital for social and emotional growth.

Murdock (1999) also found that teaching with care resulted in fewer discipline problems. Urban middle school students from historically underprivileged groups tend to be at higher risk of dropping out of school. Murdock found that teacher-student connections and motivation was a predictor of less alienation among middle school students. Years later, Murdock and Miller (2003) investigated eighth grade student perceptions of teacher caring on achievement motivation and found teacher caring predicted motivation of achievement with less discipline problems.

A longitudinal study also hypothesized that creating a caring school environment would predict positive academic and social outcomes. Battistich and Hom (1997) examined fifth and sixth grade students from diverse populations and the relationship between sense of school as a community and problem behaviors. After a baseline
assessment, 12 schools began an intervention program that promoted school as a community while monitoring delinquent behaviors. Students completed a survey measuring care, supportive interpersonal relationships, student autonomy, and frequency of ten delinquent behaviors. Results found that students who perceived a higher sense of the school community were associated with lower levels of delinquency. However, it is important to note that both positive and negative behaviors were outcomes as a result of enhancing the community. Therefore, it is vital to keep the content of the community values in mind (Battistich et al., 1997).

While educational experts agree that academics are important for student growth, social and emotional growth is equally important. Research presented in the area of caring on social outcomes has found a positive connection between teacher-student caring relationships and positive behavioral outcomes (Fraser & Walberg, 2005; Gray, 1986; Murdock, 1999; Murdock & Miller, 2013). Understanding how students feel about their classroom environment can help change social behavior to positive outcomes.

**Caring Climate in Relation to Culture and Urban Settings**

Culture affects how teachers and students perceive caring climates, especially if there is a mismatch. Cha (2008) explored caring environments of five Korean students with their two Caucasian middle school English teachers. Using Noddings’ four components of care (modeling, dialogue, practice, and confirmation), findings suggest that individuals had personal beliefs about caring based on family, culture, and individual preference. Respect dominated Korean beliefs, which would weaken Noddings’ dialogue and confirmation components because of the cultural relevance of respect. Regardless,
teachers need to invest the time to get to know and understand the entire student, culture included.

Even when teachers have the best intentions to get to know their students, if there is a misalignment of interpreting care, it can lead to educational mishaps. Valenzuela’s (1999) study of Mexican students in the United States found that Mexicans perceive caring differently than Americans. Mexican families and students may implicitly ask to be cared-for prior to caring about school. *Educacion* (Spanish for education) has a different for meaning for the Mexican culture. The value of schooling is secondary to the caring behaviors exhibited by people. The misaligned perceptions can taint teacher-student relationships and affect academic student progress and overall success. However, teachers who are able to convey caring relationships to their students can make significant differences if students come from a home where they are deficient in care (Rolón-Dow, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999).

Rolón-Dow (2005) found similar misaligned caring perceptions in her qualitative study of Puerto Rican girls’ school experiences. Nine second-generation Puerto Rican girls from a low-income middle school with varying academic and social performance were purposely chosen as participants. Critical Race Theory and Latino/a Race Theory were used to help understand how race and ethnicity guide perceptions of care in education. Aesthetic care, the political well-being of the students (such as standardized curriculum, goals, and teaching strategies), was found to be similar between teachers and the Puerto Rican girls. Noddings (2005) and Valenzuela (1999) both agree that aesthetic care is important, but it should not overshadow the genuine personal authentic care that students long for. Rolón-Dow (2005) found the Puerto Rican girls and their teachers had
misaligned perceptions of personal care. For Caucasian teachers to convey authentic care for students of historically underprivileged races and ethnicities, a complete understanding of historical background of students’ lives would have to be fused into political and pedagogical approaches that benefit the student. If the misalignment of caring perceptions continues because of a difference of race or ethnicity, even the best teacher with the greatest intentions for caring will not be able to connect with the student (Noddings, 2005; Rolón-Dow 2005).

Being aware of student culture seems to be an important characteristic to administer and receive care. Urban schools are often the most underserved and culturally diverse student populations. Students in urban areas are in need of caring environments to help them develop socially, emotionally, and psychologically. Historically, students in urban areas are often at risk of delinquent behavior. Bondy, Ross, Gallingane, Hambacher, and Elyse (2007) conducted a qualitative study of novice teachers in urban elementary classrooms. Classrooms were recorded to explore approaches to teaching classroom behavior during the first two hours of the first day of school. After video analysis and interviews with teachers, researchers concluded that while classroom behavior was the goal of the first hours of instruction, caring characteristics were present. The teachers reported the importance of developing relationships and self-disclosure to establish trust and respect. Students in urban areas and are from historically underachieving groups need to feel comfortable “to be able to work together” (p. 334). Getting to know the students, self-disclosure, and teaching behaviors through insistence helped establish a caring climate in these urban elementary classrooms.
Urban elementary schools were the focus of another study that explored the associations between student-teacher relationships, external behavioral problems, and academic performance (Fowler et al., 2008). Two hundred thirty students and twenty teachers from two predominantly African American urban elementary schools participated in this study by taking a survey. Results suggest that students’ externalizing behaviors and prosocial behaviors affect teacher-student relationships. Although not conclusive, this study suggests a link between low teacher-student relationship and external behavioral problems and in turn, a link with low academic performance.

A different qualitative case study that explored urban African American elementary and secondary school students’ perceptions of caring classroom environment found similar results (Howard, 2002). A purposeful sample of 30 students who reflected varied academic achievement and classroom behaviors were selected to participate and grouped in low, middle, and high achievement and behavioral groups. Students were interviewed once individually and once in groups of three regarding the five represented teachers’ classrooms. Student interpretations of classroom learning environments and teaching practices in urban school found three central themes that impacted student achievement: teachers who establish family-like community in the classroom, teachers who establish culturally connected caring relationships with their students, and the use of a certain type of verbal communication and affirmation of actions. It appears that the case study participants valued teacher care because they felt it affected their overall success.

Similarly, Alder (2002) investigated predominately African American urban middle school students to determine how caring relationships were created and maintained between teachers and students. Principals identified two teachers as
displaying caring classroom environment. Twelve students in two schools participated in focus groups and interviews. After coding interviews, field notes, and focus groups, Alder concluded that teachers are perceived as caring when they know their students well, provide personalized leadership for each student, teach for understanding, and hold high behavioral and academic expectations. The middle school urban area students felt it was important for their teachers to care. The need to feel a sense of belonging is necessary for positive academic outcomes.

The need for establishing positive teacher-student caring relationships is important for student growth. A large portion of the existing literature from the United States has focused on students from historically underprivileged groups and perceptions of teacher caring. The works of Valenzuela (1999), Rolón-Dow, (2005), Alder (2002), and Howard (2002) used qualitative design to understand the cultural dynamics of the relationships between teachers and students. Other empirical teacher caring studies often used urban areas as a setting, but culture, race, or ethnicity was not the focus of the study (Griffin, 1998; McHugh et al., 2013; Murdock, 1999). The need to provide students of historically underprivileged groups a caring teacher-student relationship based on respect, trust, and responsiveness is a pressing issue in American education because these students tend to be at greater risk of drop-out, failure, or delinquent behaviors.

**Caring Climate in Music Education**

A music class presents an environment with musical and extra-musical outcomes. Traditional large ensemble music classes have opportunities to develop interpersonal social relationships among students and teachers that provide a family-like atmosphere
for students to feel welcomed and ‘at home’ (Adderley et al, 2003; Hourigan, 2009; McClung, 2000).

There are several opportunities for caring relationships to form among teachers and students within the music classroom offering several opportunities for social and emotional growth (McClung, 2000). Hourigan (2009) discusses a student with special needs in band and the importance of feeling cared for and accepted by his teacher and peers. Private music lessons have also been the scene for teacher-student caring relationships as Nagel (1999) reports a new student’s struggle to adjust from moving to a new town. Nagel, a private piano teacher, listened attentively and counseled her new student’s emotions in a caring manner. Apparently, the previous piano teacher was reported not to have shown caring behaviors, which ultimately affected the student.

Research suggests that music teachers have great influences on their students and that their class can have profound impacts on students’ lives (Edgar, 2012; Hamann, Mills, Bell, Daugherty, & Koozer, 1990; Hoffman, 2008; Robinson, 1997).

The attachment and connection between music teachers and their students can be so strong that it goes beyond music. Teacher influence can carry into seeking advice. According to 150 instrumental music teachers, 93% reported that their students ask them for advice regarding family, and social matters (Sewell, 1985). Teachers felt it was their responsibility to help their students in any way they can, including giving advice regarding social matters.

Edgar’s (2012) dissertation explored four band directors’ approaches to responding to challenges affecting the social and emotional growth of their students. Edgar used a qualitative design that encompassed teacher, student, and parent interviews,
along with focus group discussions, and observations. Specific findings include making time, being aware, listening well, providing proper classroom environment, humor, trust, modeling healthy interpersonal interactions, and demonstrating humility, which were similar to several studies on teacher caring practices (Deiro, 1996; Johnson, 2006; Noguera, 2007; Valenzuela, 1999). This study supported the band classroom as a place conducive for facilitative teaching and fostering support among students, parents, and teachers because of the elective nature of the music class, continuity of teaching same students more than one year, marching band, and the act of making music.

Hamann et al., (1990) study explored the music classroom environment and effects of musical achievement of high school instrumental and choral students. A survey was administered to 1,843 high school students and found that when teachers provided an environment rich in support, organization, rule clarity, involvement, and affiliation, student achievement was high. Contrastingly, achievement suffered when teacher control and competition were high. “Students want caring and helpful teachers – those who are willing to help them reach their individual goals” (Hamann et al., 1990, p. 223). This suggests that music teachers who prioritize student needs in a caring manner facilitate their musical achievements.

A qualitative study that explores the instrumental music classroom students’ experience that encompasses a caring climate is Robinson’s work (1997). He described a rural high school band’s environment comparing experiences from the top auditioned band to the second ensemble. His findings suggest that students appreciate boundaries that facilitate a focused rehearsal environment. Students also valued the community the band created; the interpersonal relationships developed among students and teachers.
Robinson’s study did not focus on the teacher-student relationship, which was an important factor for learning as seen in other studies outside of music education (Deiro, 1996).

Adderley, Kennedy, and Berz (2003) interviewed 60 band, choir, and orchestra students in search of why they participate and stay in their respective ensembles. Findings suggest students joined large ensembles for musical, social, academic, and family reasons, and continued participation for musical, academic, psychological, and social reasons. Students felt the growth of the extra-musical benefits such as self-confidence, self-esteem, and self-knowledge. Socially, students felt that large ensemble participation improved their social skills and recognized the importance of these relationships for their overall well-being.

Sharer (1994) explored high school choral parents’ perceived expectations and desired extra-musical outcomes through their children’s participation in choir. Parents agreed that extra-musical outcomes were learned and should-be learned as a result of choir participation. McClung’s (2000) article supports Sharer’s (1994) study and encouraged music teachers to reinforce the extra-musical outcomes naturally embedded in music classes. Social and societal skills are imperative for student growth and success.

Hoffman’s (2008) qualitative study explored the middle school band classroom as a social context for identity construction. Five students were interviewed over a five-month period and discussions suggested that the students took pride and valued their participation in band. Socially, if students were accepted or rejected by their own band peers, then that would lead to further band participation or departure respectively.
From a social lens, high school band forms a culture of its own (Morrison, 2001). A longitudinal qualitative study examined the band culture of an active, successful high school marching band (Laine, 2007). The success of the band (state champions) was known, and the work ethic to attain such status was supported throughout the school community (teachers, parents, and administrators). Laine discussed the student leaders of the band and how they had formed friendships through a common interest of music, years of participation in band, and level of dedication to their musical performance. Trust and respect were evident of the relationship between students and their band director. Students felt the band director cared about their musical and personal outcomes.

