DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 613 CS 507 516

AUTHOR Kearney, Patricia; And Others
TITLE An Attributional Analysis of College Students' Resistance Decisions.
PUB DATE May 91
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (41st, Chicago, IL, May 23-27, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attribution Theory; *Classroom Communication; Classroom Environment; Classroom Research; Communication Research; *Compliance (Psychology); Higher Education; *Resistance (Psychology); Student Behavior; Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Communication Strategies; Compliance Gaining Strategies; Problem Ownership; *Teacher Immediacy

ABSTRACT

A study examined college students' resistance decisions in the classroom. Initial validation tests of the resistance typology developed by N. Burroghs, P. Kearney and T. Plax (1989) confirmed the existence of all 19 resistance categories. Further analyses indicated that the categories could be meaningfully reduced to two dimensions: Teacher-Owned (teacher is at fault) and Student-Owned (student assumes responsibility) techniques. Relying on attribution theory and problem ownership, the centrality of teacher immediacy was tested as the primary attribute for the resistance decisions of 100 undergraduate students enrolled in 4 introductory communication classes at a large western university. Results indicated that students reported a greater likelihood of using teacher-owned techniques with nonimmediate teachers and student-owned strategies with immediate teachers. Neither teachers' compliance-gaining strategy type (prosocial/antisocial) nor students' gender contributed to students' resistance decisions. Results were explicated further with the triangulation of qualitative data. Findings suggest that teachers should practice verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors with their students. (Forty-four references and 6 tables of data are attached.) (Author/PRA)

AN ATTRIBUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS' RESISTANCE DECISIONS

Patricia Kearney Timothy G. Plax

Nancy F. Burroughs

Running Head: **ATTRIBUTIONS**

*Patricia Kearney (Ed.D., West Virginia University, 1979) and Timothy G. Plax (Ph.D., University of Southern California, 1974) are Professors and Nancy F. Burroughs (Ed.D., West Virginia University, 1990) is Assistant Professor of Speech Communication at California State University, Long Beach.

This project was funded, in part, by a research assigned time grant from California State University, Long Beach.

AN ATTRIBUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS' RESISTANCE DECISIONS

ABSTRACT

This investigation was designed to examine college students' resistance decisions in the classroom. Initial validational tests of the resistance typology developed by Burroughs, Kearney and Plax (1989) confirmed the existence of all 19 categories. Further analyses indicated that the categories could be meaningfully reduced to 2 dimensions: Teacher-Owned (teacher is at fault) and Student-Owned (student assumes responsibility) techniques. Relying on attribution theory and problem ownership, we tested the centrality of teacher immediacy as the primary attribute for students' resistance decisions. Results indicated that students reported a greater likelihood of using teacher-owned techniques with nonimmediate teachers and student-owned strategies with immediate teachers. Neither teachers' compliance-gaining strategy type (prosocial/antisocial) nor students' gender contributed to students' resistance decisions. Results were explicated further with the triangulation of qualitative data. Implications for the classroom are discussed.

AN ATTRIBUTIONAL ANALYSIS OF COLLEGE STUDENTS' RESISTANCE DECISIONS

The original work on compliance in the instructional context focused primarily on classroom teachers as change agents or sources of power (c.f., Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1984, 1985; McCroskey, Richmond, Plax, & Kearney, 1985). More recent work considers the active role of the student as potential resistor to teacher compliance-gaining attempts. Even though student resistance was limited initially to students' reported compliance or noncompliance (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorensen, 1988; Plax, Kearney, Downs, & Stewart, 1986; Stewart, Kearney, & Plax, 1986; Wheeless, Stewart, Kearney, & Plax, 1987), Burroughs, Kearney and Plax (1989) devoted considerable attention to conceptually and operationally defining the complexity of college student resistance. These authors departed from the educational literature that treats student resistance as negative and subversive, by claiming that some types of classroom resistance may actually be prosocial and beneficial to instructional outcomes.

Conceptually, Burroughs et al. (1989) defined student resistance "as either constructive or destructive oppositional behavior (p. 216)." In explanation, destructive opposition reflects the more commonly held position that resistance is equated with misbehavior. Whereas destructive resistance serves to distract learning objectives, constructive resistance functions to enhance on-task behavior and learning. Such instances of

constructive resistance are likely to occur when students complain, ask numerous task-related or procedural questions, or challenge the teacher's opinions or credibility. Even though such instances of resistance may be irritating or occasionally threatening to the teacher, constructive oppositional behavior can provide useful feedback to instruction, help to modify teacher behavior and clarify learning tasks or requirements.

Within this perspective, Burroughs et al. (1989) argue that destructive student resistance may and should trigger teacher desist or compliance-gaining attempts. Alternatively, constructive student resistance should be sanctioned and potentially encouraged in the college classroom. In this way, classroom learning becomes a shared responsibility where both students and teachers become accountable. Rather than attending solely to what teachers strategically communicate to obtain compliance then, Burroughs et al. contend that power resources and strategies available to both teachers and students should be acknowledged.

In an effort to explicate those strategies college students use to resist teachers' compliance-gaining attempts, Burroughs, Kearney and Plax (1989) asked students to construct messages they would use to resist a teacher who asked them to "come to class prepared from now on." Students (N=574) generated almost 3,000 separate messages of resistance. Those messages were unitized, categorized and labeled across 19 separate resistance techniques (see Table 2).

THE PRESENT RESEARCH

In extension of the Burroughs et al. study (1989), this investigation was designed to empirically validate the different kinds of resistance techniques identified by students. In Phase 1 we assess the validity of the 19 separate categories using a free-response or construction procedure across a different sample of college learners. In Phase 2 we provide an additional check on the validity of the scheme by testing the perceived likelihood of use of each resistance technique using a selection or check-list procedure. In Phase 3 these data were used to determine whether or not a conceptually meaningful, underlying factor structure exists across the categories. In Phase 4 we report a manipulation check on the research design.

Of primary importance to this study, we move beyond validation and instrumentation to test attribution theory as an explanation of strategies students select in their resistance attempts. We reasoned that students make decisions about whether or not to resist or comply as a function of what their teachers do. In addition, we argued that students will selectively choose how they will resist based on the attributions they make about their teachers. In the following section, we provide a theoretical rationale for students' resistance selections.

Students' Attributions and Resistance

Person-perception or attribution theory provides a viable framework for investigating relationships between students' resistance strategy preferences and relevant situational or

teacher variables. The attribution process has been shown to influence students' achievement, motivation, expectations and affect (Frieze, Francis, & Hanusa, 1983; Schunk, 1990; Weiner, 1985, 1986). In general terms, attribution theory focuses on the process by which we construct, interpret and identify causes of our own behavior and that of others (see Heider, 1958; Jones & Davis, 1965; Kelley, 1967, 1973; Shaver, 1975). Based on the early work of Kelley (1950) and later on, Bruner (1957) and others, we know that certain attributes of the stimulus person are more important than others in influencing our judgments or evaluations of that individual. In turn, those evaluations influence how we react to that individual.

Following from the research and thinking of attribution theorists generally and investigators focusing on the classroom context specifically, we reasoned that students often make attributions about their teachers that affect how they react to teacher behaviors in the classroom. Students' judgments or perceptions of their instructors rely heavily on primary attributes that define for them their concept of "teacher." Those central traits that constitute for them appropriate or acceptable teacher behavior (i.e., the model teacher) are important in impression formation and thus, in attributions students make about teachers. Such traits tend to overwhelm or contaminate other less relevant characteristics. For instance, a teacher who apparently is witty and amusing may not be perceived as particularly funny when she/he also happens to be domineering and tyrannical. In

this example, teacher characteristics of dominance and tyranny would tend to suppress or confound students' recognition and appreciation for the teacher's sense of humor. Overall then, central attributes play a primary role in shaping students' perceptions of and reactions to their teachers.

