ABSTRACT

WHAT TO EXPECT WHEN THEY’RE EXPECTING: AN EXAMINATION OF COLLEGE
STUDENT EXPECTATIONS FOR INSTRUCTOR BEHAVIOR

by Jessalyn Ilene Vallade

This study uses Expectancy Violation Theory (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon, Stacks, &
Burch, 1982) as a framework for investigating students’ initial expectations of instructor
communication behavior and their subsequent violations in the classroom. The results of this
two-part study found that positive expectancy violations are associated with more prosocial
power use by instructors, higher perceptions of instructor credibility, and higher levels of student
affective learning. In addition, perceived physical attractiveness of instructors was found to be
associated with use of more referent power, as well as higher expectations of positive
communication behaviors. Finally, the extent to which students expect specific communication
behaviors, as well as how important they find these behaviors to their classroom experience is
also explored as a way of better understanding the student perspective to build a more student-
centered classroom. Practical implications and suggestions for future research are also
discussed.
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Introduction

People enter situations or relational encounters with certain expectations about how those interactions will transpire. These initial expectations shape how we approach and engage in communication as well as how we interpret the communication and behaviors of others. Expectations play a very important role, then, in the outcomes of our interaction with others on a daily basis and in many contexts. People may not always be specifically or consciously aware of what they expect or why, and how these expectations influence what they take away from a specific situation. This study seeks to explore how initial expectations in the classroom correlate with how students view their instructors as well as what they take away from the class.

Although we know quite a bit about student reactions to teacher behavior and communication of power in the classroom, we don’t know much about what specific behaviors they expect initially. Expectancy violation theory (Burgoon, Stacks, & Burch, 1982; Burgoon & Hale, 1988) considers how expectations contribute to our perceptions of others and their nonverbal behavior. More recently, norm violation theory (Levine, Anders, Banas, Baum, Endo, Hu, & Wong, 2000; McPherson, Kearney, & Plax, 2003) has sought to clarify the difference between expectations and norms, which could also help frame outcomes in the classroom, as there are social norms inherent in both the educational context and the teacher-student relationship. It is the aim of this research to explore students’ initial expectations regarding specific communication behavior of instructors, and whether the students’ perceptions of an instructor’s level of physical attractiveness and communication of power have moderating roles in these expectations. It is possible that physical attractiveness may play a role in perceptions of instructors, thus potentially moderating the relationship between expectations and expectancy fulfillment. Perceptions of power in the classroom have been examined in many contexts, but have not been tested in regard to their relationship with students’ expectancies of instructor behavior.

The relationship between students’ expectation fulfillment or violation and outcome variables (affective learning and perceptions of instructor credibility) will also be determined using expectancy violation as a theoretical framework. According to Mottet and Richmond (1998), affective learning is “an increasing internalization of positive attitudes toward the content or subject matter” (p. 370). The present research seeks to understand more about the relationship between expectancy fulfillment or violation in the classroom and levels of student affect for the
course content and instructor. Three dimensions of source credibility (competence, trustworthiness, goodwill) of the instructor will also be measured as an outcome variable to determine whether the violation or fulfillment of expectations and perceptions of teacher credibility are related. These variables will frame the examination of the current literature in this area.

The goal of this study is to improve instructors’ understanding of student expectations in the classroom. With an increase in understanding, college educators will be better equipped to provide a more student-centered learning environment. In addition, they will be able to approach differences in perception with their students with more knowledge of how these perceptions influence student experiences in the classroom as well as impressions of their instructor. Without first knowing what it is that students expect from teachers’ communicative behavior, there cannot be a full awareness of how these expectations shape the way that students respond in a class. Learning more about how expectancy violations are related to students’ affective learning or perceptions of instructor credibility can help individuals to enhance these classroom outcomes. In order to effectively gain this knowledge, expectancy violation theory (Burgoon et al., 1982; Burgoon & Hale, 1988) will be used as a framework to measure whether and how students’ expectations were violated in order to compare these violations with the outcome variables.
Chapter 1: Review of Literature