Hardcore band students were reported to have close relationships with each other because of their shared interests and dedication to band. Similar to Laine, Abril (2013) interviewed high school band students that displayed the strongest commitment to band. The students discussed the social strata established in band based on participation, talent and skill, and dedication level. Hardcore band students rarely associated with other band students because they did not match their interests. At times, some members ostracized or embarrassed other members who were not meeting musical standards. One hardcore student stated, “Sometimes we make sarcastic remarks or are in your face and say, ‘What the hell are you doing? Shape up, man!’” (Abril, 2013, pg. 11). The embarrassment and ostracizing behaviors exhibited by band members to fellow members can be described as negative social behaviors. Caring relationships among students appear present in high school band, but typically among members of their own social strata. There is still much to explore about caring relationships from other members points of view including the
director. What about the teacher? How does the band director feel about the social separation found within the band?

It seems that the hardcore band students described (Abril, 2013; Laine, 2007) were associated with being leaders of the band. Melton (2004) explored high school band student leaders in relation to exploited use of power. Two urban high schools and their bands students in both leadership and non-leadership positions were interviewed and observed. Student testimonies revealed that being in a leadership position was a way to be a bully, and those not in those positions were vulnerable to being victims of bullying. While the level of bullying varied to different degrees, students felt they belonged to the band community. Students felt leadership was important for a band to function, however integrity of the leaders varied. Both leaders and non-leaders reported the band director’s images of student leaders are to be role models. Some leaders exemplified role model positive behavior while other leaders took advantage of the ‘power’ and displayed antisocial or bullying behaviors. It appears that student leaders in Melton’s study care enough about the band program to volunteer for more responsibility; however, some leaders took advantage of the ‘power’. Despite experiencing negative bullying behavior, students were resilient, committed, and enjoyed the family-like atmosphere found in band.

Establishing caring relationships among teachers and students is feasible in secondary music classes because of the elective nature, the music making process, and continuity of the same teacher for multiple years (Edgar, 2012; McHugh et al., 2013). High school bands can develop into a community of their own (Robinson, 1997) and students value the sense of community because of the development of interpersonal
relationships and band feeling like home (Adderley et al., 2003; Melton, 2004). High school parents viewed the importance of teaching extra-musical outcomes, such as developing interpersonal relationships and collaboration skills (Sharer, 1994). Creating positive caring relationships between teachers and students is common in band because of the interest of music, and for the collective overall good of the ensemble (Abril, 2013; Laine, 2007). However distorted positions of power given to students (Melton, 2004), and the social separation among members (Abril, 2013) merits further investigation of caring relationships in band.

**Measuring Caring Climate**

Physical education research has begun to explore ways to measure caring climate. These studies are critical to the present study because physical education (especially in secondary schools) often have characteristics similar to instrumental music classrooms. Collaboration, large group goals, individual responsibility, and several social behaviors (prosocial and antisocial) are some of their commonalities. Additionally, large class sizes, mixed grades, elective nature, and multiple years with the same teacher are also common between high school bands and physical education classes.

Physical education is often a required class for students, but can also be an elective. The mixed group of student interests of the course can disrupt the educational environment. Rikard (2009) reviewed two older studies of high school students and found that most students did not care about physical education class because they perceived their teachers and the school did not care. Students felt the physical education class was boring, embarrassing, and disconnected to their lives. Additionally, students reported that
the overcrowded classes prevented the students from connecting with their teacher or
with other students. This was not the only study where large class sizes are mentioned as
a possible barrier for establishing caring connections (Deiro, 1996; Lee & Ravizza, 2008;
McHugh et al, 2013; Ravizza, 2005).

Middle school students reported several opportunities within physical education
classes for the teacher to exhibit and convey that they care (Ravizza, 2005). Larson
(2006) found that elementary and secondary students reported several opportunities for
teachers to exhibit care, mostly through attention given to students and other engrossment
behaviors. Larson suggests there are several opportunities to care in physical education
classes because of the high level of interpersonal interactions among students. Caring is
essential for attitude. Among pre-service physical education teachers, caring for students
came mostly through pedagogical design such as tailoring lessons for students’ needs and
being responsible for student learning (Lee & Ravizza, 2008). Interpersonal caring was
apparent through appropriate self-disclosure. Conveying care to physical education
classes is different for every teacher (Bae, 2011).

Physical education can occur outside of the school and is found in sports teams
and community sports groups. Physical education and sports researchers explored
benefits of a caring climate at the National Youth Sports Program (NYSP). It is critical to
feel a sense of belonging, especially in sport programs where levels of ability are visible
were interested in exploring the attitudes of soccer players toward the game, coach, and
each other in the presence of a caring climate. A measure was created (Caring Climate
Scale or CCS) to access athletes’ attitudes and found positive behaviors and attitudes
among players when surrounded by caring climate. Results found soccer players felt the NYSP to exhibit moderate levels of care. The measure had strong reliability and validity and used in subsequent research on caring climates.

NYSPs were also used in a study that compared a caring-based physical intervention program versus a traditionally focused physical program (Newton, Watson, Gano-Overway, Fry, Kim, & Magyar, 2007). Over 350 underprivileged adolescents participating in two NYSPs were either in the caring group ($N = 90$) or traditional group ($N = 263$) of physical activity programs. After five weeks of intervention, the caring group reported higher levels of caring, empathic concern, and future expected participation compared to the traditional group. Additionally, the caring group perceived lower levels of ego-involving motivation.

Fry and Gano-Overway (2010) used the CCS to explore caring climates of youth soccer teams and their attitudes toward the coach, teammates, and commitment to the sport. Results indicate that athletes who perceived higher levels of caring on their team were reported to have higher levels of enjoyment, more positive attitudes toward teammates and coaches, and greater commitment to the sport of soccer. Athletes with higher caring levels also engaged in more caring behaviors toward their coaches and teammates. It appears that caring benefited the soccer team and individual athlete’s social behaviors and overall attitudes.

Gano-Overway (2013) brought the CCS back to schools and explored physical education caring climates and its connections to student social behaviors (prosocial and antisocial) mediated through empathy. Middle school students ($N = 528$) completed measures of empathy, prosocial and antisocial behaviors, and caring climate. Gano-
Overway also explored mean differences of gender and examined the prevalence of bullying in physical education classes. She hypothesized a model where caring climate influences social behaviors (both positive and negative) with empathy as a partial mediator between caring and behaviors. Using structural equation modeling, Gano-Overway used empathy as a mediator between perceived caring climate and social behaviors. Statistical assumptions were tested and met, and analysis began with descriptive statistics, Pearson correlations, and t-tests to explore trends in and relationships among variables. Parceling was used to reduce the amount of parameters estimated, and improve the normality of the data. Gano-Overway tested the measurement models to determine goodness of fit, and test mediation effects of the model.

Descriptive results found middle school students perceived physical education climate as caring. Cognitive empathy seemed to resonate with students, however affective empathy was neutral. Girls reported higher levels of cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and prosocial behaviors compared to boys. Correlations showed that perceived caring climate was positively related to cognitive empathy and prosocial behavior, and was negatively correlated with antisocial behavior. Cognitive empathy correlated with both prosocial and antisocial behavior, whereas affective empathy was only associated with prosocial behaviors.

Students also reported higher participation rates of engaging in prosocial behaviors, and were rarely involved in antisocial or bullying behaviors during physical education class. Bully prevalence reports indicate 15% of students have bullied others during physical education class, and 23% have bullied other in school. However more students reported being bullied (28% during physical education and 39% during school).
After Gano-Overway examined the direct effects model as an acceptable fit, results found that the paths between caring climate and prosocial behavior \( (B = 0.34) \) and antisocial behavior \( (B = -0.34) \) were significant. She also examined the constrained and unconstrained structural models and found the unconstrained model resulted in a significantly better fit to the data. Supporting the mediation effect, cognitive empathy positively predicted prosocial behavior \( (B = 0.51) \) and negatively predicted antisocial behavior \( (B = -0.19) \), while perceived caring climate positively predicted cognitive empathy \( (B = 0.25) \).

Results of Gano-Overway’s (2013) research found that perceived caring climate positively predicted prosocial behavior and negatively predicted antisocial behaviors mediated through cognitive empathy. Caring climates appeared to affect student social behavior and was reported in and outside of class. The present study is a modified version of Gano-Overway’s (2013) study, but set in a high school band setting. Modifications will be discussed in detail in chapter three. Music education research lacks in specific studies that focus on caring climates, empathy, and social behavior of students.

Sports and physical education researchers have taken an interest in caring environments. With large class sizes, sometimes elective and competitive nature, and varying levels of talents and abilities, physical education warranted caring behaviors to set the tone for behavior. Larson (2006) found that there were several opportunities for teachers to exhibit caring behaviors during physical education class. Behaviors were reported similar to previous research, pedagogical care (tailoring lessons and activities to meet students needs) and personal care (getting to know the students). With Newton et al. (2007) development of the Caring Climate Survey, sports and physical education research
on care expanded. The interpersonal connections among teams, teammates, and the coaching staff were examined to determine how athletes perceived the caring climate in sports (Fry & Gano-Overway, 2010), camps (Newton et al., 2007), and physical education classes in school (Gano-Overway, 2013).

**Conclusion**

The advancement of society and technological trends has sacrificed opportunities for adolescents to develop positive relationships with important adults in their lives (Karam, 2006; Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Extended families tend to live far away compared to families pre-1950s, thus fewer adult role models for children and adolescents. The lack of positive adult role models outside of the immediate family allows children and adolescents to seek influence (positive or negative) elsewhere.

Adolescence is often associated as a period of great risk for academic failure and negative social behavior all in search of identity (Wolfe et al., 2006). Research pertaining to the social behavior of students in schools includes students of all ages, but has mostly focused on elementary and early adolescents. While antisocial or bullying behaviors peak during early adolescents (Olweus, 1993), bullying behaviors still occur in high school and are problematic for society. Research has found that 30% to 75% of students were involved in bullying behavior – in the role of bully, victim, or both (Nansel et al., 2001; Demeray & Malecki, 2003). Bullying studies have taken the form of self-report frequency, peer-nominated frequency report, and teacher report. Bullying can be direct (physical violence), indirect or verbal (spreading rumors or name calling), relational (manipulation of friends or ostracizing), or cyber (use of social media and text
messaging) (Wang et al., 2009). Bullying occurs in males and females with the most common harassment being indirect behaviors (Olweus, 1993). Regardless of the type of bullying, negative social behavior problems in schools continues to be problematic to society and needs further investigation. School efforts to defuse bullying problems include zero tolerance strategies or implementing bully prevention programs, but the negative social problems persist and it is evident through tragic cases of recent teen hazing, murders, and suicides.

Teachers serve a key role in the development of social, emotional, and psychological growth of their students. While policy makers, administrators, parents, and teachers are all concerned with the academic outcome of students, teaching is also about the psychological development and overall wellbeing of the students (Noddings, 2005). Creating positive caring teacher-student relationships could help students to make positive decisions regarding their behavior and how it relates to others.

Developing caring teacher-student relationships begins with the teacher. Studies have described how teachers establish care in their classrooms by getting to know the students, appropriate self-disclosure, helping with work, flexibility, and setting high academic and behavioral expectations (Deiro, 1996; Fraser & Walberg, 2005; Johnson, 2006; McHugh et al., 2013; Ravizza, 2005). Teaching contains emotion (Hargreaves, 1998) and caring for students overall wellbeing is linked to the profession. Some teachers take care to a different level by serving as an unofficial counselor to their students (Edgar, 2012; Philippo, 2010; Sewell, 1985; Teed, 2002).