Attributions of Immediacy and Strategy Type. Prior research on compliance-resistance indicates that teacher immediacy and, to a lesser extent, strategy type are apparently two attributes which influence students' reactions--in terms of their willingness to resist or comply to teacher demands. Immediacy, defined as physical or psychological closeness (Mehrabian, 1967, 1971), is demonstrated primarily by nonverbal behaviors of approach. Specifically, positive head nods, smiles, eye contact, vocal expressiveness, forward body leans, purposeful gestures and close physical distance all signal immediacy. In turn, these approach behaviors communicate perceptions of warmth, friendliness and interpersonal closeness (Andersen, 1979; Gorham & Christophel, 1990; Kearney, Plax, & Wendt-Wasco, 1985). A number of studies have substantiated the relationship between teacher immediacy and students' affective learning. In particular, students report significantly greater liking toward immediate, as opposed to nonimmediate, teachers (Andersen, 1979; Kearney, Plax, Wendt-Wasco, 1985; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986; Richmond, McCroskey, Plax, & Kearney, 1986).

Strategy type refers to those compliance-gaining techniques teachers employ to elicit students' on-task behavior. Early

research on compliance-gaining in the instructional context identified 22 inductively-derived Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs; Kearney et al., 1984) appropriate for classroom use. More recently, these 22 BATs were reduced empirically to two underlying factor structures, prosocial and antisocial (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorensen, 1988).

Conceptually and operationally, prosocial BATs include those messages that are designed to be helpful and beneficial to students. Such techniques encourage students, elicit cooperation and are reward-based. Antisocial or punishment-based BATs refer to those strategies which foster competitiveness, exclude students and undermine students' self-esteem. Like the research on immediacy, a number of studies support the conclusion that prosocial BATs are associated with positive student affect, whereas antisocial BATs produce negative student outcomes (e.g., McCroskey et al., 1985; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986).

Immediacy as a Primary Attribute. Pertinent to this study, research indicates that students reported greater willingness to comply with teachers who were perceived as immediate, as opposed to nonimmediate. Students also reported a reluctance to comply with those who used antisocial, as opposed to prosocial techniques to gain compliance (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorensen, 1988; Plax, Kearney, Downs, & Stewart, 1986). These investigators conclude that both immediacy and strategy type are predictors of students' reported resistance; however, we have yet to test the relative

impact of those predictors on students' selections of compliance-resistance strategies.

Further, we have reason to suspect that immediacy may be more central to students' judgments of their teachers than the type of strategy teachers use to elicit compliance. Plax, Kearney, McCroskey and Richmond (1986) demonstrated that for students' affect, perceptions of teachers' generalized immediacy supercedes or modifies the negative impact of antisocial strategy use. Subsequently, Kearney, Plax, Smith and Sorensen (1988) reported that students were unable to accurately differentiate prosocial from antisocial BAT types when the strategy was imbedded within the context of immediacy. That is, when the treatment condition referenced an immediate teacher, students perceived the teacher as using prosocial compliance-gaining messages--even when the teacher actually used an antisocial BAT type.

Apparently, a generalized approach or avoidance orientation provides a framework which influences students' perceptions of BAT type. These authors (Kearney et al., 1988) reasoned that students may either disregard or misperceive antisocial BATs as prosocial when the source/teacher is immediate. Within the context and language of attribution theory, we might argue that immediacy provides an antecedent or historical attribution to the specific behavior of compliance-gaining strategy choice. Two information processing rules derived from attribution theory support this argument: Saliency (Taylor & Fiske, 1975) and primacy (Ross, Lepper, & Hubbard, 1975).

First, a person's behavior is attributed to the cause that is most salient and present at the time the behavior is observed. Second, information obtained later about an individual is either disregarded or assimilated into attributions formed earlier about an individual--even when the information is discrepant (Kelley & Michela, 1980). In other words, a generalized nonverbal approach/avoidance orientation of immediacy serves to guide or frame students' perceptions of any isolated and/or subsequent behavior. Immediacy then, becomes the overriding, critical attribute in students' resistance decisions.

Assuming that immediacy, as opposed to strategy type, is the primary attribute in students' tendencies or willingness to resist or comply, then immediacy should also predict the kinds of strategies students select in their resistance attempts. When faced with a nonimmediate, unfriendly, cold teacher, students may choose antisocial, retaliatory strategies that correspond with those negative attributions. When resisting an immediate, warm, amiable teacher, however, students may select more prosocial, moderate messages of dissent. This logic led us to hypothesize that:

H: Teacher immediacy significantly affects students' resistance selections greater than either strategy type (prosocial/antisocial) or the interaction between immediacy and strategy type.

METHODS

Initially, a series of data analyses were performed to

validate the 19 category compliance-resistance typology derived by Burroughs, Kearney and Plax (1989). These analyses are organized around Phases 1, 2, and 3. In Phase 4 we conducted a manipulation check on the research design. These phases are described under the heading, "Validation and Instrumentation." Next, we report the "tests of the Research Hypothesis" and supplementary analyses.

Validation and Instrumentation

Phase 1

In Phase 1 we examined whether or not the resistance categories would hold up to a retest employing the construction procedure. Testing the stability of all 19 techniques, we should expect a different sample of students to construct messages that can be coded across the same set of categories.

Subjects. Participants were 100 (54 females, 46 males) undergraduate students enrolled in 4 introductory communication classes at a large Western university. Class sizes ranged from 19 to 30+. Approximately 30% of the sample were freshmen, 35% sophomores, 20% juniors, and 15% were seniors. The mean age of the students in this sample was 26. The course fulfilled general education requirements across the university and therefore, students represented a diversity of major fields.

Procedures. In order to replicate the basic design of the Burroughs et al. (1989) experiment, students were provided with one of four written scenarios developed and validated by Kearney, Plax, Smith and Sorensen (1988). Scenario 1 was constructed to stimulate perceptions of an immediate college teacher employing

antisocial strategies in an attempt to gain student on-task compliance (i.e., "coming to class more prepared"). Scenario 2 included an immediate teacher employing prosocial strategies. Scenario 3 manipulated perceptions of a nonimmediate teacher using antisocial techniques, while Scenario 4 included a nonimmediate teacher employing prosocial compliance-gaining strategies (N = 25 per condition).

Prior research employing these four scenarios on numerous samples from a college student population indicated that students perceived all protocols as realistic with successful manipulations of both the immediacy/norimmediacy and prosocial/antisocial conditions (see for instance, Kearney et al., 1988). Employing the treatment check of "imaginability" used by Burroughs et al. (1989) and Kearney et. al. (1988), subjects in this study perceived all four scenarios as realistic (means above 5.0 on a 1-7 scale). In order to avoid having intact groups, subjects were randomized out of classes into one of four treatment conditions.

After reading one of the four scenarios, students were told that regardless of this teacher's demand, there may be a number of reasons why they either wouldn't or couldn't comply. Students were then asked to write out three reasons why they would resist this type of request (see Table 1 for sample statements provided by students for each condition). This task was included in order to stimulate student resistance. The data accessed through this procedure substantiated that students actually assumed a

resistance role. Typical reasons for not complying reported by students were: "I have too many extracurricular activities that are more important," "Because I want to do it my way" and "I do not like the teacher." (These data were also used in the overall interpretation of the data analyses included in this report).

Insert Table 1

After anchoring their resistance, students were prompted further to envision themselves <u>really</u> not wanting to or not being able to go along with the particular teacher demand. Students were also encouraged to be concerned with their initial reaction, not how they would feel tomorrow or next week. They were then instructed to write out what they would <u>say</u> to this teacher in their efforts to resist the particular demand. The questionnaire also indicated that students should feel free to write as many different things as they felt they might say.