Expectancy Violation and Norm Violation Theories

The central idea of expectancy violation theory is that there are situations and circumstances in which violations of social norms and/or expectations produce arousal, which can be positive or negative (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon, Newton, Walther, & Baesler, 1989). The inherent assumption of this theory is that people go into interpersonal interactions with certain expectations of others’ nonverbal behavior; these expectations are products of two things: (1) social norms, and (2) the known idiosyncrasies of those we interact with (Burgoon et al., 1982; Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon, Poire, & Rosenthal, 1995). Once our expectations are violated, we experience heightened arousal, which distracts us from the purpose of the interaction and focuses our attention toward the source of the arousal (the person who has violated our expectations). This shift in attention then causes a person to subsequently interpret and evaluate the violation act in order to define it as either a positive or a negative violation. This evaluation is the violation valence (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). A violation is positively valenced when an individual’s actions or behaviors exceed expectations in a way that is pleasing. A negatively valenced violation, on the other hand, occurs when expectations are not met.

The reward valence, or assessment of the communicator, is taken into consideration in addition to the valence of the violation act itself. Reward is a function of several factors, including, but not limited to, communicator and relationship characteristics such as sex, personality, physical attractiveness, status, and communication style (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon et al., 1989; Burgoon et al., 1995). Derived, interactional behaviors are also included in communicator reward valence, such as possessing tangible rewards or giving positive feedback. Overall, communicator valence is the degree to which a person is “someone with whom it is desirable to interact” (Burgoon & Hale, 1988, p. 62). Burgoon et al. (1995) also take into consideration the perceiver’s goals and preferences.

Expectancy violation theory predicts that extreme violations, when committed by a high reward communicator, are more likely to be positively valenced, or evaluated; “arousal prompted by rewarding individuals becomes positively labeled and responded to, the converse for non-rewarding individuals” (Burgoon et al., 1982, p. 115). It is pointed out, however, that there are some behaviors and messages that are inherently evaluated as positive or negative; the
perceived reward valence of the communicator affects only how we label a violation when the act itself is ambiguous and subject to a range of interpretations (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon et al., 1989).

Expectancy violation theory, then, includes violations of expectations based on specific knowledge of individuals in addition to social norms; social norms are more salient in initial interactions, when there is not much known about the other person or their idiosyncrasies. Norm violation theory (Levine, et al., 2000; McPherson, et al., 2003), on the other hand, focuses primarily on social norms as determining factors in our judgment of others’ behavior. Levine et al. (2000) define norms as dictating “the range of behaviors that are socially appropriate and inappropriate given the situation” (p. 124). According to this theory, even when we know someone to have consistent behaviors, or idiosyncrasies, that fall outside of acceptable social norms, we still evaluate it negatively, though we might come to expect this behavior, because it violates our norms. “The norm violation model recognizes that behaviors violating norms are, by definition, socially inappropriate. Such behaviors should be evaluated negatively independently of whether the behaviors are anticipated or unexpected” (Levine et al., 2000, p. 127).

The focus of this study will extend previous results in expectancy violation research by looking at student expectations of specific instructor communication behaviors. These specific behaviors have been drawn from various areas of study, including verbal (Gorham, 1988) and nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988; McCroskey, Fayer, Richmond, Salinen, & Barraclough, 1996), affinity-seeking (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986), teacher misbehaviors (Kearney, Plax, Hays, & Ivey, 1991), and student motivators (Gorham & Christopel, 1992). Two factors that may contribute to students’ evaluations of instructors (i.e., communicator reward valence) are the communication of power on the part of the teacher, as well as the students’ perceptions of instructors’ physical attractiveness. These variables will be examined to determine if there is a moderating relationship between them and students’ expectations, expectation fulfillment, and the outcome variables of student affective learning and perceived instructor credibility. In addition, as sex and estimated instructor age potentially contribute to students’ overall assessments and expectations, they will also be considered. Each of these variables and their implications will be discussed.
Communicator Reward Valence

Expectancy violation theory includes communicator reward valence, or the assessment of a communicator, as a variable that contributes to how expectancy violations are valenced or interpreted (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). As noted earlier, reward can include communicator characteristics as well as derived behaviors. In the current study, instructors’ physical attractiveness, age, and sex will be examined as possible characteristics that may contribute to communicator reward valence. Teachers’ use of power in the classroom will be measured as a derived interactional behavior that may potentially be a factor in this variable as well.