Schools facilitate most social relationships established by adolescents. Studies have suggested the positive benefits of establishing a caring school environment
enhances positive student development (Battistich & Hom, 1997). Establishing a caring school environment seems ideal, however caring starts with individual relationships, and in the case of schools, teacher-student relationships. Research has found the benefits of establishing and maintaining positive caring teacher-students relationships in education. The development of positive teacher-student relationships affects students’ academic performance, stronger socialization, and fewer delinquent behaviors (Bergin & Bergin, 2009; Fraser & Walberg, 2005; Hargreaves, 1998; Noguera, 2007; Schlichte et al., 2006). When students perceive teacher care, studies found an improvement in overall motivation and interests in school (Baker, 2006; Wentzel, 1997; Wentzel et al., 2010). Caring teacher-student relationships have helped students at risk or of historically underachieving groups (Alder, 2002; Fowler et al., 2008; Howard, 2002; Lewis et al., 2012; Rolón-Dow, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999). While care can mean different things to diverse cultures and ethnicities (Lewis et al., 2012; Rolón-Dow, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999), several studies have defined caring from student and teacher perspectives (Fedderson, 2007; Fox, 1999; Hayes et al., 1994; Lee & Ravizza, 2008).

Several qualitative studies have explored the depth of caring teacher-student relationships. While it is important to understand these case studies and how teachers convey care to their students, it becomes difficult to generalize teacher caring behaviors because of the unique characteristics of each teacher, student, school, and community. Existing empirical research on caring teacher-student relationships has been found with mostly positive relationships between teacher-student caring and academic and social outcomes (Fowler et al., 2008; Fraser & Walberg, 2005; Newton et al., 2007). However, the research has been limited to younger students in general education classes.
Physical education research has begun to explore ways to measure teacher-student caring relationships and overall caring climate within the past ten years (Bae, 2011; Fry & Gano-Overway, 2010; Gano-Overway, 2013; Larson, 2006; Lee & Ravizza, 2008; Newton et al., 2007; Ravizza, 2005). However, many of these studies were in sports camp settings, or were with younger students (elementary and middle school aged students). High school students are in need of caring teacher-student relationships too, yet the research on care is scarce for this age group.

Bands provide students a place to learn and grow as a group. High school band directors are in a special position where they can monitor atypical student behavior because of the retention of students for multiple years (Carter, 2011). High school band students have reported strong connections to the band program because it felt like ‘home,’ and they felt a strong sense of belonging (Adderley et al., 2003; Laine, 2007). However, just because of the homelike connection does not mean that band was free of bullying. Melton (2004) found high school band student leaders abusing the power of their leadership position to bully or harass other members. Despite those band student reports of being bullied, they remained in band.

Large ensemble performance groups, like high school bands, provide a solid environment where students feel accepted and learn extra musical lessons such as cooperation and trust in order to meet their goals. Band teachers appear to be caring because of the typical extra hours spent planning and rehearsing, and the nature of a group setting, however there has been no research in this area. This study explored the relationships between perceived caring climates established in high school bands and the effects it had on student social behaviors.
Findings Related to the Design of the Study

The purpose of the study was to explore the connections between caring climate, empathy, and student social behaviors in high school bands. Participants were high school band directors and their students enrolled in band because:

- Adolescents are associated with the most potential for at risk academic and social behaviors (Espelage et al., 2000; Olweus, 1993; Wolfe et al., 2006).
- Bullying, aggression, and antisocial behaviors are problematic among adolescents (Demeray & Malecki, 2003; Eisenberg & Aalsma 2005; Juvonen et al., 2000; Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus, 1993; Perry et al., 1988).
- High school students have not been the focus of caring research (Fowler et al., 2008; Fraser & Walberg, 2005; Newton et al., 2007).

Student antisocial behavior has become problematic in schools. Studies suggest that a lack of positive adult role models has caused students to seek influence elsewhere (Karam, 2006; Bronfenbrenner, 1986). Research on care in education, mostly caring teacher-student relationships, has found positive outcomes.

- The development of positive teacher-student relationships affects students’ with better academic performance, stronger socialization, and fewer delinquent behaviors (Bergin & Bergin, 2009; Fraser & Walberg, 2005; Hargreaves, 1998; Lewis et al., 2012; Noguera, 2007; Schlichte et al., 2006).
- Studies have found an improvement in overall motivation and interests in school when students perceive teacher care (Baker, 2006; Wentzel, 1997; Wentzel et al., 2010).
- Caring teacher-student relationships have helped students at-risk or of historically underachieving groups (Alder, 2002; Fowler et al., 2008; Howard, 2002; Lewis et al., 2012; Rolón-Dow, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999).

Teachers are in a position to establish caring relationships with their students and expect positive social behaviors. High school band directors are in a special position where they can monitor atypical student behavior because of the retention of students for multiple years (Carter, 2011). Band students’ perceptions of teacher caring will be used to understand the caring climate found in band classes. Schools and classrooms facilitate most social relationships established by adolescents.

- Studies have suggested the benefits of establishing a caring school environment and how it enhances positive student development (Battistich & Hom, 1997).

- High school band students have reported strong connections to the band program because it feels like ‘home,’ and they felt a strong sense of belonging (Abril, 2013; Adderley et al., 2003; Laine, 2007).

- However some students involved in band activities have experienced varying degrees of negative behaviors (Melton, 2004).

Band students and teachers completed a survey designed to measure variables of caring climate, empathy (cognitive and affective), and student social behavior (positive and negative).

- Although research in care and education has been predominately qualitative designs, quantitative research was used because of strengths in measuring and understand care from students’ perspectives (Agne, 1992; Baker, 2006; Battistich & Hom, 1997; Fraser & Walberg, 2005; Fowler et al., 2008; Fry & Gano-
Affective empathy and cognitive empathy were measured using the *Basic Empathy Scale*, which has been a reliable valid measure used in other studies (Gano-Overway, 2013; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006).

- Empathy (both cognitive and affective) has been associated with social behaviors (Eisenberg, 2005; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Feshbach, 1997; Fry, Gano-Overway, 2010; Gano-Overway, 2013; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2004, 2006; Roberts & Strayer, 1996).

Based on previous measures of the Child Social Behavior Questionnaire (Warden et al., 2003) and the Bully Scale (Espelage et al., 2000), student social behavior (positive and negative) was measured using new measures that adapt to high school band setting.

- The positive social behavior measure was the *Music Positive Behavior Questionnaire* (MPBQ) and the negative social behavior measure was the *Negative Behavior Scale* (NBS) discussed in detail in the next chapter.

*Caring Climate Survey* was used to measure caring because it has demonstrated strong validity and reliability as seen in other studies (Fry & Gano-Overway, 2010; Gano-Overway 2013; Newton, Fry, Watson et al., 2007; Newton, Watson, Gano-Overway, et al., 2007).
CHAPTER 3

Method

The purpose of this study was to explore the connections between student perceived caring climate and student social behavior in high school bands. The study was conducted to understand student and teacher perceptions of caring climates in band, and to what extent caring climates affect students’ behaviors in band class, events, or activities. The following research questions were devised to gain further understanding of the caring climate, empathy, and student social behaviors found in high school bands.

1. How do perceived caring climate, cognitive empathy, and affective empathy influence student social behaviors (positive and negative) in band?

2. To what extent do perceptions of caring climates differ by teacher attributes (gender, years of teaching experience, years teaching at present school), student attributes (gender, ethnicity, instrument, years of band participation, victimization), school elements (school size, socioeconomic status), and band program elements (band size, band success)?

Research question one was designed to explain the relationships among the predictors (caring climate, cognitive empathy, and affective empathy) and the outcome variables (positive social behaviors and negative social behaviors). Research question two was designed to describe various groups within high school band and how they perceive caring climate. Comparisons between teacher and student groups, and groups among the student sample, can further explain if and how perceptions vary.
Pilot Study

Before conducting this study, a pilot test of the questionnaire was conducted to determine reliability, age appropriateness, and overall readability for high school band students. Fifteen high school band students from a public school in Miami-Dade County were administered the questionnaire at the beginning of a summer band rehearsal in July. Two word changes were addressed in the Basic Empathy Scale because six students did not fully understand the word choice of work out. The original item, *I can usually work out when people are cheerful*, was changed to *I can usually figure out when people are cheerful*. Similarly, the original item *I can usually work out when my friends are scared*, was changed to *I can usually figure out when my friends are scared*. Cronbach’s alpha was used to determine the reliability for each individual measure and results are discussed under each subsection accordingly.

Data Collection Procedures

After receiving approval from the Internal Review Board from the University of Miami (see Appendix A) and the Research Review Committee from Miami-Dade County Public Schools (see Appendix B), an email was sent to the Florida Bandmasters Association (FBA) Executive Director explaining the study and requesting the support of FBA by providing the membership e-mail list (see Appendix C). An email was sent out to 32 FBA members teaching public high school in Miami Dade County that explained the study and asked for volunteer directors and their students (see Appendix D). Volunteer directors that responded were sent information electronically that included instructions, principal consent letter, student script, parent consent form, student assent form, and
questionnaire links (see Appendix E –J respectively). Students and parents were informed about the study through the band directors reading the student letter to the students, and then by having the band directors distribute parent consent forms and student assent forms that further explained the study. Students were allowed to participate in the study if they returned a signed parent consent form and student assent form.

Once the band directors had agreed to participate, they were responsible for obtaining their principal’s consent, completing the director questionnaire, and for distributing the student *Band Climate Questionnaire* link to those students who returned a signed parent consent form and student assent form. The electronic questionnaire was completed by the band director and by their students. If students were enrolled in multiple band courses, they were to complete the questionnaire once. The *Band Climate Questionnaire* provided anonymity of responses and was completely voluntary. The questionnaire took approximately 5 to 10 minutes to complete. The principal letter of consent, parent consent forms, and student assent forms were returned to the researcher at the conclusion of the study. See Appendices K and L to view the *Band Climate Questionnaire* student and teacher version.

**Participants**

Participants were Florida high school band teachers and their students. Sampling was limited to high school band directors who were members of FBA, and who taught public high school in Miami-Dade County. Miami-Dade County was selected because of the various levels of band enrollment, various degrees of band program success,
representative socioeconomic status levels, demographic diversities of students in urban and suburban settings, and because every high school has only one band director.

Of the 32 band directors who received the email, 12 teachers responded. Two teachers stated they were not interested in participating at this time, and ten teachers confirmed their interest and participated in the study. One teacher was dropped from the study because none of their students completed the questionnaire ($N = 9$ teachers, response rate of 28.1%).

Frequency counts of teacher demographics were collected in order to better understand the teacher sample (see Table 1). Eight of the nine high school band directors were men, and all of the teachers were either White Non Hispanic, or Hispanic. The teacher sample had varying years of teaching experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Demographic Characteristics of Participating Band Directors ($N = 9$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Characteristic</strong></td>
<td><strong>$n$</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-14 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching at present school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-14 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more years</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on statistical procedures discussed later in this chapter, a goal of 200 student participants was set for the study. A total of 235 students attempted to complete the questionnaire but 20 were immediately eliminated from the study due to incomplete responses (missing more than half of the questionnaire), and six were eliminated because of careless responses. The careless surveys were detected by uniform responses regardless of item content. For example, some students selected the highest response for the entire survey. Therefore, those six surveys were eliminated from the study. Another six surveys were eliminated because scatter plots revealed certain scores as outliers (discussed in detail later in this chapter under Preliminary Analysis). Hence, a total of 203 student questionnaires were used ($N = 203$ students).