This open-ended question employed in the original Burroughs et al. study was designed to elicit a diverse range of messages that college students might use. A total of 547 messages was generated across the entire sample with an average of 5.5 messages reported by each student. Comparably, in the Burroughs et al. study, students constructed an average of 5.1 messages.

<u>Results</u>. The 547 messages were unitized and coded into the 19 message categories obtained by Burroughs et al. (see Table 2). Specifically, after reviewing the 19 category labels and definitions reported in Burroughs et al., one of the present

investigators unitized the message constructions. Reliability of unitization was assessed by having a second investigator unitize a subset of 25 protocols. Unit-by-unit agreement was 96 percent. The two unitizers met and discussed unit disagreements until agreements were reached. Message coding followed unitization. Two trained coders (graduate students) who were naive to the experiment, independently coded each of the message units into the 19 category system. Intercoder agreement, assessed by unit-by-unit agreement, was .89. Computing Cohen's (1960) Kappa statistic, reliability was estimated at .85.

Insert Table 2

The results of Phase 1 support the stability of the 19 category scheme reported by Burroughs et al. The message-based system proved to be reproducible and exhaustive across a random sample of comparable college students. Messages constructed by college students in this sample and coded into the original 19 categories, were notably similar to those reported earlier. Importantly, all 547 messages constructed by students in this sample could be coded into one of the 19 categories. Following from the construction procedure, we can conclude that the 19 category compliance-resistance typology is robust and a valid representation of the variety of ways college students report resisting teachers' attempts to get them to comply.

Phase 2

In Phase 2, we tested the validity of the 19 categories using

the selection, as opposed to the construction, procedure. We were interested in whether or not students are able to report using the same variety of techniques when asked to select from a strategy checklist.[1]

Subjects. Participants were 377 (208 females, 169 males) undergraduate students enrolled in introductory communication classes satisfying general education electives at a large Western university. Class size ranged from 19 to 50+ students. Approximately 8% of the sample were freshman, 16% sophomores, 46% juniors, 31% seniors. The mean age of the students in this sample was 25.

Procedures. Using a modified version of the design employed in Phase 1, four different scenarios/questionnaires were randomly distributed to students within and across classes. Ninety-four students received the immediate/antisocial treatment; 95 received immediate/prosocial; 92 received nonimmediate/antisocial and 96 received nonimmediate/prosocial. As in Phase 1, after reading one of the four teacher scenarios, students were asked to write out three reasons why they would resist this type of demand. Data accessed employing this manipulation were similar to those generated in Phase 1.

After indicating reasons for their resistance, students were provided with the original sets of multiple messages representing each of the 19 compliance-resistance techniques reported by Burroughs et al. (1989). Technique labels were not included on the questionnaire. Students were asked to rate on a 1-7 scale

how likely they would use a "variation of these statements" to resist the teacher in the given scenario. Higher scores indicated greater likelihood of use.

Results. An examination of the means and standard deviations obtained from students' responses indicated that all 19 techniques would be used; however, selected use of some strategies were greater than for others ($\bar{X}$'s ranged from a low of 1.35 to a high of 4.79). Table 3 provides the means and standard deviations for each technique by treatment condition. Across almost all conditions, students reported the greatest likelihood of using 3 techniques: Reluctant Compliance (#4), Direct Communication (#7), and Priorities (#11; $\bar{X} > 4$). In contrast, students indicated that they would be least likely to use Active Resistance (#5), Disruption (#8), and Challenge the Teacher's Basis of Power (#12; $\bar{X} < 2$). These results, in conjunction with those obtained in Phase 1, further illustrate the validity of the 19 category compliance-resistance typology. Even though students' relied on certain strategies more than others, the reported use of all 19 categories was evident across both the construction and selection data collection procedures.

Insert Table 3

Phase 3

Next we determined whether the 19 categories could be reduced to a meaningful underlying factor structure. An overall default factor analysis (eigenvalue < 1.0) was computed across all 4

scenarios.[2] Results indicated an initial 5-factor solution. However, factors 1 and 2 accounted for most of the variance (37%). Moreover, these first two factors were conceptually consistent. Subsequent analysis with 2-factor extractions produced stable factors with all items loading on their respective factor. (Factor analysis with alpha extraction produced a similar 2-factor solution).[3] An examination of the item loadings revealed that 6 items failed to meet a liberal 50/30 criterion. With those items eliminated, our second 2-factor solution revealed that another item failed to meet the criterion as well. Items representing factor 1 included: Teacher Advice, Teacher Blame, Appeal to Powerful Others, Modeling Teacher Behavior and Modeling Teacher Affect. Factor 2 items included: Active Resistance, Deception, Excuses, Ignoring the Teacher, Priorities, Hostile Defensive and Student Rebuttal.

In an attempt to further refine each factor, we considered two additional criteria for item inclusion. First, we examined mean likelihood of use ratings to ensure that no items were retained that students indicated they would be "extremely unlikely" to use. All techniques represented in the 2 factors were rated above 2.0 for likelihood of use except for Active Resistance ($\bar{X}$ = 1.82). Given only minimum reported use for this technique then, Active Resistance was dropped from factor 2. Next, we examined strategies for unnecessary conceptual redundancy. Because Excuses and Priorities overlapped conceptually, we eliminated the lower rated technique, Excuses,

from factor 2. These procedures allowed both factors to be represented by equal numbers of strategies.

The results of our third and final series of two-factor solutions on the 10 remaining items are reported in Table 4. Item loadings illustrate a consistent pattern for factors 1 and 2 both within and across all 4 treatment conditions. Alpha reliabilities obtained for each solution ranged from .88 to .93 for factor 1 and .86 to .91 for factor 2. Variance accounted for increased to 53% from the 37% produced in our initial 2-factor solution. Thus, substantial within and across treatment condition validity was obtained for our final factor solutions.

Insert Table 4

Interpreting the 2-Factor Structure. Strategies reflected in the obtained 2-factor structure indicate that students reliably discriminate between problems of their own making from problems attributed to their teachers. Factor 1, which we labeled "Teacher-Owned," represents strategies in which the student considers the teacher as the problem source. Factor 2 techniques, labeled "Student-Owned," presume the student assumes the responsibility or blame. This interpretation is consistent with one of three alternative explanations offered by Burroughs et al. (1989). Moreover, a substantial body of literature exists in education that supports the distinction between teacher and student problem ownership.

In explanation, the research on problem ownership has

focused exclusively on teachers' (or parents') perceptions of student misbehaviors (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981; Gordon, 1970, 1974; Seeman, 1988). Pertinent to our study are two types of problem-ownership common to the classroom: Teacher-owned and student-owned. From the teacher's point of view, teacher-owned problems are those in which the student interferes with the teacher's objectives, often causing the teacher to be angry or frustrated. Student-owned problems include those in which the student's needs or objectives are interrupted by other students or events "that do not include the teacher" (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981, p. 297). Interestingly, neither problem ownership type identifies the teacher as a potential problem source.

Interpreting our two factors required that we change the focus from teacher to student perceptions in our definition of problem ownership. From the student's point of view then, teacher-owned problems include those teacher behaviors that interfere with the student's needs and objectives. Messages or strategies that reflect the Teacher-Owned factor are consistent with that reconceptualization. Drawing from sample messages that represent Teacher Ownership, students are likely to resist by saying, "If you weren't so boring, I would do what you want" or "I would participate more if you were more enthusiastic about what you're doing." These statements and others reflected in factor 1 place the blame for resistance on the teacher. Clearly, strategies reflecting Teacher Ownership illustrate that students see the teacher as responsible for their resistance decisions.