Power. French and Raven (1959) put forth five bases of power that have subsequently provided the basis of the majority of power research: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert. Reward power is based on the perception that one has the ability to either administer positive outcomes or remove/decrease negative outcomes. Coercive power is essentially the opposite, stemming from the perception that one has the ability to administer negative outcomes or punishments. Legitimate power refers to some acknowledged norm or value that dictates that one has the right or authority to influence another. Referent power is based on identification, or a “feeling of oneness” with another, or a desire to identify with someone. If there is already a close association, referent power also includes the desire to maintain this relationship. Finally, expert power is based on the extent of the knowledge or experience that one has or is perceived to have.

Richmond and Roach (1992) came to three conclusions on power and communication. (1) There is a certain amount of power rooted in most relationships, (2) power is perception, and (3) power and communication are inextricably linked (Richmond & Roach, 1992, p. 47). Regarding their first conclusion, the relationship between instructors and their students is one in which there is a fairly high level of power difference, based on the definition of their respective roles set forth by the institution of education in our culture. The social and educational structure within which the relationship exists creates a hierarchy of power to which teachers and students alike are subject. By definition, the role of teacher affords an individual more power than the role of student. They have the power to determine course content, schedule, and, ultimately, students’ grades. This makes the teacher-student relationship an ideal context to study power at work, especially how this power is handled and negotiated.
The second conclusion, that power is perception, relates to the methodology of this study. McCroskey, Richmond, Plax, and Kearney (1985) discovered that perceptions of power use are not consistent between teachers and students, and they explicitly suggest the use of student reports in research. Teachers have also reported their own behavior as employing primarily prosocial behavioral alteration techniques (BATs), and yet report other teachers frequently using antisocial BATs (Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1983). This means that teacher’s self reports are likely flawed, as they perceive their own behavior differently, and perhaps more positively, than others’. Therefore, while some studies have teachers self-report on their power usage (e.g., Kearney et al., 1983), this study relies on student perceptions of teacher power usage. Regardless of what power messages teachers intend to relay, the messages that are actually communicated and interpreted will affect students’ experiences with, and perceptions of their instructor.

Finally, Richmond and Roach’s (1992) third conclusion contends that power and communication are inextricably linked. Without expression of power messages through communication channels, there would be no perception of power, and without these perceptions, there would be no recognition or outcome of power. Power, essentially, does not exist until it is communicated. This study intends to discover more about power relations in the classroom through examination of student reports of instructor communication of power. French and Raven (1959) laid the foundation in power research that allows these power messages to be measured.

**Power in the classroom.** These five bases of power have been the focus of much study in communication and social behavior research. Power is inherently important to the study of instructional communication because, as Richmond and Roach (1992) posit, “one must concede that the role of teacher, almost by definition, involves social influence” (p. 58). There is a hierarchical power structure in place in our educational system, and the use and negotiation of power is integral to our communication in the classroom.

Within this context, power use has been related to many education influences and outcomes, including motivation (Richmond, 1990), teacher evaluations (Schrodt, Witt, Myers, Turman, Barton, & Jernberg, 2008), cognitive learning (McCroskey & Richmond, 1984; Richmond, McCroskey, Kearney, & Plax, 1987), affective learning (McCroskey & Richmond, 1984; McCroskey, Richmond, Plax, & Kearney, 1985; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond,
1986; Roach, 1991), immediacy (Plax et al., 1986), and confirmation behaviors (Turman & Schrodt, 2006). In addition, differences in teacher and student perceptions of teacher power use have been found (McCroskey et al., 1985), as well as differences between experienced and prospective teachers (Kearney, Plax, Sorenson, & Smith, 1988) and professors and graduate teaching assistants (Roach, 1991). Power usage by students has been investigated as well (Golish & Olson, 2000).