School and band information were also collected to better understand the community environment. The majority of participating schools were large, with total school enrollment larger than 2500 students, most of which were also Title One Schools (see Table 2). However, when looking at band enrollment, the medium size programs dominated the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>School Information ($N = 9$ schools)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title One School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes Title One</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Title One</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801-1350</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1351-1900</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-2500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501 or more students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50 students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-150 students</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 or more students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While student participants came from nine different schools, the distribution of students was not equal across schools (see Table 3). Schools were assigned pseudonyms to protect the identities of participants. Band directors were asked to report the top band’s ratings from the FBA District Concert Music Performance Assessments for the past three years. Rankings from highest to lowest are Superior, Excellent, Good, Fair, and Poor. Revealing band concert ratings for the past three years brings a better understanding of the band culture (see Table 4).

Table 3  
*Student Distribution Among Participating Schools (N = 203 students; N = 9 schools)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4  
*Overall Band FBA MPA District Concert Ratings (N = 9 schools)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Student participant demographic information can be found in Table 5. The male to female ratio of this sample is 2:1. Some students did not respond to demographic items.

Table 5

*Student Demographics (N = 203)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Non Hispanic</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Non Hispanic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade in School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwinds</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Years Participating in Band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more years</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measures

The Band Climate Questionnaire was compiled from different scales to measure variables of perceived caring climate, cognitive and affective empathy, negative behaviors, positive behaviors, and demographic information. The present study was inspired by a study on caring climate provided in physical education classes (Gano-Overway, 2013). This study used the same measures to investigate the variables of perceived caring climate, cognitive and affective empathy, and positive social behaviors. A different negative social behavior measure was used and is discussed later in this chapter. Slight alterations to the caring and positive social behavior measures were taken and explained in detail below. All items were re-worded when needed to reflect the instrumental ensemble setting.

Students and teachers were asked to complete all portions of the questionnaire. The teacher questionnaire was worded differently than the student questionnaire to accommodate the teacher’s perspective.

Caring Climate. The Caring Climate Survey (CCS) has been used in several studies in different fields of research to explore the perception of caring environments. Caring climate was defined as the extent to which individuals perceive a particular setting to be interpersonally safe, supportive, and capable of being valued and respected (Newton, Fry, Watson, Gano-Overway, Kin, Magyar, & Guivernau, 2007). Caring not only comes from the group leader, but from others within the group, therefore items were generated that reflected feeling cared-for within the group setting (Newton et al., 2007). The authors piloted the measure with children in a sports camp and after exploratory factor analysis, found that one factor (caring climate) supported the validity. In a follow
up study, the same authors did a confirmatory factor analysis that limited the measure to 13 items. Internal reliability was strong ($\alpha = .92$).

This study’s pilot test used all 13 items of the CCS with some wording changes to accommodate high school band setting. For example, the original item *The leaders respect kids* was changed to *The band director respects students*. The original survey mentions camp *leaders* in several items, and the revised version for this study was changed to *band directors*. In addition, because high school adolescents completed the survey, the word *kids* was changed to *students* throughout the measure. The CCS used a 5-choice Likert-type scale with the neutral choice in the middle (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Internal reliability for the pilot was strong ($\alpha = 0.80$).

**Cognitive and Affective Empathy.** The Basic Empathy Scale (BES) is a 20-item survey that measures the two subscales of empathy: affective and cognitive (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). Affective empathy is the ability to share feelings (e.g., *After being with a friend who is sad about something, I usually feel sad*; 11 items), while cognitive empathy is the ability to understand feelings (e.g., *I can understand my friend’s happiness when he/she does well at something*; 9 items). The BES uses a 5-choice Likert-type scale with the neutral item of *Neither Agree nor Disagree* (1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree). Research supported adequate factor and construct validity with good internal consistency for the subscales (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). Three goodness-of-fit indices suggested that the two factors (cognitive and affective) supported validity of the measures (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). Reliability for both cognitive empathy and affective empathy were
both good (cognitive empathy $\alpha = 0.79$ and affective empathy $\alpha = 0.85$). Results for the reliability of the pilot test was moderately strong (cognitive empathy $\alpha = 0.71$ and affective empathy $\alpha = 0.62$).

**Negative Social Behaviors.** The Bully Scale (BS) is a five-item questionnaire that measures the frequency of specific negative social behaviors for adolescents, focusing on bullying (Espelage et al., 2000). Researchers found the Bully Scale (BS) to be a strong and valid measure after confirmatory factor analysis (Cronbach’s $\alpha = 0.83$) and was consistent with the definition of psychological and physical acts of antisocial behaviors (Espelage et al., 2000). Three additional items were added to the negative social measure taken and adapted from the Child Social Behavior Questionnaire (discussed in the next section), *I spread a rumor about another student*, *I joined in a group of students to hurt another student*, and *I broke/damaged another student’s personal property to upset them*. The first two items were added because of the indirect negative social behavior often found among adolescents (Olweus, 1993). The last item was added because of opportunity for other students to tamper with personal equipment used in bands (instruments, supplies, music). The new eight-item negative social behavior scale measured specific behaviors that range from subtle to overt aggressive behaviors and is called the *Negative Behavior Scale* (NBS). Item scoring is frequency-based, as found in the Bully Scale (Espelage et al., 2000), measuring levels of how often the student did the specific behavior in the last 30 days. Instructions read, *How many times did you do the following IN BAND in the last 30 days?*, with response options being $A =$ *none*, $B =$ *1-2 time(s)*, $C =$ *3-4 times*, $D =$ *5 or more times*. Teachers were asked how many times have they witnessed these behaviors in band. The term “in band” was defined
for students and teachers and read as *any large ensemble class, rehearsal setting, or planned band activity where the band teacher is in charge of the band students.*

Cronbach’s *alpha* was used to test reliability of the new measure during the pilot (*α* = 0.51).

**Positive Social Behaviors.** Portions of the *Child Social Behavior Questionnaire* (CSBQ) were used to assess student prosocial behaviors (Warden et al., 2003). The original measure had five subsections with four items each that measure Practical Prosocial Behavior, Relational Prosocial Behavior, Overt Antisocial Behavior, Relational Antisocial Behavior, and Victimization. The current study used the two prosocial subscales (similar to Gano-Overway, 2013) to measure positive social behaviors, which had shown consistent reliability (*α* = 0.72, Warden et al., 2003). The prosocial measure was revised to accommodate the band setting as well as provide age-appropriate language for adolescents. For example, the original student item *Helping another child in class with their work* was changed to *I helped another student with their schoolwork.* The original eight-item measure had two items that were omitted for this study because they could not conform to the band setting (*Letting another child in your class play with his/her game or toy; Sharing crisps or treats with another child during playtime or dinnertime*). Two new items were added to the positive social measure that met the high school band setting. *I helped another student learn their music* was similar to *I helped another student with their schoolwork,* but was specific to helping behavior in music. *I tried to get students to work together* was also added to the prosocial measure because of the opportunities bands have to work together in small groups. The revised version of the
positive social behavior section of the CSBQ is referred to as the *Music Positive Behavior Questionnaire* (MPBQ).

Finally, the format of item responses was changed from a three-choice Likert option (*often, sometimes, or never*) to a four-choice frequency scale identical to the NBS (*A = none, B = 1-2 time(s), C = 3-4 times, D = 5 or more times*). The original Likert options refer to frequency, however, *never* is the only option provided that can equate a number. The ambiguity of rating scale terms such as *often* or *sometimes* can be interpreted differently (Payne, 2003). Instead, frequency options were provided to gain a more accurate account of behavior. In addition, the original CSBQ was designed for children in elementary school (ages 7-9), so the researcher read each item out loud and the students were instructed to select one of the three choices in front of them. The original format was suitable for the young aged children but was changed for high school adolescents as they are expected to be able to read, comprehend, and answer items independently. Instructions read identical to the negative social measure discussed in the previous section, *How many times did you do the following IN BAND in the last 30 days,* with response options being *A = none, B = 1-2 time(s), C = 3-4 times, D = 5 or more times*. The frequency response options were used to mirror the negative social behavior response options discussed in the previous section. Consistency in directions, scale, and number of options was important for measuring both positive and negative social behaviors. “In band” was defined for students and teachers as *any large ensemble class, rehearsal setting, or planned band activity where the band teacher is in charge of the band students*. Cronbach’s *alpha* was used to test reliability during the pilot test (*α = 0.86*).
Victimization. A victimization section was added to the design of the study because of the few studies that suggested band students being victims of bullying and negative behaviors within band (Melton, 2004). The victimization scale from the CSBQ (Warden et al., 2003) was used with slight wording revisions. The original four-item scale was used with changes to the word—child was replaced with student. For example, Being hit by another child in your class was changed to Being hit by another student in your class. Scoring was identical to the other social behavior measures as students were to report the frequency they encountered the behavior in the last 30 days (A = zero times, B = 1-2 time(s), C = 3-4 times, D = 5 or more times). Students and teachers were asked to complete the four items of victimization to recall behaviors in band. “In band” was defined for students and teachers as any large ensemble class, rehearsal setting, or planned band activity where the band teacher is in charge of the band students. Cronbach’s alpha was used to test reliability of the measure during the pilot (α = 0.58).

Variables

Caring Climate (CC) was measured using the Caring Climate Survey (CCS). Item responses were assigned numeric values (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree) and summed to create a perceived caring climate score. The highest possible caring climate score was 65 and the lowest was 13. The higher the score equates a higher level of perceived caring climate.

Empathy was measured using the Basic Empathy Scale (BES), which contains two subscales for cognitive and affective empathy. Item responses were assigned numeric values matching the CCS (1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree). Affective
Empathy (AE) variable was calculated using the eleven affective items from the BES. The highest possible score for affective empathy was 55 and the lowest was 11. Cognitive Empathy (CE) variable used the nine cognitive items from the BES. The highest possible score for cognitive empathy was 45 and the lowest was 9. The higher the score equates a higher level of empathy respectively.

Negative Social Behaviors (NSB) was computed by adding the eight negative social behavior items from the NSB. Scoring was reversed for negative social behaviors; higher scores indicated lower levels of negative social behaviors. The highest score available was 32 and the lowest was 8.

Positive Social Behaviors (PSB) was measured by summing the eight positive social behavior items from the MPBQ. A higher score indicated higher levels of prosocial behaviors. The highest score available was 32 and the lowest was 8.

Victimization (V) was negatively scored to indicate higher scores equating lower levels of victimization. The lower the score the more victimized the student felt. The highest score of victimization was 16 and the lowest score was 4.

Demographic information was collected for the student and teacher, as well as general band and school information. Student gender, ethnicity, grade level, principal instrument, and total years participating in band were collected from the students. Principal instrument was categorically divided into three sections: woodwinds, brass, and percussion. Total years participating in band was also be grouped into three groups: 1-2 years, 3-4 years, and 5 or more years.
Teacher gender, ethnicity, years of teaching experience, and total years teaching at present school were collected from the teacher. Years of teaching experience and total years at present school was categorically divided into four ordinal groups: 1st year = rookie teachers, 2-5 years = novice teachers, 6-14 = seasoned teachers, 15 or more years = veteran teachers.

High school enrollment was categorically divided into six groups as used in the FBA Classification System (www.flmusiced.org/fba/handbook): C (1-400 students), CC (401-800 students), B (801-1350 students), BB (1351-1900 students), A (1901-2500 students), and AA (2501 or more students). Band size was determined by the number of students enrolled in band class: under 50 students, 51-150 students, and 151 or more students. School socioeconomic status was categorized as either Low or High (Title One or not Title One, respectively). Finally, band success was determined using the last three years of the Florida Bandmasters Association District Concert Band Ratings. Categories for band success were Superior, Excellent, Good, Fair, or Poor, based on averaging the past three years of concert ratings from the Music Performance Assessments. The average ratings used the FBA scoring guide (www.flmusiced.org/fba/handbook).