In contrast, strategies which reflect the second factor suggest that students themselves, not the teacher, actually own the reasons for their resistance. For example, students who select Student-Owned strategies are likely to say, "I have other homework so I can't prepare well for this one" or "Right or wrong, that's the way I am." These statements and others reflected in factor 2 suggest that students justify their resistance by holding themselves primarily responsible for their own behavior.

Phase 4

The same students employed in Phases 2 and 3 were also asked to respond to two follow-up items: (1) "Have you ever had to deal with a teacher like the one described in this survey before?" (yes/no) and (2) "Assuming that you have had a teacher like this, briefly describe the teacher." Responses to these items provided data to substantiate the effectiveness of the manipulation.

Results. Prior research has already confirmed the "believability" or "imaginability" of the 4 treatment conditions (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorensen, 1988; Burroughs, Kearney, & Plax, 1989). In this phase we also considered whether or not students had been exposed to a teacher represented in their given scenario. Asking students to indicate (yes/no) if they "ever had to deal with a teacher like the one described" assessed that experience-based familiarity. An overall chi-square was computed across the frequencies of these forced-choice responses for the 4 treatment conditions ($X^2 = 29.82$, $df = 6$, $p < .0001$).

Results indicated that students were more familiar with some

of the scenarios than with others. Specifically, most students reported familiarity with a nonimmediate teacher who used an antisocial compliance-gaining strategy (yes = 62, no = 30), followed by nonimmediate/prosocial (yes = 51, no = 43, 2 did not indicate) and immediate/prosocial (yes = 47, no = 48), with fewest students reporting familiarity with immediate/antisocial (yes = 28, no = 64, 2 did not indicate). Results indicated that some obvious differences existed among students' experiences with immediate or nonimmediate teachers who use either antisocial or prosocial strategy types.

We also examined students' responses to the item that asked them to describe a teacher like the one in their respective scenario. Interestingly, even though some students had indicated no direct experience with the teacher they were exposed to in the scenario, almost all were able to successfully describe a teacher of that type. (Representative lists of student descriptions of teachers by scenario are available from the authors). These results, taken together, raise the issue of whether students' selections of resistance strategies may be influenced by their familiarity or lack of familiarity with that particular teacher/strategy combination. Consequently, familiarity (yes/no) was included as a covariate in statistical tests of the research hypothesis.

Tests of the Research Hypothesis

As in Phases 2, 3 and 4, we relied on the same subjects and their responses to the teacher scenarios and checklist strategies.

Statistical Design. In order to test the relative impact of teacher immediacy and strategy type on students' particular resistance selections, a regression-type 2 (immediate/nonimmediate teacher) X 2 (prosocial/antisocial strategy) X 2 (college students' gender)[4] fixed effects multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA) was used with experience-based familiarity as the covariate. The criterion, resistance selections, was operationalized to include students' summed responses across each of the teacher-owned and student-owned resistance strategy types. Thus, two dependent variables were included in the MANCOVA. Table 5 reports the means and standard deviations of each treatment condition and each separate predictor for teacher-owned and student-owned criterion measures.

Insert Table 5

Results. Results indicated that the covariate, familiarity, was nonsignificant ($F < 1$). Tests of the beta weights for each criterion were also nonsignificant (teacher-owned = $t < 1$; student-owned = $t < 1$). Therefore, students' experience-based familiarity with the teacher represented in the scenario did not appear to covary with their resistance strategy selections. Power was estimated at .995 (Cohen, 1977).

Additional analyses following from the MANCOVA indicated no significant complex or simple interactions among immediacy, strategy type and students' gender. Neither complex nor simple main effects for strategy type and students' gender were

significant. Available power techniques and tables do not address adequately complex k-group multivariate designs with large samples (Stevens, 1980). Thus, no estimates are reported for any of the nonsignificant complex effects computed in this study. However, for simple effects, power is estimated at .995 for medium effect at alpha .05 with a simple of 400. As predicted, the complex main effect for teacher immediacy was significant and accounted for 22% of the variance in the model (Wilks = .823, Approx. F = 39.45 with 2/367 df, p < .0001).

Following from this analysis, both simple main effects were significant. Specifically, college students reported that they would be significantly more likely to use teacher-owned resistance techniques with nonimmediate ($\bar{X}$ = 17.65) than with immediate teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 12.04; F = 61.25, df = 1/368, p < .0001, eta-squared = 14%). Moreover, students reported greater likelihood of using student-owned techniques with immediate ($\bar{X}$ = 15.33) than with nonimmediate teachers ($\bar{X}$ = 14.02; F = 4.17, df = 1/368, p < .05, eta-squared = 1%).[5] Thus, the hypothesis was supported for both criterion measures of students' resistance.

Supplementary Data. To assist us in interpreting the results of the tests of the research hypothesis, we examined the variety of student responses to one final question, "Briefly explain why you selected the particular resistance strategies you indicated you'd use with this specific teacher."[6] Table 6 provides a representative sample of those student responses by scenario.

Insert Table 6

To summarize, students who were exposed to the immediate, as opposed to the nonimmediate, teacher scenarios explained their resistance selections by indicating that they liked the teacher; they thought the teacher was "kind," "friendly," "approachable" and "interesting." In short, students perceived that the immediate teacher was doing a good job.

This perception was particularly evident across students' reactions when the immediate teacher employed prosocial compliance-gaining strategies. Students felt that the teacher was telling them to comply "for my own good." We identified this theme across a number of reoccurring student reactions. For example, consistent with our finding that students were more likely to select student-owned strategies to resist immediate teachers, one student indicated that "it is not the teacher's fault [for noncompliance], but the student's fault." Another student substantiated our interpretation that students would be more likely to blame themselves, rather than their immediate teachers, for their noncompliance: "I would feel bad about not doing well or not being into the class, so I would make excuses for myself." Even when students were exposed to an immediate teacher employing antisocial strategies, they continued to express responsibility for their own actions: "I would tend to take responsibility for the problem" and "I would understand the reason for the teacher's concern, but I felt it was a problem that he/she

need not worry about."

For the nonimmediate teacher conditions, students commonly blamed the teacher, not the themselves, for their resistance selections. Interestingly, students seemed to be divided in their approach; while some preferred to confront the teacher directly, others opted for a more indirect, anonymous approach to resistance. For instance, one student wrote, "I don't believe in beating around the bush. I will go to the source of the problem, i.e., the teacher." Another was even more assertive, "In no way do I have the tendency to feel inferior to any instructor. I am just as in control of him as he is with me. The respect should be mutual and if he/she attempts to condescend to me, I would willingly and eagerly confront." Others were more circuitous: "I have never really gone to a teacher and complained....Instead, I take the easy route--bad mouth him, give a bad teacher evaluation, don't suggest him to others," and "I would simply do what was required of me to pass with a good grade. I would either comply with the demand or make excuses or maybe talk with the teacher, but I would not openly refuse."

Regardless of the prosocial or antisocial strategy type employed, nonimmediate teachers were held primarily accountable for students' selecting teacher-owned techniques. Students indicated that teachers in the nonimmediate conditions were "unenthused" about their jobs, "incompetent," "cold and uncaring." They wanted to see the teachers become aware of their own performances and improve their teaching skills. Many students

reported that they would "drop the class," "switch sections" or "suffer through the course" if they had no other choice.

These interview-type data both corroborate and elaborate findings obtained from analyses of students' responses to the selectionist data. Direct tests of the research hypothesis revealed that students would be more likely to select student-owned resistance techniques with immediate teachers, but be more likely to choose teacher-owned strategies with nonimmediate teachers. Our qualitative analysis reveals that students' strategy preferences were based primarily in attributions they made about their teachers. With immediate teachers, the attributions were overwhelmingly positive and thus, students "owned" the problem and selected parallel strategies. With nonimmediate teachers however, the attributions were negative; thus, students blamed the teacher and chose to resist with teacher-owned techniques.