The general consensus in the research is that the five usages of power, or power bases, can be categorized into two types: prosocial (referent, expert, reward) and antisocial (legitimate, coercive). Overall, the research consistently provides support for prosocial power use generating more positive associations and outcomes, while the opposite is generally true for antisocial power use. Richmond (1990) found the use of coercive power in the classroom to be negatively associated with student motivation, while instructor use of referent and, to a lesser extent, expert powers were positively related to motivation. Learner empowerment is also associated with instructor use of referent, reward, and legitimate power, although results suggest that referent power is the primary base enhancing learner empowerment (Schrodt et al., 2008). In the same study, it was determined that teachers who use expert and referent (prosocial) power strategies receive higher teacher evaluations. On the other hand, engaging in coercive (antisocial) power use was negatively associated with teacher evaluations (Schrodt et al., 2008). Referent and expert power have also been positively related to cognitive and affective learning; again, coercive power was negatively correlated, along with legitimate power, with both kinds of learning (Richmond & McCroskey, 1984). Interestingly, reward power became important only when the teacher lacked referent or expert power (Richmond & McCroskey, 1984). Richmond et al. (1987) found that antisocial behavioral alteration techniques (BATs) were negatively associated with cognitive learning while prosocial BATs were positively associated. In addition, teacher confirmation behaviors have been found to be closely associated with prosocial forms of power use in the classroom (Turman & Schrodt, 2006).

Immediacy has been proven to be an important variable in the classroom, and the use of prosocial power messages, including reward, expert, and referent power, is positively correlated with reported perceptions of teacher immediacy, which in turn leads to greater affective learning. In contrast, antisocial power messages, based on coercive and legitimate power, decrease these perceptions and lead to reduced levels of affective learning (Plax et al., 1986). Although a
relationship has been found between immediacy and student perceptions of prosocial power use, these studies have been correlational; it is therefore unclear whether this is a causal relationship, or whether prosocial power use could be influencing student perceptions of immediacy. Power use could be a contributing factor to communicator reward valence, similar to communication style. This study, within the framework of expectancy violation theory, seeks to ascertain how student perceptions of instructor usage of power, whether prosocial or antisocial, contribute to communicator reward valence, and thus influence student expectations of instructor behavior and perceptions of expectancy violations. Prosocial power use has primarily been found to correlate with positive student responses in the classroom, while antisocial power use has had the opposite effect (Richmond, 1990; Richmond & McCroskey, 1983). Schrodt et al. (2008) found that antisocial power behaviors “fundamentally violate students’ expectations that the instructor will relate to them in a courteous and respectful manner” (p. 195). The existing body of research on instructor power use and students’ subsequent reactions to their instructors form the basis for the first hypothesis.

H1: Ratings of prosocial power use by instructors will be positively related to positive expectancy violations, while antisocial power use will be negatively related to positive expectancy violations.

In addition to the possibility that power usage contributes to communicator reward valence, and thus perceptions of expectancy violation, physical attractiveness is a feature that has consistently been associated with this facet of expectancy violation theory (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon et al., 1989; Burgoon et al., 1995).

**Physical Attractiveness.** Dion, Berscheid, and Walster (1972), assert that physical appearance, in addition to sexual identity, “is the characteristic most obvious and accessible to others in social interaction,” (p. 285). While many would like to believe that it is what is on the inside that counts, years of research have shown us that physical attractiveness is something that we notice and ascribe value to. Much of the research has sought to examine Dion et al.’s (1972) classic study in which they indicate, “what is beautiful is good.” Physical attractiveness has been correlated with expectations of social success (Abbott & Sebastian, 1981; Dermer & Thiel, 1975; Eagly, Makhijani, Ashmore, & Longo, 1991), higher evaluations of intellectual competence (Jackson, Hunter, & Hodge, 1995), trustworthiness, expertise, and liking (Patzer, 1983), desire to communicate (Weiss & Houser, 2007), immediacy (Rocca & McCroskey, 1999), and task
performance (Landy & Sigall, 1974). In addition, physically attractive people have an increased likelihood of effectively influencing others (Mills & Aronson, 1965) and even receiving lighter sentences in court (Sigall & Ostrove, 1975).

Specifically, the influence of teachers’ perceived physical attractiveness has been assessed in much research to date. Reported levels of perceived physical attractiveness of teachers have been consistently related to positive student evaluations of instructors (Goebel & Cashen, 1979; Hamermesh & Parker, 2005; Riniolo, Johnson, Sherman, & Misso, 2006). Attractive teachers were viewed as less likely to give students too much work, more likely to be friendly, to encourage students to interact, to be better organized, and to be overall better teachers (Goebel & Cashen, 1979). Student perceptions of teacher attractiveness were also found to influence their perceptions of teacher organization and classroom management, as well as motivation and sensitivity (Brosius & Smith, 1990).