**Preliminary Analysis**

The electronic questionnaires (student and teacher) were divided into sections for each measure. Using the student data, composite scores were created by summing the item scores in each designated measure (Caring Climate–CC, Affective Empathy–AE, Cognitive Empathy–CE, Positive Social Behavior–PSB, Negative Social Behavior–NSB,
and Victimization—V). Cronbach’s alpha was used to check reliability of each measure (see Table 6).

Table 6
**Reliability for Variables using Cronbach’s alpha (N = 203)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>α</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring Climate (CC)</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy (AE)</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy (CE)</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Social Behavior (PSB)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Social Behavior (NSB)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimization (V)</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions.** Assumptions were tested for all statistical procedures conducted including multiple linear regression, one-way analysis of variance, independent t-tests, single sample t-tests, and Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance. Multiple linear regression subsumes ANOVAs and t-tests, therefore assumptions were first tested for regression.

Sample size was met with a minimum sample needed using the formula $N \geq 104 + m$, where m is the number of predictors. Experts agree to use the formula that creates a higher number of participants as the minimum sample size (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In this case, with three predictors, $N \geq 104 + 3$ required a minimum of 107 student participants. This study met the sample size requirements with $N = 203$ student participants.

The Malhalanobis test was used to detect outliers within the data. Outliers were found by converting variable scores to Z-scores and then eliminating the data larger than the three standard deviations on at least two or more measures. A total of six surveys were eliminated because of outliers ($N = 203$).
Independence of residuals was tested using the Durbin-Watson test. A score above one will meet the assumption that residuals are independent. PSB regression Durbin-Watson score was 1.83 and NSB score was 1.78, therefore the residuals were independent.

P-P Plots for both PSB and NSB regressions were used to determine normality of distribution. The residuals clustered around the line for PSB, which suggests normality was met for outcome variable of PSB. NSB P-P Plots were not as linear, suggesting further analysis was needed. Descriptive statistics found NSB negatively skewed beyond -1. Therefore, NSB was transformed using logarithmic transformation to meet normality assumption (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

Multicollinearity and singularity assumptions were checked by using SPSS multicollinearity diagnostic tables. Variance proportions were not overloaded for any one dimension. Additionally, VIF scores for each predictor was close to one, suggesting multicollinearity was non-problematic (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).
CHAPTER 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to explore the connections perceived caring climate has on student social behaviors in high school band. The study was conducted to gain a better understanding of student perceptions of the high school band caring climate. The following research questions were devised to gain further understanding of the caring climate, empathy, and student social behaviors found in high school bands.

1. How do perceived caring climate, cognitive empathy, and affective empathy influence student social behaviors (positive and negative) in band?

2. To what extent do perceptions of caring climates differ by teacher attributes (gender, years of teaching experience, years teaching at present school), student attributes (gender, ethnicity, instrument, years of band participation, victimization), school elements (school size, socioeconomic status), and band program elements (band size, band success)?

Research Question One

To answer the research question, How do perceived caring climate, cognitive empathy, and affective empathy influence student social behaviors (positive and negative) in band?, student mean scores were used for the listed variables (see Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>57.73</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>35.10</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB</td>
<td>22.13</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSB</td>
<td>29.37</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pearson correlations were analyzed to determine the strength and direction of the relationships between the predictors and the outcome variables (see Table 8). Negative Social Behavior (NSB) displayed a significant relationship with Caring Climate \( (r = -0.27, p < .01) \). The relationship suggests that as students’ perceptions of caring climate increase their negative social behavior decrease. Cognitive Empathy (CE) displayed significant relationships with PSB \( (r = 0.222, p < .01) \) and CC \( (r = 0.201, p < .01) \). As students’ cognitive empathy increase their positive social behaviors and perceptions caring climate both increase.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>AE</th>
<th>PSB</th>
<th>NSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.270**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td>0.222**</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.213**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Separate multiple linear regressions were performed regressing PSB and NSB on CC, CE, and AE. With PSB as the outcome variable, the omnibus regression was statistically significant \( F (3, 199) = 3.43, p < .05, R^2 = .049 \) (see Table 9). The significant variable was CE with 0.22 standardized beta weight. For every one standard deviation increase in CE \( (SD = 4.28) \), PSB will increase by 0.22 standard deviation \( (SD = 5.8) \). Cognitive empathy accounts for 4.9% of the variance in positive social behaviors in high school band. The other predictors of CC and AE were non-significant.
Table 9

Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Positive Social Behavior (N = 203)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .049$

When NSB was the outcome variable, the omnibus regression was also statistically significant, $F(3, 199) = 5.65, p < .01, R^2 = .078$ (see Table 10). Caring Climate was the only significant variable and had a strong standardized beta weight of -0.27. For every one standard deviation increase in CC ($SD = 6.18$), NSB would decrease by 0.27 standard deviation ($SD = 2.6$). The caring climate variable explained 7.8% of the variance in negative social behaviors.

Table 10

Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Negative Social Behavior (N = 203)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .078$

Research Question Two

The next question, To what extent do perceptions of caring climates differ by teacher attributes (gender, years of teaching experience, years teaching at present school), student attributes (gender, ethnicity, instrument, years of band participation,
victimization), school elements (school size, socioeconomic status), and band program elements (band size, band success)?, used a series of statistical procedures to gain an understanding of the existing relationships. Perceptions of caring climate divided by group (as stated in research question two) were performed using independent sample t-tests, single sample t-tests, and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). To simplify reporting, results are divided into two sections, non-significant and significant results.

**Non-significant Results.**

**Gender.** An independent sample t-test was used to determine whether perceived caring climate differed by student gender. Results found that student gender was not a statistically significant factor for perceived caring climate, $t_{(195)} = -0.49, p = .62$. Teacher gender difference could not be calculated because there was only one female teacher participant.

**Ethnicity.** One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine whether student ethnicity (grouped by white non Hispanic, black non Hispanic, Hispanic, or other) influenced student perceptions of CC. Results were non significant, $F_{(3, 194)} = .046, p = .99$, student perceptions of CC did not differ by ethnicity.

**Student band experience, year in school, and instrument.** One-way ANOVAs were performed on student attributes to determine whether perceptions of caring climate differed among students. Student attributes of years participating in band (grouped 1-2 years, 3-4 years, 5 or more years), grade in school ($9^{th}$, $10^{th}$, $11^{th}$, or $12^{th}$), and instrument (woodwinds, brass, and percussion) did not influence perceptions of caring climate, $F_{(2, 182)} = .33, p = .70$, $F_{(3, 182)} = 1.37, p = .26$, and $F_{(2, 192)} = 1.11, p = .33$, respectively.
**Band success.** Independent sample $t$-test was used to determine if perceptions of caring climate differed by band success. Band success was determined by averaging the last three years Florida Bandmasters Association District Concert Music Performance Assessment ratings using the FBA handbook. Most school ratings were either superior or excellent, therefore groups were divided in two, superior bands and non-superior bands (see Table 11). Independent sample $t$-tests were performed and student perceptions of caring climate grouped by band success was non-significant, $t_{(201)} = -1.42$, $p = .16$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band Success</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Band</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>57.07</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Superior Band</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>58.30</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher experience.** An ANOVA was used to assess the relationship between students’ perceived caring climate (CC) and teacher attribute of total years teaching experience. Years of teaching experience were categorized into four groups (first year, 2-5 years, 6-14 years, and 15 or more years). Student perceptions of caring climate did not perceive differently by years of teacher experience, $F_{(2, 200)} = 2.66$, $p = .07$.

**School size.** School size also produced non-significant results. School size was divided into four groups based on student enrollment classified by Florida School Music Association (800-1350 students, 1351-1900 students, 1901-1500 students, and more than 2501 students). ANOVA results indicate that school size was statistically non-significant in student perceptions of caring climate, $F_{(1, 199)} = .84$, $p = .47$. 
Significant Results.

**Teacher experience at school.** A one-way ANOVA was used to determine whether student perceptions of caring climate differed by the amount of years the teacher had taught at the school. Years teaching at the same school was grouped into four categories (first year, 2-5 years, 6-14 years, and 15 or more years). Descriptive statistics are found in Table 12. Student perceptions of caring climate differed by group of years teaching at the current school, $F_{(2, 200)} = 14.47, p < .01, \eta^2 = .13$. Post hoc tests using Tukey HSD found significant differences between groups one (2-5 years) and two (6-14 years) ($M = -4.37, SE = .86, p < .01$), and one (2-5 years) and three (15 or more years) ($M = -4.57, SE = 1.43, p < .01$). No statistical significance was found between groups two and three ($M = -.20, SE = 1.43, p = .99$). Results suggest that student perceptions of caring climate were higher when teachers had remained at the school for more than five years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Teaching at Current School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years (group 1)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>55.30</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-14 years (group 2)</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>59.67</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more years (group 3)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student leadership.** Students were asked whether they held a leadership position in band. Descriptive statistics for leadership groups are in Table 13. An independent sample $t$-test was conducted and results were statistically significant, $t_{(196)} = -2.24, p < .05$. Students in band leadership positions perceived caring climate differently from students who did not hold a leadership positions. Leaders perceived caring climate lower
than non-leaders. Cohen’s $d$ effect size was calculated and considered a small effect size $d = -.33$ (Gamst, Meyers, & Guarino, 2008).

Table 13
*Descriptive Statistics for Students Who Held Leadership Positions (N = 203)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Position</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56.33</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>58.40</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_School SES._ School elements were also used to determine whether groups differed on perceptions of caring climate. School socioeconomic status (SES) was grouped by Title One or Non Title One School reported by the teacher (see Table 14). The assumption of homogeneity of variances test for SES did not hold, $F = 4.18, p < .05$. Although independent $t$-tests are robust to this assumption, the $t$-test was calculated using a formula in which equal variance were not met. Statistically significant differences were found in perceptions of caring climate for SES $t_{(201)} = 4.17, p < .01$. Students in Title One Schools reported higher levels of caring climate in high school band compared to students in non Title One schools. Cohen’s $d$ effect size was moderately strong, $d = .6$.

Table 14
*Descriptive Statistics for Students in Title One Schools (N = 203 students)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title One School</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>59.18</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>55.67</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Band size._ Band enrollment was divided into three groups to determine whether CC differed by band size (less than 50 students, 51-150 students, or more than 151 students). However, only one band was represented in the smallest group, therefore, the data was re-grouped in two categories—less than 150 students and 151 or more students.
(see Table 15). An independent sample $t$-test was used to determine whether student perception of caring climate differed by band enrollment. Results indicate that student perceptions of caring climate differed by band enrollment groups, $t_{(201)} = 3.26, p < .01$. Students felt a lower sense of caring climate as the bands increased in size. Cohen’s $d$ effect size was moderately strong $d = -.47$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band Enrollment</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 150 Students</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>58.72</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151 or More Students</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>55.81</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teacher and student perceptions.** A single sample $t$-test was used to determine whether perceptions of caring climate differed between teachers and their students. The teacher CC mean score was used as the test value. Students perceived caring climate differently than teachers, $t_{(202)} = -3.85, p < .01$. This suggests that teachers have higher perceptions of caring climate compared to their students.