DISCUSSION

Initial efforts to validate the compliance-resistance typology developed by Burroughs, Kearney and Plax (1989) confirmed the existence of all 19 resistance techniques for college student use. Empirical support for this conclusion was illustrated across two different college student samples using the open-ended, construction procedure and the checklist-type, selection approach. Additional analyses revealed that students reported the greatest likelihood of using Reluctant Compliance, Direct Communication and Priorities and least likelihood of using

Active Resistance, Disruption and Challenge the Teacher's Basis of Power. These initial findings suggest that college students would rather avoid open and aggressive confrontation with teachers in their resistance attempts. Instead, students might prefer to give excuses, try to change the teacher's behavior or grudgingly comply.

Further analyses of students' reported technique preferences indicated that the categories could be reduced to 2 interpretable dimensions: Teacher-Owned and Student-Owned factors. These dimensions parallel the types of problem-ownership documented in the contemporary educational literature (Brophy & Rohrkemper, 1981; Gordon, 1970, 1974; Seeman, 1988). However, that literature interprets problem-ownership from the teacher's perspective. In this study we examine ownership from the student's point of view.

In explanation, we reasoned that students who resist teachers' compliance-gaining attempts select strategies on the basis of <u>who</u> they perceive as responsible for their resistance. Our factor solution suggests that students blame two potential problem sources: Either the teacher "owns" the problem or the student does. Techniques and messages that comprise the teacher-owned dimension imply that the teacher, not the student, is the primary reason for their resistance. Students who reportedly use teacher-owned strategies are likely to perceive the teacher behaving inappropriately or inconsistently with their expectations of what instructors should or should not do. For instance, most of the messages representing these strategies refer to the teacher

as "boring," "unenthusiastic," "unprepared" and "doesn't seem to care." Consequently, students may feel justified in their resistance to teacher demands and select strategies that place blame directly on the teacher.

Our second factor, student-owned, suggests that students do not universally blame teachers for their resistance decisions. Instead, they frequently assume the responsibility for owning problems themselves. Techniques and messages representing the student-owned dimension reveal that students claim the right to make their own mistakes and to take control over their own lives. Moreover, they may resent the teacher trying to tell them what they should or should not do. Their reactions to compliance-gaining attempts may be more aggressive or assertive (e.g., Hostile Defensive and Student Rebuttal); on the other hand, they may try to placate or deceive (e.g., Deception and Ignoring the Teacher).

Determining whether students would report a greater likelihood of using either student-owned or teacher-owned techniques as a function of particular teacher characteristics was the focus of our research hypothesis. Results indicated that college students were influenced by perceptions of teacher immediacy in their strategy selections. This was not the case for compliance-gaining strategy type, however. Only teacher immediacy significantly affected students' strategy choices. For both immediate teacher conditions, students reported a greater likelihood of using student-owned resistance techniques. In

contrast, students relied more on teacher-owned strategies when responding to nonimmediate teacher scenarios. These results can be explained by integrating the research and thinking on immediacy, problem-ownership and attribution theory.

First, we know that immediate teachers are associated with greater student affect than nonimmediate teachers (Kearney, Plax, & Wendt-Wasco, 1985; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986; Richmond et al., 1986). Second, students are more likely to comply with immediate, as opposed to nonimmediate, teachers (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorensen, 1988). Third, the results of the present study indicate that teacher immediacy is an important attribute in students' resistance strategy selections. Fourth, we reasoned that judgments of teacher immediacy direct students' subsequent attributions of problem ownership. In turn, these attributions of problem ownership govern students' selections of either teacher-owned or student-owned resistance techniques.

The link between attributions of problem ownership and teacher immediacy is explicated further with the triangulation of other pertinent data. Specifically, we examined students' reasons for noncompliance as well as their explanations of why they selected the resistance strategies they did. Across responses to both items, we found that students in the nonimmediate teacher conditions attributed almost universally undesirable teacher characteristics: "Negative," "not effective," "cold," "unmotivated," "unenthusiastic," "uninteresting" and "boring."

In reverse, students in the immediate teacher conditions

referenced only positive attributes about their teacher (e.g., "competent," "enthusiastic," "does a good job" and "concerned") when asked to explain their strategy selections. Interestingly, these same students made no reference to their immediate teacher when asked to generate reasons for their noncompliance. Instead, they only made attributions regarding themselves (e.g., other priorities, lack of motivation, aptitude or interest in the subject).

A number of heuristic questions were raised which provide direction for future research. Do college students' resistance constructions, selections and concomitant dimensions of ownership generalize beyond hypothetical teacher compliance-gaining scenarios? Correspondingly, will the resistance strategies comprising the two problem ownership factors remain stable with other teacher on-task demands? Will naive coders sort student messages of resistance into categories similar to those obtained by Burroughs et al.? What types of teacher requests/demands do students commonly resist and why? Using a ranking response option, will students prioritize their resistance selections as a function of relevant teacher attributes? And, to what extent are students' selective resistance decisions associated with learning outcomes?

From the perspective of the college teacher, other important questions can be raised. For instance, do teachers' attributions of students' problem-ownership affect teachers' compliance-gaining strategy choices? Is repeated student resistance a meaningful

attribute in teachers' decisions to employ sequentially-based prosocial and antisocial techniques? How do teachers' attributions about student resistance influence their verbal plans to strategically manage the classroom?

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE CLASSROOM

Because one critical goal for teachers is to manage the classroom in such a way that learning can and does occur, the findings of this study are particularly relevant. In this section we apply what we have learned about teacher immediacy and student resistance to the classroom environment. We should note that generalizing the results of a single investigation directly to all classrooms is problematic. In some cases, this task is virtually impossible. With that understanding, we "frame" our findings within the context of other relevant theory and research which speaks to our results. Moreover, we remind the practitioner that our data were collected and interpreted within the college classroom and thus, these results may not be applicable to elementary and secondary teachers and students. We begin by overviewing what we know about teacher immediacy.

Prior research reveals that students like immediate teachers. That is, they like teachers who are verbally and nonverbally "close." Specific nonverbal behaviors that communicate immediacy include head nodding, smiling, eye contact, forward body leans, use of gestures and standing physically close. Teachers who are verbally immediate address students by their first names, converse with students before and after class, refer

to the class as "our" class and what "we" are doing, and praise students' work or accomplishments. All these behaviors and more signal warmth and friendliness to students. In contrast, nonimmediate behaviors signal coldness, distance and detachment. Immediate teachers communicate how much they like students; nonimmediate teachers communicate the reverse. This liking/not liking orientation is contagious and reciprocal; students respond in kind.

Research on student resistance further indicates that college students report a greater willingness to comply with teacher demands or requests when their teacher is immediate, as opposed to nonimmediate. Apparently, students are more likely to resist a cold, unfriendly teacher, but are more willing to comply with a warm, friendly instructor. The teacher characteristics or behaviors that communicate liking or disliking for students appear to be the same behaviors which prompt students to resist or comply. Students will be more receptive and responsive to teachers they like as opposed to teachers they do not. Teachers who are able to verbally and nonverbally generate this positive affective relationship with their students then, are also likely to be in the enviable position of getting students to do homework, remain attentive to lectures and other learning-related activities.

The central role of immediacy persists even when other potentially relevant teacher behaviors are considered. In this investigation we examined the pervasiveness of immediacy in

relation to what teachers might say to students to gain their compliance. Our results demonstrate that teacher immediacy, not the compliance-gaining messages, direct students' resistance decisions. Extending this finding, college students were asked to explain their reasons for resistance. Their responses further corroborate the importance of immediacy. When asked to resist a nonimmediate teacher, students blamed the teacher for creating a condition where they felt a need to resist. For an immediate teacher, however, students interpreted their resistance as a function of their own priorities and needs.