It is important to note the limitations of looking at physical attractiveness by itself. Riniolo et al. (2006) point out that “the evaluation of who is perceived as physically attractive is not simply an objective variable, but is partially a subjective judgment that can be influenced by multiple outputs” (p. 21-22). Therefore, within the context of this study, there are no attempts to objectively evaluate physical attractiveness; instead, evaluations are based on students’ perceptions of attractiveness, as their perceptions are ultimately what they base their expectations and evaluations of the instructor on. Indeed, McCroskey, Valencic, and Richmond (2004) point out that “students will begin to develop perceptions of the teacher as soon as they begin to be exposed to her/him” (p. 199); it can be argued that one of the first things students are exposed to is the physical appearance and attractiveness level of the instructor.

These self-reported perceptions will form the basis of the investigation into whether or not physical attractiveness is associated with perceptions of power usage and student expectations of instructor behavior. For example, if a teacher is seen as physically attractive, will he or she be expected to engage in more positive behaviors (i.e., smile more, be more enthusiastic)? If this same instructor does not engage in these positive behaviors, will students perceive it as a more serious violation than if a teacher seen as unattractive engages in the same behaviors? Rocca and McCroskey (1999) found that physical attractiveness was positively correlated with perceptions of immediacy behavior, and, according to Burgoon and Hale (1988), people may have higher standards or more stringent expectations of people they evaluate as high
reward communicators. Therefore, “it is possible for a high reward person to commit a more grievous violation” (Burgoon & Hale, 1988, p. 65). Essentially, there can be a larger gap between what people expect of a high reward communicator and in what behaviors they actually engage. It is this tenet of expectancy violation theory, along with the results of Rocca and McCroskey’s (1999) study, which form the foundation of the second hypothesis.

H2: Perceived level of attractiveness will be positively correlated with expectations of positive behaviors.

If it is true that “what is beautiful is good” (Berscheid et al., 1972), then it would make sense for students to associate physical attractiveness with more prosocial power use, as prosocial power use is seen as a positive communication behavior, and physical attractiveness has been linked to several other positive communication behaviors, providing the logic for the third hypothesis.

H3: Instructor’s level of perceived physical attractiveness will be positively correlated with perceived prosocial power use.

Sex and Age. The literature concerning communicator sex is inconsistent, and not much is known about our expectations of behavior for men versus women. There have been mixed results regarding how we evaluate men and women in terms of their physical attractiveness, ranging from no differences (Riniolo et al., 2006; Dion et al., 1972) to higher ratings of females (Brosius & Smith, 1990; Buck & Tiene, 1989), and higher ratings of attractive males (Bokek-Cohen & Davidowitz, 2008; Jackson et al., 1995). Context may also play a role in how attractiveness is evaluated (i.e., the classroom). If physical attractiveness evaluations contribute to the communicator reward valence and thus impact the interpretation of behavior and expectancy violations, then it is possible that men and women might be evaluated differently, although not enough is known about the specific direction of these differences to form a hypothesis.

In addition, sex differences have been found in the context of power use. Females have been found to use primarily prosocial power strategies and BATs, and to use them more often than males (Kearney et al., 1983; Kearney et al., 1984; Kearney et al., 1988), although Kearney et al. (1985) found no meaningful differences in power use based on instructor sex. Thus, while there is much research to suggest that women use more prosocial power strategies than males, the research is not entirely consistent. If power use contributes to communicator reward valence,
along with physical attractiveness, the same possibilities of sex influence in behavior expectation and subsequent violation might apply. It makes sense that students may have different behavioral expectations of male and female teachers, which forms the basis of the first research question in this study.

RQ1: Do students have different behavioral expectations for male and female teachers?

In addition to teacher sex, teacher age may also play a role in student expectations. Although students may rarely be aware of their instructor’s actual age, perceived age of teachers could influence students’ expectations of their behavior. For instance, students may expect teachers who are seen as being closer in age to themselves to engage in more immediate behaviors than teachers seen as older. Students may view instructors of different ages as fulfilling different roles in the classroom. Not much is known about the impact of instructor age on student expectations, and an examination of the role that instructors’ age plays in college student perceptions and expectations in the classroom is absent from the instructional literature. The possibility remains, however, that it may be a mediating factor in the current study, and the second research question is thus designed to address this possibility.

RQ2: Is student perception of instructor’s age related to behavioral expectations?