Single sample $t$-tests were also performed for each school. Data files were split according to school and each teacher’s raw score was used as the test value for their school (see Table 16). Schools A, E, and G had different perceptions of caring climate between the teacher and their students. Teachers in schools A and E perceived the caring climate higher than their students, while the teacher at school G was the only teacher who perceived caring climate statistically significant lower than the students.
Victimization. Victimization data was not normally distributed. The negatively skewed data suggests that victimization of bullying was non problematic in the sampled high school bands (see Table 17). Sixteen was the highest score in victimization, suggesting that no victimization was reported for that student. Sixteen was also the mode of the data, with median at 15 and mean at 14.16.

Table 16
Perceptions of Caring Climate by School (N= 203)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Test Value</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54.15</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-7.36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62.47</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>56.90</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>55.81</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60.24</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-7.16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.17</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Victimization data was not normally distributed. The negatively skewed data suggests that victimization of bullying was non problematic in the sampled high school bands (see Table 17). Sixteen was the highest score in victimization, suggesting that no victimization was reported for that student. Sixteen was also the mode of the data, with median at 15 and mean at 14.16.

Table 17
Descriptive Statistics for Raw Data of Student Victimization (N = 203)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data was divided in two groups, those who reported no victimization and those that reported any victimization in band (see Table 18). The two groups’ perceptions of caring climate were compared using a Kruskal-Wallis test. Assumptions of homogeneity of variance and similar distributions were met after ranking data, creating rank scores for each participant, then finding the absolute difference of the rank score and the mean rank score. Homogeneity assumption was non significant ($F_{(1, 201)} = .77, p = .38$). Kruskal-Wallis test was performed and perceptions of caring climate were significantly different among victimization groups, $\chi^2 = 12.37$, with a small effect size of .06. Results
suggest that students who reported any victimization in band reported a lower level of perceived caring climate.

Table 18  
*Groups of Victimization on Caring Climate (N = 203)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victimization</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>89.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Victimization</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>118.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual means for caring climate and victimization were used to compare perceptions of climate within a particular school (see Table 19). Schools B and H reported the most amount of victimization, however school B also reported the highest mean school of caring climate. School H reported the second lowest caring climate score and the highest level of victimization in band.
Table 19
*Caring Climate (CC) and Victimization (V) Means Reported by School (N = 203)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School and Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>54.15</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>62.47</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>13.65</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>56.90</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>55.81</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>60.24</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>59.87</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>60.17</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>55.07</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CC</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

Discussion and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to explore the connections between perceived caring climate, empathy (cognitive and affective), and student social behaviors (positive and negative) in high school bands. Volunteer band directors and their students completed an electronic questionnaire aimed at answering the following research questions:

1. How do perceived caring climate, cognitive empathy, and affective empathy influence student social behaviors (positive and negative) in band?

2. To what extent do perceptions of caring climates differ by teacher attributes (gender, years of teaching experience, years teaching at present school), student attributes (gender, ethnicity, instrument, years of band participation, victimization), school elements (school size, socioeconomic status), and band program elements (band size, band success)?

Discussion

Perceptions of caring climate mean scores in this study suggest that high school band have caring environments. Significant relationships were found between caring climate and negative social behavior and between cognitive empathy and positive social behavior. A multiple linear regression confirmed a relationship between cognitive empathy and positive social behavior, which supports previous research (Eisenberg, 2005; Eisenberg & Miller, 1987; Roberts & Strayer, 1996). As students’ scores increase...
in cognitive empathy, positive social behavior will also increase. Prosocial behaviors are positively linked with the ability to understand someone’s emotions.

While perceived caring climate did not predict students’ positive social behaviors, a separate multiple linear regression found significant relationships between caring climate and negative social behavior. The significant relationship with the negative social behavior suggests that students with higher perceptions of caring climate are less likely to engage in negative social behavior. Studies of caring climates in schools have found similar results, when students perceive teachers care, an overall improvement in school motivation occurs (Baker, 2006; Wentzel, 1997; Wentzel et al., 2010), as well as fewer delinquent behaviors (Bergin & Bergin, 2009; Fraser & Walberg, 2005; Hargreaves, 1998; Lewis et al., 2012; Noguera, 2007; Schlichte et al., 2006).

Perceptions of caring climate had varying results when analyzed by student demographics, teacher demographics, band elements, and school elements. Student gender was non-significant in perceptions of caring climate, which agrees with previous research (Gano-Overway, 2013; Hayes et al., 1994). Gender did not influence student perceptions of caring climate. These results support Noddings’ assertion that caring is genderless and that everyone is responsible for caring (2005).

Perceptions of caring climate grouped by ethnicity had non-significant results. Previous research has reported varying student perceptions of teacher care based on ethnicity, however student essays were the source of data collection (Hayes et al., 1994). Previous research found that students perceive teacher caring higher when ethnicities between teacher and students match (Noddings, 2005; Rolón-Dow, 2005). While this study could not focus not on teacher ethnicity due to sample size, the majority of the
schools had matching ethnicities between the teacher and a large portion of the students. Perhaps the amount of matching ethnicities of Hispanic students along with their Hispanic teachers added to the overall effect that the band climate is caring. Perceptions of caring climate in high school band categorized by matching teacher and student ethnicity is worthy of further investigation.

Teacher attributes of years teaching and years teaching at current school had varying influence on perceptions of caring climate. While overall years of teaching experience was non-significant, the amount of years teaching at the current school affected perceived caring climate. Student perceptions of caring climate increased when the teacher had stayed at the school for more than five years. This agrees with other research that suggests that the development of caring climate takes years because of the need to develop the teacher-student relationships (Deiro, 1996; Goodlad, 1984; Johnson, 2006; McHugh et al., 2013; Noddings, 2005; Ravizza, 2005). The high school band environment is an example of the multiple years a student can have the same teacher, hence a longer time to establish a caring relationship.

Student attributes of grade, instrument, and years participating in band did not affect their perceptions of caring climate. Categorizing student reports of victimization into two groups, results found that students who did not report any victimization perceived caring climate higher than students who did report victimization. If a student is feeling victimized by any level of bullying, their perceptions of the caring climate can weaken. While there is no research found that directly studies victimized students perception of caring climate in school, studies have found caring teachers have helped at-
risk students (Alder, 2002; Fowler et al., 2008; Howard, 2002; Lewis et al., 2012; Rolón-Dow, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999).

Although overall victimization did not seem to be problematic in high school bands, there were students who reported being victimized, statistically non-significant but humanly significant. Of the students that reported victimization, most of the reported bullying acts were either psychological or social bullying. Being left out of an activity was reported as the most frequent act of bullying, followed by being picked on by another student in band class. The least reported was physical bullying. This supports Olweus’ (1993) research that most bullying comes in social and psychological formats. Future studies on bullying should concentrate on the psychological and social acts of bullying and the effects it has on the victim and the overall caring environment.

Students were also asked whether they held a leadership position in band. Their leadership status did influence perceptions of caring climate. Students who held leadership positions in band perceived the caring climate lower than did the non-leaders in band. One might suspect that students would accept additional responsibilities if they felt an attachment to band, linking the caring environment to their attachment. Perhaps the additional work and responsibilities assigned to the leaders weakened their caring perspectives. Maybe student leaders felt aesthetic care instead of authentic care once the additional responsibility was added. Is there a shift in perceptions of caring climate from the student leaders? If so, when does that occur? Student leaders are helpful in running a band program (Criss, 2010), however further research is needed to understand how the student leaders are portraying the caring climate.
Band size based on enrollment had different perceptions of caring climate by group. The students in the smaller band programs had higher perceptions of caring climate compared to students in the larger bands. The larger band group had two schools versus the smaller band size had the remaining seven schools. One of the large group schools was a magnet school and had the largest amount of participants, which could have affected the band size variable outcome. However, results suggest that the smaller more intimate setting of student-teacher ratio could possibly ease establishing caring teacher-student relationships, which is an important part of caring climate (Deiro, 1996; Goodlad, 1984; Johnson, 2006; McHugh et al., 2013; Noddings, 2005; Ravizza, 2005).

Socioeconomic status (SES) was grouped in two based on school criteria, Title One or Not Title One. Results suggest that Title One schools perceived caring climate higher than students in schools not considered Title One. Although school SES was classified using Title One status, student perceptions of caring climate were high despite the potential financial problems they may have been facing at home. Results of this study conflict with previous studies in which students of historically underachieving and underserved groups perceive caring lower than students not in these groups. However, the same studies found that caring climates can help students in traditionally underachieving groups (Alder, 2002; Fowler et al., 2008; Howard, 2002; Lewis et al., 2012; Rolón-Dow, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999).

Perceptions of caring climate appeared to be similar between teachers and students. Generally, teachers had higher levels of caring climate compared to their students. When analyzed per individual school, three teachers had different perceptions of caring climate compared to their students. Teachers at schools A and E had statistically
significant higher perceptions of caring climate compared to their students. The teacher at school G was the only teacher who perceived caring climate significantly lower than his students. Perhaps with a larger representative sample from that school might suggest different results. Future research can explore individual cases of way a teacher may perceive the caring climate lower than their students.

Conclusions

Based on these results, the following conclusions were drawn:

1. Cognitive empathy, the ability to understand one’s emotions, can positively influence student behavior.

2. Students with higher perceptions of caring climate are less likely to engage in negative social behavior.

3. Teacher perceptions of caring climate tend to be higher than student perceptions of caring climate.

4. The amount of years teaching at the current school influences how students perceive caring climate. Students’ perceived caring climate higher when teachers remained at the school for more than five years.

5. Socioeconomic status found student perceptions of caring climate higher in groups with lower SES. Band students found caring climate high despite the financial problems of Title One schools.

6. Students in smaller band programs perceived caring climate higher than students in larger programs.
7. Students in leadership positions perceived caring climate lower compared to the non-leaders in high school band.

8. While victimization appeared to be minimal in high school band, perceptions of caring climate differed between the students who reported being victims of bullying and non-victims of bullying. Victimized students perceived the high school band caring climate less favorable than the non-victim students.

**Implications**

Based on the results of the study, the following implication were suggested:

1. Students with higher perceptions of caring climate are less likely to engage in negative social behavior. Teachers should strive to establish and maintain a caring classroom climate by getting to know the students, being a good listener, and helping consistently. If any student’s behavior changes (either academically or socially), it is important for the band director to care to find out what is causing the change in behavior. Authentic care is caring about the entire person. If students perceive a high level of care within the band climate, they are less likely to engage in negative behaviors.

2. Teachers should be aware that their own perception of the band caring climate tends to be higher than the perceptions of their students. Regardless of how much teachers care, it is important for teachers to continue to show they authentically care through their actions for the entire school year. In the case of high school bands, caring goes beyond musical performance. If students do not perceive care, the caring relationship does not exist (Noddings, 2005).
Understanding that students’ perceptions of caring climate is lower than the teachers’ perception could allow teachers to focus on care consistently.

3. Being able to understand one’s emotions (cognitive empathy) leads to positive social behavior. Teachers should participate and encourage small group collaborations among students. Highlighting students’ strengths and pairing them with others may lead to better understanding of students among each other, which in turn could lead to positive behaviors. The more students can empathize with one another, the possibility of prosocial behaviors developing increases.

4. Stability in band programs is not new, and student perceptions of caring climate support band directors staying at the same school for longer durations. Students’ perceived caring climate higher when teachers had taught at the school for more than five years.

5. While band programs sizes can vary, the smaller band programs tended to have higher perceptions of caring climate. Even if teachers have large programs, establishing caring teacher-student relationships is important to develop a caring climate. Teachers should invest the time to get to know all of their students on an individual level.

6. Band directors should be careful when assigning responsibilities to student leaders. With leaders’ perceptions of caring climate lower than non-leaders, it seems logical to believe that leaders once had a higher perception of caring climate. Have open discussions with student leaders about feelings toward
band environment. Leaders are there to assist and serve the program, but they need to feel cared for too.