We also asked students to indicate how they would resist either an immediate or nonimmediate teacher. Their responses revealed that they would use one of two types of strategies: Teacher-Owned or Student-Owned. Teacher-owned strategies are those they would be more likely to employ with a nonimmediate teacher. In other words, students are likely to resist a nonimmediate teacher by complaining to the Dean or Department Head that the teacher is incompetent or tell the teacher that she/he is boring and does not seem to care. All the strategies that represent the teacher-owned dimension of resistance imply that students find the teacher at fault and should be held responsible for their noncompliance.

In the immediate teacher condition, students reported that they would be more likely to use student-owned techniques in their resistance attempts. Students might argue that they have other homework to do, they are too busy, they are old enough to make up

their own minds and do not need to be told what to do. They might also ignore the teacher or pretend to comply. These student-owned strategies imply that students hold themselves, not the teacher, responsible for their resistance decisions. When asked to explain why they selected the particular strategies they did, students continually commented on the teacher's characteristics or attributes that reflected a general immediacy or nonimmediacy orientation.

Based on these and related findings, we recommend to teachers that you first and foremost, practice verbal and nonverbal immediacy behaviors with your students. Engage in behaviors that signal approach, closeness, liking and concern. When you do, you can expect your students to like you and be more willing to go along with your requests or demands. Should they be unable or unwilling to comply, however, your students are likely to assume responsibility for their noncompliance. Rather than finding fault with you, the teacher, students are more apt to blame themselves or other circumstances. Unfortunately, for nonimmediate teachers, we can assume that those same students are likely to find fault with their teachers and hold them accountable.

Footnotes

1. Several issues have been raised regarding the validity of both check list and construction type assessments. Specifically, Burleson, Wilson, Waltman, Goering, Ely and Whaley (1988) claimed that message constructions (as opposed to selections) provide "better" data which are more sensitive to the influence of particular variables, are more representative of "real world" effects, and are not as subject to social desirability biases. These claims have been disputed by others. For instance, Hunter (1988) argued that "there is no evidence to suggest that choice compliance-gaining message instruments are subject to social desirability bias" (p. 168). Seibold (1988) warned that "researchers in the area should accept neither Burleson and his colleagues' conclusion about the invalidity of the selection procedure nor their claims for the construction methods' concurrent validity" (p. 159). In a more direct test of these issues, Plax, Kearney and Sorensen (1990) and Sorensen, Plax and Kearney (1989) reported data that do not support the allegations leveled against the selection procedure. Instead, their data suggest that the construction approach is less sensitive to real world differences, provides results similar for other known predictors, and is just as likely to elicit socially desirable prosocial messages.

2. Factor analyses were also computed for responses within each of the 4 treatment conditions. These results parallel those obtained with responses across all treatments and they are

available upon request.

3. Based on the Editor's recommendation, factor analysis using alpha extraction was employed in both the default and 2-factor computations. Alpha factor analysis provides the basis for reliably generalizing to a universe of variables from a sample of variables (Rummel, 1970, pp. 129-132). Using this procedure, similar results were obtained: The same items loaded on their respective factors within and across situations. These results are available from the senior author.

4. Previous research indicates that students' gender has little or no impact on either students' compliance or resistance decisions (Kearney, Plax, Smith, & Sorensen, 1988). Students' gender was included in the present statistical design, however, in order to assess potential effects on students' resistance selections for this university population.

5. Alpha percentages were calculated to compare the number of tests found to be significant with the number expected to be significant by chance. For the complex main effect of teacher immediacy and the simple main effect for "teacher-owned" resistance at the obtained .0001 level, alpha percentage = .08%. For the simple main effect for "student-owned" resistance at the obtained .05 level, alpha percentage = 40%. Because lower alpha percentages are more indicative of nonchance effects, more confidence can be placed in the first two significant effects than in the latter (Steinfatt, 1979).

6. "Triangulation," or the use of two or more data sets to test, corroborate and elaborate each other, is well documented as a powerful method for increasing the validity of findings. For a complete explanation of the process of data triangulation see Morine-Dershimer (1983).

REFERENCES

Andersen, J. F. (1979). Teacher immediacy as a predictor of teaching effectiveness. In D. Nimmo (Ed.), Communication yearbook 3 (pp. 543-559). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Brophy, J. E., & Rohrkemper, M. M. (1981). The influence of problem ownership on teachers' perceptions of and strategies for coping with problem students. Journal of Educational Psychology, 73, 295-311.

Bruner, J. S. (1957). Going beyond the information given. In H. G. Gruber, K. R. Hammond, and R. Jessor (Eds.), Contemporary approaches to cognition (pp. 41-69). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burleson, B. R., Wilson, S. R., Waltman, M. S., Goering, E. M., Ely, T. K., & Whaley, B. B. (1988). Item desirability effects in compliance-gaining research: Seven studies documenting artifacts in the strategy selection procedure. Human Communicaton Research, 14, 429-486.

Burroughs, N. F., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1989). Compliance-resistance in the college classroom. Communication Education, 38, 214-229.

Cohen, J. (1960). A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20, 37-46.

Cohen, J. (1977). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd edition). New York: Academic Press.

Frieze, I. H., Francis, W. D., & Hanusa, B. H. (1983). Defining

success in classroom settings. In J. M. Levine & M. C. Wang (Eds.), Teacher and student perceptions: Implications for learning (pp. 3-28). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gordon, T. (1970). Parent effectiveness training. New York: Wyden.

Gordon, T. (1974). Teacher effectiveness training. New York: Wyden.

Gorham, J., & Christophel, D. M. (1990). The relationship of teachers' use of humor in the classroom to immediacy and student learning. Communication Education, 39, 46-62.

Heider, F. (1958). The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley.

Hunter, J. E. (1988). Failure of the social desirability response set hypothesis. Human Communication Research, 15, 162-168.

Jones, E. E., & Davis, K. E. (1965). From acts to dispositions: The attribution process in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. Vol. 2 (pp. 219-266). New York: Academic Press.

Kearney, P., Plax, T.G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power in the classroom IV: Alternatives to discipline. In R. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication yearbook 8 (pp. 724-746). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. Communication Education, 34, 19-28.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Smith, V. R., & Sorensen, G. (1988).

Effects of teacher immediacy and strategy type on college student resistance to on-task demands. Communication Education, 37, 54-67.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G , & Wendt-Wasco, N. J. (1985). Teacher immediacy for affective learning in divergent college classes. Communication Quarterly, 33, 61-74.

Kelley, H. H. (1950). The warm-cold variable in first impressions of persons. Journal of Personality, 18, 431-439.

Kelley, H. H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In D. Levine (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation. Vol. 15 (pp. 192-238). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Kelley, H. H. (1973). The processes of causal attribution. American Psychologist, 28, 107-128.

Kelley, H. H., & Michela, J. L. (1980). Attribution theory and research. Annual Review of Psychology, 31, 457-501.

McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1985). Power in the classroom V: Behavioral alternation techniques, communication training and learning. Communication Education, 34, 214-226.

Mehrabian, A. (1967). Attitudes inferred from neutral verbal communications. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 31, 414-417.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). Silent messages. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Morine-Dershimer, G. (1983). Tapping teacher thinking through triangulation of data sets. Austin, TX: The Research and

Development Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, Report No. 8014.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., Downs, T. M., & Stewart R. A. (1986). College student resistance toward teachers' use of selective control strategies. Communication Research Reports, 3, 20-27.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. Communication Education, 35, 43-55.

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., & Sorensen, G. (1990). The strategy selection-construction controversy II: Comparing pre- and experienced teachers' compliance-gaining message constructions. Communication Education, 39, 128-141.

Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1986). Teacher nonverbal immediacy training and student affect. Communication, 15, 181-194.

Ross, L., Lepper, M. R., & Hubbard, M. (1975). Perseverance in self perception and social perception: Biased attributional processes in the debriefing paradigm. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 880-892.

Rummel, R. J. (1970). Applied factor analysis. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Schunk, D. H. (1990). Introduction to the special section on motivation and efficacy. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82, 3-6.

Seeman, H. (1988). Preventing classroom discipline problems: A guide for educators. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Seibold, D. R. (1988). A response to "Item Desirability in Compliance-Gaining Research." Human Communication Research, 15, 152-161.

Shaver, K. G. (1975). An introduction to attribution processes. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Sorensen, G., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1989). The strategy selection-construction controversy: A coding scheme for analyzing teacher compliance-gaining message constructions. Communication Education, 38, 102-118.

Steinfatt, T. M. (1979). The alpha percentage and experimentwise error rates in communication research. Human Communication Research, 5, 366-374.

Stevens, J. P. (1980). Power of the multivariate analysis of variance test. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 728-737.

Stewart, R. A., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1986). Locus of control as a mediator: A study of college students' reactions to teachers' attempts to gain compliance. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), Communication yearbook 9 (pp. 691-704). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Taylor, S. E., & Fiske, S. T. (1975). Point of view and perceptions of causality. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32, 439-445.

Weiner, B. (1985). An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. Psychological Review, 92, 548-573.

Weiner, B. (1986). An attributional theory of motivation and emotion. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Wheeless, L. R., Stewart, R. A., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1987). Locus of control and personal constructs in students' reactions to teacher compliance attempts: A reassessment. Communication Education, 36, 50-58.

TABLE 1

STUDENT-GENERATED REASONS FOR NONCOMPLIANCE BY TREATMENT CONDITION*

Immediate/Antisocial

"My grade is my own concern, not the teacher's."
"I'm an adult and can accept responsibility on tests for my lax attitude."
"I got behind and I'm finding it hard to catch up."
"This class isn't as important to me as other classes."
"The subject doesn't turn me on."

Immediate/Prosocial

"I simply forgot to do the assignment."
"I don't feel like I need to prepare."
"My load from other classes is too great."
"I need to be pushed."
"This class isn't in my major, so I only need a C to get by."

Nonimmediate/Antisocial

"The teacher is too negative."
"I have a rebellious attitude toward the teacher."
"The teacher is not effective."
"You do your job, I'll do mine."
"I don't enjoy people who are cold and order me around."

Nonimmediate/Prosocial

"The teacher is unmotivated, why should I be?"
"The course is far less important than the teacher believes."
"I don't like him [sic]."
"I am put off by the teacher's personality."
"If the teacher doesn't enjoy teaching, is it worth my time to learn?"

---

*These reasons generated by students illustrate common and reoccurring themes. More complete lists are available from the senior author.

TABLE 2

COMPLIANCE-RESISTANCE TECHNIQUES and MESSAGES

1. TEACHER ADVICE:

Prepare yourself better so you give better lectures Be more expressive; everything will work out to your advantage. You should relate more with students before trying to give any advice. If you open up, we'll tend to be more willing to do what you want.

2. TEACHER BLAME:

The teacher is boring. The teacher makes me feel uneasy. It is boring; I don't get anything out of it. Your teaching methods do not motivate me. You don't seem prepared yourself. If you weren't so boring, I would do what you want. You're going to fast; the work is too hard.

3. AVOIDANCE:

I would drop the class. I won't participate as much. I won't go to class. I might keep the class but quit attending. I'll sit in the back of the room.

4. RELUCTANT COMPLIANCE:

I'll do only enough work to get by. Although I would comply with the teacher's demands, I would do so unwillingly. I'll come prepared but not be interested at all. I would be unwilling to do this but probably comply. Grudgingly, I'll come prepared.

5. ACTIVE RESISTANCE:

I won't come prepared at all. I'll leave my book at home I'll keep coming to class unprepared. I would not go along with the teacher. I'll never come prepared. I'll continue to come unprepared to get on the teacher's nerves.

6. DECEPTION:

Act like I'm prepared for class even though I may not be. I may be prepared, but play dumb for spite. I'll make up lies about why I'm not performing well in class. I would cheat off someone else. I might tell the teacher I would make an effort to comply but would not. I'll pretend to be prepared, but instead, borrow from others in class.

7. DIRECT COMMUNICATION:

Go to the teacher's office and try and talk to him/her. After class, explain my behavior. Tell the teacher of the communication problem he/she has. I would take to the instructor and them him/her the way he/she is perceived by the class. Talk to the teacher and explain how I feel.

8. DISRUPTION:

I would be noisy in class. I'll disrupt the class by leaving to get needed materials. I'll talk to friends in class while the teacher is lecturing. I would always come in late. I'll ask questions in a monotone voice without interest. I'll be a wise-guy in class.

9. EXCUSES:

S I don't feel well. I don't understand the topic. I would keep giving excuses. I can remember things without writing stuff down. I forgot and I'm sorry. The class is so easy I don't need to stay caught up. My car broke down.

10. IGNORING THE TEACHER:

S I probably wouldn't say anything; just do what I was doing before. Ignore the teacher's requests, but come to class. I would simply let the teacher's request go in one ear and out the other. I would just ignore the remark and keep up the same habit.

11. PRIORITIES:

S I have other homework so I can't prepare well for this one. I have kids and they take up my time. I'm too busy. The class is not as important as my others. This class doesn't have anything to do with my major. Due to a heavy class load, I just don't have the time. I only took this class for general education requirements.

12. CHALLENGE THE TEACHER'S BASIS OF POWER:

I would ask the teacher if others in class were asked to do the same. No one else is doing it, so why should I have to? Do you really take this class seriously? How does the teacher know what will be good or bad for me? Why will this help or hurt me? If this is such a good idea, why don't you prove it?

13. RALLY STUDENT SUPPORT:

I would talk to other students to see if they feel the same (there is safety in numbers). Try to get the class to rally around the teacher's unprofessional style or unrealistic demand. I would tell my classmates not to go to class. I might get other students to go along with me in not doing what the teacher wants. Get the rest of the class to support my behavior that the teacher is trying to change.

14. APPEAL TO POWERFUL OTHERS:

I might complain to the department head that this instructor is incompetent and can't motivate the class. I would make a complaint to the Dean of the school about the teacher's practices. I would talk to my advisor. I would speak to the Department head. Threaten to go to the Dean.

15. MODELING TEACHER BEHAVIOR:

I would participate more if you were more enthusiastic about what you're doing. You aren't enjoying it, so how can I? If the teacher was not going to make the effort to teach in an interesting way, I would not make an effort to listen. Simply say that with the effort the instructor puts forth, why should I prepare for class? You don't do it, so why should I?

16. MODELING TEACHER AFFECT:

You don't seem to care about this class, why should I? You don't care. The teacher doesn't care about students, so why should I care about what the teacher wants? The teacher doesn't seem to care except when there are problems. You have no concern for this class.

17. HOSTILE DEFENSIVE:

I'm old enough to know how I can do in this class. Tell the teacher what he/she can do with this class! Tell the teacher that my behavior is my business. Right or wrong, that's the way I am. I'm surprised you even noticed I'm in your class. Lead your own life!

18. STUDENT REBUTTAL:

I don't need this grade anyway. I'm doing fine right now without changing my behavior. We'll see when the test comes up. I have my own way of doing things. I know what works; I don't need your advice.

19. REVENGE:

I'll express my dissatisfaction with the teacher/course on evaluations at the end of the term. I won't recommend this teacher/class to others. I'll steal or hide the teacher's lecture notes/tests. I'll tear assignment articles out of books or journals in the library. I'll write a letter to put in the teacher's file.