7. Bullying is prevalent among high school students, with psychological and social bullying formats dominating. While band does not have too many encounters, it is imperative that band directors monitor and assess student social behaviors. While encouraging and demonstrating caring behaviors is a great start to diminishing negative behaviors, it is does not solve all behavioral issues. Communicate with the students (independently and collectively), especially those suspicious of being a bully or a bully-victim. Establishing trust between the teacher and student begins with communication.

**Recommendations**

The present study explored connections between perceived caring climate, empathy (cognitive and affective), and student social behaviors (positive and negative) in high school band. The following considerations should be taken for replication of the study or further research in the area of caring climate in bands.

1. A larger teacher sample will improve reliability and gain a better understanding of the state of the caring climates established in high school bands.

2. Student participants were limited to those who turned in signed parent consent and student assent forms. Perhaps students who did not turn in forms (maybe more irresponsible or not care as much about band) have different opinions of caring climate and student social behaviors in band. A
replication of this study using all students in band classes would give a more accurate representation of band caring climate and both positive and negative social behaviors.

3. Exploring varying levels of band, such as middle school students’ perceptions of band caring climate would add to the existing literature. Additional music classes, such as orchestra, choir, or general music students’ perceptions of caring climate would be valuable to music educators.

4. Although perceptions of caring climate in general did not differ between teachers and students, and teacher perceptions of caring climate tend to be higher than their students, an individual case study of the band program where the teacher perceived caring lower than their students would be interesting. Understanding the climate of the individual band program might lead to a clearer picture of how students perceive the climate.

5. Approach investigating caring climate through qualitative methods may lead to deeper insight of the band climate.

6. Future studies can explore band leadership roles and perceptions of caring climate throughout the school year.

7. Future research can explore the effects of social and psychological bullying with perceptions of caring climate in band.

This study explored connections between caring climate, cognitive empathy, affective empathy, and student social behaviors (positive and negative) in high school band. Cognitive empathy predicted positive social behaviors and caring climate
influenced student social behaviors, students with higher perceptions of caring climate were less likely to engage in negative social behaviors. When teachers remained at a school for more than five years, student perceptions of caring climate were higher. Smaller band programs had higher levels of student perceptions of caring climate compared to the larger band programs. Student leaders in band tend to perceive caring climate lower than non-leaders. Students at schools with lower SES perceived caring climate higher than those students with less financial problems. Overall victimization was not a large problem for band students, however small amounts of social victimization were reported. Students who reported victimization perceived caring climate in band lower than those who did not report victimization.

Caring is an essential part of human relationships and high school bands are in a position to foster a caring climate that can influence student behavior. Student perceptions can differ according to group, but the fundamental need to feel cared for is undeniable, especially for adolescent students who need social and emotional stability. Band is already a place where a lot of students feel at home, and based on the results of this study, caring climate can help influence student social behaviors toward others. Future research can replicate and modify this study to continue gaining knowledge and understanding of the caring climates found in band and how it affects student behavior.
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d.coffman1@miami.edu

Dear Dr. Don Coffman:
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<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Initial Study</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
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Amanda Coltes-Rojas, MPH, CIP
Director
Regulatory Affairs & Educational Initiatives
August 18, 2014

Ms. Susana Lulama
3411 SW 112 Avenue
Miami, FL 33165

Dear Ms. Lulama:

I am pleased to inform you that the Research Review Committee (RRC) of the Miami-Dade County Public Schools (MDCPS) has granted you approval for your request to conduct the study, “Exploring Connections Between Caring Climate, Empathy, and Student Social Behaviors in High School Bands” in order to fulfill the requirement of your dissertation at the University of Miami.

The approval is granted with the following conditions:

1. **Participation of the schools targeted in this study is at the discretion of each principal.**
   
   Please note that even with the approval of the RRC, it is still the responsibility of the Principal as the gatekeeper of the school to decide whether to participate or not. As stated in the Board rule, “... the principal of the individual school has the privilege of deciding if RRC-approved research will be conducted within his/her school.” A copy of this approval letter must be presented/and or shared with each Principal of the targeted schools.

2. The participation of all subjects (such as students, parents, faculty, or staff) is **voluntary.**

3. The anonymity and/or confidentiality of all subjects must be assured. **No** student identifying information can be used, such as MDCPS Student ID number or Student SSN.

4. Informed consent forms must be secured for targeted adults (teachers and parents).

5. Parent consent forms must be secured for all students before they can participate in the study.

6. Student Assent forms must be secured before students can participate in the study.

7. The study will involve asking the **voluntary** participation of approximately 40 music teachers and 500 students in grades 9 through 12 at various High Schools.

8. The study simply asks for the voluntary agreement of the targeted students and teachers to complete an anonymous online surveys outside of the learning and teaching time.
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LETTER TO THE FLORIDA BANDMASTERS ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
August 19, 2014

Dear Neil Jenkins,

My name is Susana M. Lalama and I am a Ph.D. candidate in music education at the University of Miami Frost School of Music. Prior to my graduate schooling, I was a high school band director for seven years at Barbara Goleman High School in Miami-Dade County.

My dissertation is based on classroom caring climate and student behavior found in high school bands. I am interested in understanding the caring relationships between teachers and students and seeing how it affects student behaviors (prosocial and antisocial behaviors toward other students). Results of the study can be beneficial to band teachers throughout Florida and the United States as we gain a better understanding of perceived caring climates from the student point of view and how it impacts student social behaviors in and outside of band.

I am asking for the support of the Florida Bandmasters Association in cooperating with this study. I would like to request volunteer band directors and their students involved in Florida Bandmasters Association to participate. I will send out all necessary information via email, but would like your consent to solicit volunteer high school band directors from Miami-Dade County who are members of FBA.

If you desire more information regarding the study, please contact me at susielalama@gmail.com or 305-968-8252. I hope we will be working together in pursuit of improving student social behavior in and outside of band.

Sincerely,

Ph.D. Candidate, Music Education
Frost School of Music
University of Miami
APPENDIX D

EMAILED LETTER TO MIAMI DADE COUNTY BAND DIRECTORS
Dear Directors,

My name is Susana M Lalama and I am a Ph.D. candidate at the University of Miami Frost School of Music. I am conducting a study that pertains to student and teacher perceptions of the caring climate found in high school band. I am curious how students perceive the high school band environment and how it affects their social behaviors in and outside of band.

I am currently seeking volunteers to participate in the study in which you and your students will fill out a brief survey. There are no costs or risks to you or your students by taking this survey as all responses will remain anonymous and results will be generalized. The survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete.

I am asking for you to respond with a YES or a NO to this email if you would like further correspondence regarding this study.

Thank you for your time and assistance in creating better students and music programs throughout Florida.

Susana M. Lalama
Graduate Student
Frost School of Music
University of Miami
APPENDIX E

ELECTRONIC INSTRUCTIONS SENT TO PARTICIPATING BAND DIRECTORS
Dear Director,

Thank you for taking part in this survey. Students who are currently in band (no color guard) are asked to take the student survey, and you as their band director, are asked to take the teacher survey (links are below). I have attached a short script to the students that explains a little more about the study. I have also attached a parent consent form and student assent form that needs to be signed and collected (I'll pick them up from you whenever you are ready). If you need me to provide copies of the parent permission I can do that (I know copying at schools can be difficult) just let me know the amount that you need, or they each student can print it out themselves and return the signed forms to you. I have also attached a letter to the principal that provides them with basic information about the study, and asks for a signature of consent to support the study.

Distribute the student internet URL link to students who have agreed to participate by turning in signed parent consent form and signed student assent form. I will collect all consent forms at the conclusion of the study by sending a self addressed stamped envelope.

Student Survey Link  
https://umiami.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6nhSYra48eOUKAl

Teacher Survey Link  
https://umiami.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_e8P8lFpIScg9TWI

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to email me.  
Thank you!  
Susie Lalama
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PRINCIPAL CONSENT LETTER
June 16, 2014

Dear School Principal,

My name is Susana M. Lalama and I am a Ph.D. candidate in music education at the University of Miami Frost School of Music. My dissertation is based on caring climates found in high school bands. Specifically, I am interested in finding out how students perceive the level of care involved in high school band and how it affects their social behaviors. Results of the study can be beneficial to band teachers throughout Florida and the United States.

The study will include the band director(s) and their band students filling out a brief electronic survey about caring climate, empathy, and social behavior in band. The survey will take about 5-10 minutes complete at a time that is most convenient to the students and teacher(s). All responses will remain anonymous and only be used in generalizing results. There are no risks or discomforts to either the students or teachers participating in the study. Appropriate parent consent forms and student assent forms will also be distributed and collected before any child can participate. With your consent, I hope the music education profession can gain a better understanding of caring relationships in large group ensembles.

Simply sign this letter at the bottom to allow the school band program to participate in this study. If you desire further information regarding this study, contact me at s.lalama@umiami.edu.

I thank you in advanced for your time in an effort to improve the daily lives of our students and band teachers.

Sincerely,

Susana M. Lalama
Graduate Student
University of Miami
Frost School of Music

_______________________________
Principal’s Signature
August 16, 2014

Dear Students,

You are being asked to participate in a research study that explores the connections between the perceived caring climate and student social behavior found in high school bands. Your role is very important but also very simple. You will be asked to complete an electronic survey that will take about 5 to 10 minutes to complete. There are no personal risks from taking part in this study, and no way to identify your responses because of anonymity of responses. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to refuse to participate in the study, withdraw your consent at any time, or not answer certain items. Your standing in school will not be impacted by your decision to not participate or withdraw from the study. If you have any questions regarding the study, please contact s.lalama@umiami.edu and we will answer whatever questions regarding the study.

Thank you for your time.

Susie Lalama
Graduate Teaching Assistant
University of Miami
APPENDIX H

PARENT CONSENT FORM
University of Miami  
PARENT CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY  
Exploring connections between perceived caring climate, empathy, and student social behavior in high school bands

The following information describes the research study in which you are being asked to participate. Please read the information carefully. At the end, you will be asked to sign if you agree to allow your child to participate.

PURPOSE OF STUDY:  
Your child is being asked to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to explore connections between the perceived caring climate and student social behavior found in high school bands.

PROCEDURES:  
Your child’s role is very important but also very simple. Once the teacher collects this letter of consent and the student assent form, the teacher will email an Internet URL survey link to your child. Your child can take the survey at any time that is convenient for him/her. The survey consists of opinion-based items regarding the classroom environment found in band. The survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete.

RISKS AND/OR DISCOMFORTS:  
We do not anticipate your child will experience any personal risk or discomfort from taking part in this study.

BENEFITS:  
No benefit can be promised to your child from participating in this study. The study is expected to benefit society at large by gaining a better understanding of perceptions of classroom caring environment from both teacher and student points of view.

CONFIDENTIALITY:  
Once the survey has been completed and submitted electronically, your child’s role in this study is fulfilled. Data will be stored using Qualtrics Survey Software that enables Secure Socket Layering Security for transmission of responses. There is no way to identify an individual because of they anonymous responses.

COSTS:  
There are no costs associated with your child’s participation in this study.

RIGHT TO DECLINE OR WITHDRAW:  
Your child’s participation in this study is voluntary. Your child is free to refuse to participate in the study or withdraw his/her consent at any time during the study.

Your child’s standing in school will not be impacted by your or your child’s decision to not participate or withdraw from the study.
CONTACT INFORMATION:
Susana Lalama, 305-968-8252 (student researcher) or Dr. Coffman 305-284-6252 will gladly answer any questions you may have concerning the purpose, procedures, and outcome of this project. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact Human Subjects Research Office at the University of Miami at (305) 243-3195.

PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT:
I have read the information in this consent form and agree to allow my child to participate in this study. I have had the chance to ask any questions I have about this study, and they have been answered for me. I am entitled to a copy of this form after it has been read and signed.

____________________________  ____________________
Student Name (Print)          Date

I allow my child to participate. ____________________________
Signature of Parent/Guardian

If you do not wish for your child to participate, sign the designated line below.

I DO NOT allow my child to participate. ____________________________
Signature of Parent/Guardian

____________________________  ____________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent          Date
University of Miami

STUDENT ASSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY
Exploring connections between perceived caring climate, empathy, and student social behavior in high school bands

The following information describes the research study in which you are being asked to participate. Please read the information carefully. At the end, you will be asked to sign if you agree to participate.

PURPOSE OF STUDY:
You are being asked to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to explore connections between the perceived caring climate and student social behavior found in high school bands.

PROCEDURES:
Your role is very important but also very simple. Once the teacher collects this letter of assent and the parent consent forms, your teacher will email you an Internet URL student survey link. You can take the survey at any time that is convenient for you. The survey consists of opinion-based items regarding the classroom environment found in band. The survey will take less than 10 minutes to complete.

RISKS AND/OR DISCOMFORTS:
We do not anticipate you will experience any personal risk or discomfort from taking part in this study.

BENEFITS:
No benefit can be promised to you from participating in this study. The study is expected to benefit society at large by gaining a better understanding of perceptions of classroom caring environment from both teacher and student points of view.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
Once the surveys have been completed and submitted electronically, your role in this study is fulfilled. Data will be sorted using Qualtrics Survey Software that enables Secure Socket Layering Security for transmission of responses. There is no way to identify an individual because of anonymous responses.

RIGHT TO DECLINE OR WITHDRAW:
Your participation in this study is voluntary. You are free to refuse to participate in the study or withdraw your consent at any time during the study.

Your standing in school will not be impacted by your decision to not participate or withdraw from the study.

CONTACT INFORMATION:
Susana Lalama, 305-968-8252 (student researcher) or Dr. Coffman 305-284-6252 will gladly answer any questions you may have concerning the purpose, procedures, and outcome of this project. If you have questions about your rights as a research subject you may contact Human Subjects Research Office at the University of Miami at (305) 243-3195.
PARTICIPANT AGREEMENT:
I have read the information in this consent form and agree to participate in this study. I have had the chance to ask any questions I have about this study, and they have been answered for me. I am entitled to a copy of this form after it has been read and signed.

Student Name (Print) ______________________ Date ______________________

____________________________ Student Signature

If you do not wish to participate, sign the designated line below that states you DO NOT want to participate.

I DO NOT choose to participate. ______________________ Student Signature

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent ______________________ Date ______________________
APPENDIX J

BAND CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE LINK HANDOUT
Thank you for choosing to participate in the study *Exploring Connections between Perceived Caring Climate, Empathy, and Student Social Behavior in High School Bands.* Follow the link below and answer each item as you truly feel.

Student Survey Link
https://umiami.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_6nhSYra48OUKAI
APPENDIX K

BAND CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE – STUDENT VERSION
Circle the response that you feel best fits your experience in high school band.  
(SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, NS= Not Sure, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree)

1. Band students are treated with respect.  
2. The band director respects students.  
3. The band director is kind to students.  
4. The band director cares about students.  
5. Band students feel they are treated fairly.  
6. The band director tries to help students.  
7. The band director wants to get to know all of the students.  
8. Band students like each other for who they are.  
9. The band director listens to students.  
10. The band director accepts students for who they are.  
11. Students feel safe in the band.  
12. Students feel comfortable in the band.  
13. Students feel welcomed everyday in band.

Circle the response that best corresponds to you.  
(SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neither Agree nor Disagree, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree)

14. My friends’ emotions don’t affect me much.  
15. After being with a friend who is sad about something, I usually feel sad.  
16. I can understand my friend’s happiness when she/he does well at something.  
17. I get frightened when I watch characters in a good scary movie.  
18. I get caught up in other people’s feelings easily.  
19. I find it hard to know when my friends are frightened.
20. I don’t become sad when I see other people crying.  SA  A  N  D  SD
21. Other people’s feeling don’t bother me at all.  SA  A  N  D  SD
22. When someone is feeling ‘down’ I can usually understand how they feel.  SA  A  N  D  SD
23. I can usually figure out when my friends are scared.  SA  A  N  D  SD
24. I often become sad when watching sad things on TV or in films.  SA  A  N  D  SD
25. I can often understand how people are feeling even before they tell me.  SA  A  N  D  SD
26. Seeing a person who has been angered has no effect on my feelings.  SA  A  N  D  SD
27. I can usually figure out when people are cheerful.  SA  A  N  D  SD
28. I tend to feel scared when I am with friends who are afraid.  SA  A  N  D  SD
29. I can usually realize quickly when a friend is angry.  SA  A  N  D  SD
30. I often get swept up in my friends’ feelings.  SA  A  N  D  SD
31. My friend’s unhappiness doesn’t make me feel anything.  SA  A  N  D  SD
32. I am not usually aware of my friends’ feelings.  SA  A  N  D  SD
33. I have trouble figuring out when my friends are happy.  SA  A  N  D  SD

How many times did you do the following IN BAND in the last 30 days?
“In band” refers to any type of large ensemble class, rehearsal setting, or planned band activity where the band director is in charge of the band students.

A = never     B = 1-2 time(s)     C = 3-4 times     D = 5 or more times
34. I called other students names to make fun of them. A B C D
35. I teased another student. A B C D
36. I stuck up for another student who was in trouble. A B C D
37. I joined in a group of students to hurt another student. A B C D
38. I tried to get students to work together. A B C D
39. I befriended another student who had no one to talk to. A B C D
40. I helped another student learning their music. A B C D
41. I spread a rumor about another student. A B C D
42. I said something funny about a student to make other students laugh. A B C D
43. I have helped another student if they had fallen or hurt themselves. A B C D
44. I was nice to another student who was sad or unhappy. A B C D
45. I broke/damaged another student’s personal property to upset them. A B C D
46. I helped another student with their schoolwork. A B C D
47. I threatened to hit or hurt another student. A B C D
48. I pushed, shoved, slapped, or kicked another student. A B C D
49. I cheered up another student who was upset. A B C D

How many times did the following happen to you IN BAND during the last 30 days? “In band” refers to any type of large ensemble class, rehearsal setting, or planned band activity where the band director is in charge of the band students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>A = never</th>
<th>B = 1-2 time(s)</th>
<th>C = 3-4 times</th>
<th>D = 5 or more times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50. Being picked on by another student in your class.</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Being left out of an activity.</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Being upset because another student kept being nasty to you.</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Being hit by another student in your class.</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Demographics** Circle one response per item.

54. Gender
   - Male
   - Female

55. Race/Ethnicity:  
   - White, Non Hispanic
   - Black, Non Hispanic
   - Hispanic
   - Other

56. Grade in School
   - 9
   - 10
   - 11
   - 12

57. Years of band participation
   - 1-2
   - 3-4
   - 5 or more

58. Principal Instrument
   - ____________________________

59. Do you hold a leadership position in band?  
   - Yes
   - No
APPENDIX L

BAND CLIMATE QUESTIONNAIRE – TEACHER VERSION
Circle the response that you feel best fits your band.
(SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, NS= Not Sure, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree)

1. Band students are treated with respect. SA A NS D SD
2. I respect the students. SA A NS D SD
3. I am kind to the students. SA A NS D SD
4. I care about the students. SA A NS D SD
5. Band students feel they are treated fairly. SA A NS D SD
6. I try to help the students. SA A NS D SD
7. I want to get to know the students. SA A NS D SD
8. Band students like each other for who they are. SA A NS D SD
9. I listen to the students. SA A NS D SD
10. I accept students for who they are. SA A NS D SD
11. Students feel safe in the band. SA A NS D SD
12. Students feel comfortable in the band. SA A NS D SD
13. Students feel welcomed everyday in band. SA A NS D SD

Circle the response that best corresponds to you.
(SA= Strongly Agree, A= Agree, N= Neither Agree nor Disagree, D= Disagree, SD= Strongly Disagree)

14. My friends’ emotions don’t affect me much. SA A N D SD
15. After being with a friend who is sad about something, I usually feel sad. SA A N D SD
16. I can understand my friend’s happiness when she/he does well at something. SA A N D SD
17. I get frightened when I watch characters in a good scary movie. SA A N D SD
18. I get caught up in other people’s feelings easily. SA A N D SD
19. I find it hard to know when my friends are frightened. SA A N D SD
20. I don’t become sad when I see other people crying. SA A N D SD
21. Other people’s feeling don’t bother me at all.  SA  A  N  D  SD
22. When someone is feeling ‘down’ I can usually understand how they feel.  SA  A  N  D  SD
23. I can usually figure out when my friends are scared.  SA  A  N  D  SD
24. I often become sad when watching sad things on TV or in films.  SA  A  N  D  SD
25. I can often understand how people are feeling even before they tell me.  SA  A  N  D  SD
26. Seeing a person who has been angered has no effect on my feelings.  SA  A  N  D  SD
27. I can usually figure out when people are cheerful.  SA  A  N  D  SD
28. I tend to feel scared when I am with friends who are afraid.  SA  A  N  D  SD
29. I can usually realize quickly when a friend is angry.  SA  A  N  D  SD
30. I often get swept up in my friends’ feelings.  SA  A  N  D  SD
31. My friend’s unhappiness doesn’t make me feel anything.  SA  A  N  D  SD
32. I am not usually aware of my friends’ feelings.  SA  A  N  D  SD
33. I have trouble figuring out when my friends are happy.  SA  A  N  D  SD

How many times did you WITNESS the following IN BAND in the last 30 days? “In band” refers to any type of large ensemble class, rehearsal setting, or planned band activity where the band director is in charge of the band students.

A = never  B = 1-2 time(s)  C = 3-4 times  D = 5 or more times

34. A student called another student names to make fun of them.  A  B  C  D
35. A student teased another student.  A  B  C  D
36. A student stuck up for another student who was in trouble. A B C D
37. A student joined in a group of students to hurt another student. A B C D
38. A student tried to get students to work together. A B C D
39. A student befriended another student who had no one else to talk to. A B C D
40. A student helped another student learning their music. A B C D
41. A student spread a rumor about another student. A B C D
42. A student said something funny about another student to make other students laugh. A B C D
43. A student helped another student if they have fallen or hurt themselves. A B C D
44. A student was nice to another student who was sad or unhappy. A B C D
45. A student broke/damaged another student’s personal property to upset them. A B C D
46. A student helped another student with their schoolwork. A B C D
47. A student threatened to hit or hurt another student. A B C D
48. A student pushed, shoved, slapped, or kicked another student. A B C D
49. A student cheered up another student who was upset. A B C D

**Demographics** Circle one response per item.

50. School ________________________________

51. Gender Male Female

52. Race/Ethnicity White, Non Hispanic Black, Non Hispanic Hispanic Other

53. Years of Teaching Experience 1st year 2-5 6-14 15+

54. Years teaching at present school 1st year 2-5 6-14 15+
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55. SES of school</th>
<th>Title 1</th>
<th>not Title 1</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56. School enrollment</td>
<td>1-400</td>
<td>401-800</td>
<td>801-1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1351-1900</td>
<td>1901-2500</td>
<td>2500+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Band enrollment</td>
<td>Under 50</td>
<td>51-150</td>
<td>151+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

58. FBA Concert District Ratings the past three years
   a. 2013: Superior   Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor
   b. 2012: Superior   Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor
   c. 2011: Superior   Excellent   Good   Fair   Poor