TABLE 3

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR STUDENTS' LIKELIHOOD OF USE BY TEACHER CONDITION

Category*	Overall		Immed/Anti		Immed/Pro		Non/Anti		Non/Pro	
	M**	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
1.	2.81	1.93	2.29	1.58	2.18	1.56	3.55	2.15	3.23	2.01
2.	3.30	2.03	2.66	1.74	2.91	1.98	3.87	2.11	3.76	2.03
3.	3.14	2.00	2.72	1.90	2.78	1.84	3.94	2.06	3.13	1.99
4.	4.02	1.96	3.61	1.88	4.03	2.06	4.40	2.06	4.06	1.79
5.	1.82	1.34	1.68	1.16	1.71	1.16	2.04	1.60	1.85	1.38
6.	2.69	1.81	2.42	1.66	2.99	1.97	2.83	1.96	2.52	1.59
7.	4.51	1.97	4.79	1.77	4.77	1.89	4.31	2.12	4.18	2.06
8.	1.46	1.21	1.35	1.04	1.57	1.29	1.55	1.46	1.35	1.00
9.	2.69	1.72	2.89	1.71	2.94	1.87	2.40	1.58	2.52	1.67
10.	3.46	1.88	3.29	1.76	3.39	1.88	3.41	2.03	3.74	1.85
11.	3.91	1.83	4.14	1.71	4.46	1.81	3.42	1.91	3.59	1.71
12.	1.94	1.40	2.04	1.49	2.01	1.40	1.96	1.47	1.76	1.23
13.	2.14	1.65	1.89	1.36	2.00	1.64	2.36	1.81	2.32	1.73
14.	2.79	1.98	2.18	1.77	2.28	1.78	3.38	1.91	3.30	2.14
15.	3.29	2.09	2.61	1.82	2.53	1.73	4.25	2.11	3.78	2.17
16.	2.66	1.80	2.40	1.66	2.04	1.41	3.19	1.96	3.01	1.90
17.	2.42	1.74	2.52	1.69	2.59	1.86	2.40	1.89	2.17	1.50
18.	2.20	1.60	2.32	1.57	2.54	1.81	2.14	1.73	1.81	1.16
19.	2.99	2.21	2.30	1.91	2.80	2.15	3.48	2.37	3.39	2.23

*For category labels, see Table 2
**Range = 1-7, with 7 = most likely to be used.

TABLE 4

FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR TEACHER-OWNED AND STUDENT-OWNED RESPONSES TO THE COMPLIANCE-RESISTANCE TYPOLOGY QUESTIONNAIRE.

TECHNIQUE	Immed/Anti T	Immed/Anti S	Immed/Pro T	Immed/Pro S	Nonimmed/Anti S	Nonimmed/Anti T	Nonimmed/Pro T	Nonimmed/Pro S	Overall T	Overall S
Teacher Advice	.68	.03	.74	.08	-.16	.79	.82	-.03	.78	-.07
Teacher Blame	.53	.10	.52	.30	.34	.47	.31	.45	.53	.25
Deception	.14	.53	.31	.50	.65	-.26	-.06	.62	.06	.58
Ignoring the Teacher	.13	.68	.03	.71	.83	-.05	-.28	.59	.03	.69
Priorities	-.39	.59	-.09	.59	.61	.01	-.12	.57	-.21	.61
Appeal to Powerful Others	.66	.18	.77	-.17	-.12	.48	.45	-.07	.63	-.07
Modeling Teacher Behavior	.91	.15	.71	.30	.16	.80	.86	.08	.86	.10
Modeling Teacher Affect	.92	.14	.80	.22	.45	.71	.86	.09	.85	.19
Hostile Defensive	.17	.77	.30	.73	.82	.27	.46	.57	.26	.75
Student Rebuttal	.23	.70	.23	.71	.72	.30	.31	.63	.19	.73
Eigenvalues	3.48	1.89	3.60	1.60	3.48	2.05	3.02	1.84	3.24	2.04
Variance	34.8	18.9	36.0	16.0	34.8	20.5	30.2	18.4	32.4	20.4
Interfactor Correlations	.18		.27		.11		.08		.14	
Alpha Reliabilities	.90	.86	.89	.89	.90	.88	.89	.86	.93	.91

TABLE 5

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR TEACHER-OWNED AND STUDENT OWNEDRESISTANCE

Condition	Teacher-Owned $\bar{X}$	Teacher-Owned SD	Student-Owned $\bar{X}$	Student-Owned SD
Immediate/Antisocial	12.14	6.52	14.68	5.53
Immediate/Prosocial	11.94	6.14	15.97	6.28
Nonimmediate/Antisocial	18.25	6.98	14.21	7.02
Nonimmediate/Prosocial	17.08	7.19	13.84	4.76
Immediate	12.04	6.31	15.33	5.94
Nonimmediate	17.65	7.09	14.02	5.96
Antisocial	15.16	7.40	14.45	6.30
Prosocial	14.52	7.15	14.90	5.66

TABLE 6

STUDENT EXPLANATIONS FOR SELECTING PARTICULAR RESISTANCE STRATEGIES BY TREATMENT CONDITION*

Immediate/Antisocial

"The teacher was obviously competent and seemed to be enthusiastic about teaching. My immediate response would not be for revenge or spite but for justifying my actions with reasons or telling the teacher that this is my life and I know how to lead it better than he/she does."

"Because I am able to accept the consequences on my lack of preparedness. I am an adult and don't need to be treated as a child. It is good advice to come prepared, but the teacher should not use this threat of lowering my grade to elicit a response from me. As I said, I am an adult and can accept my responsibility for my actions."

"Instead of getting upset and fighting back I think I would try to work something with the teacher--try to come to an understanding that we would both be satisfied with. As far as resistance, I would most likely tell the truth and then stretch it with excuses."

Immediate/Prosocial

"Obviously, the teacher does a good job, it is the student who doesn't. I wouldn't complain about the teacher or say anything back to him, but I would make justifications for myself for not coming prepared. I would feel bad about not doing well or not being into the class, so I would make excuses for myself."

"The teacher seemed concerned, I didn't want to be rude. I just want to do my own thing and I don't want a Professor telling me what to do."

"I believe that when I enroll in a class, it is my duty to see it through to the end, or drop it if I feel I am unable to keep up with the instructor's demands. The only reasons I would not come to class prepared are personal problems or work/class conflict. Still, even after this, I would try to meet with the instructor to find some way to correct the problem."

Nonimmediate/Antisocial

"I would be honest with the teacher and tell him/her that the reason I don't feel motivated or enthusiastic is because he/she doesn't appear that way. I'd want to be honest so that the teacher may feel pressured to change his/her teaching methods."

"I would not want to hurt the teacher's feelings by telling him/her to their face that I feel they are boring and have an uninteresting class. If I could do it anonymously, then I would feel much better through student evaluations."

"Because the teacher is what makes a class. If the teacher is boring or isn't excited about the class then neither am I. I would hate to do homework or study for the class, so I would make up excuses."

Nonimmediate/Prosocial

"I do feel that if a teacher doesn't motivate her/his class, soon students won't care about that class. They will put off studying and just won't care. But I wouldn't put her/his job in danger. Just have her/him to improve."

"The resistances I would choose would hopefully improve the situation for both student and teacher. Resistance that does not lead to change and can only hurt the student would not be beneficial. Resistance that made the teacher aware that his performance was less than satisfactory to the student would help everyone."

"Usually, when the teacher confronts you if you act like you care he will probably leave you alone. The you can forget about what he said and go back to doing things your own way."

---

*These explanations illustrate reoccurring themes. More complete lists are available upon request.