Students’ perceptions of instructors’ power use, physical attractiveness, age, and sex may contribute to their evaluations of their teacher’s communicator reward valence, which may in turn relate to their expectations. These variables are important to consider in the current context in order to determine whether and how they potentially moderate student expectations, evaluations, and outcomes in the classroom. Specifically, the current goal is to explore more about what specific instructor behaviors students expect, and how the fulfillment or violation of these specific expectations affect the outcome variables of affective learning and perceived instructor credibility.

Expectancy Violation and Instructor Behavior

Support for expectancy violation theory and partial support for norm violation theory have been found in the classroom. This is not surprising, given the unique factors that are associated with this context. In many situations, when students walk into a classroom, especially at the college level, it is unlikely that they have interacted with that particular instructor before. Without any previous interaction on which to base their expectations, it is likely that students
would form their expectations from more general social norms of what is appropriate in a classroom. As the semester goes on and students become more familiar with their instructor and his or her specific behavior patterns and communication habits, expectancy violation theory would predict that students change their expectations as their knowledge of the instructor and the specific classroom situation increases, thereby relying less on social norms. Calista (1975) found results consistent with this prediction in his study of college student expectations and evaluations, concluding that end-of-course instructor ratings “offered only a partial, and sometimes misleading, understanding of expectations and classroom dynamics” (p. 196), because they did not take into account the fact that students’ expectations actually varied over the semester.

It is appropriate to acknowledge that a percentage of students may glean identifying information about a specific instructor before their first encounter with them. Students, especially those in upper classes, could have acquaintances that have taken a class with a certain teacher and can give an account of their perceptions or experiences, for example. In addition, with the upsurge in social networking sites, availability of grade distributions, and websites that are devoted to professor ratings, there are many opportunities for students to form expectations about instructors they have never actually met. Although these are certainly possibilities, in the current study determining the source of a student’s expectations is not the focus. Instead, the focus is on whether or not these initial expectations are violated, positively or negatively, and what associations these violations have with the outcome variables being examined.

Norm violation theory, in contrast, would predict that, as long as the instructors’ behaviors were within the range of those deemed acceptable by social norms, the students’ expectations would not be violated. On the other hand, if the instructors’ behavior fell outside of this range, it would result in a negative violation. McPherson et al. (2003) found that expressions of teacher anger violated norms of appropriate behavior in the classroom, and were thus negatively evaluated, leading to students’ negative affect for both the teacher and the course. However, it was also found that students’ judgments of these anger expressions differed as a function of how well students knew their instructor; this finding is actually consistent with expectancy violation theory, though the results were interpreted within the framework of the norm violation model.
There are several studies that have investigated the specific expectations students have in the classroom (e.g., Sander, Stevenson, King, & Coates, 2000; Moore, Moore, & McDonald, 2008). For example, Sander et al. (2000) looked at student expectations regarding teaching and learning methods, with the result that formal and interactive lectures were most frequently expected, but interactive lectures, tutorials, and group work were the most preferred. Interestingly, this provided evidence that “some students are entering university with the expectation that they will not be taught in the way they would prefer” (p. 319). In addition, the results indicated that the five top teaching qualities expected by students were teaching skills, teacher approachability, knowledge, enthusiasm, and organization (Sander et al., 2000). In addition, several studies have found significant differences between populations or subsets of students, including differences based on traditional versus nontraditional student status (Houser, 2005, 2006), personality predispositions (Frymier & Weser, 2001), cultural role expectations (McCargar, 1993), gender, GPA, and class status (Moore et al., 2008). This research contributes much to the dialogue on student expectations, as it is important to consider the diversity of contemporary college classrooms. Although research of expectations in the classroom is not new, this study aims to add to this body of literature by examining student expectations of specific instructor communication behaviors and how these expectations are fulfilled or violated.

Research using expectancy violation theory has found support in the areas of interpersonal attraction (Burgoon et al., 1982; Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon et al., 1989), immediacy (Burgoon & Hale, 1988), credibility (Burgoon et al., 1982; Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon et al., 1989), and persuasiveness (Burgoon et al., 1982). Within the classroom, positive expectancy violations and high communicator reward have been associated with positive evaluations of instructors (Calista, 1975), student satisfaction (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006), motivation, and cognitive learning (Houser, 2006). Based on previous research on expectancy violation in the classroom, then, it would make sense, within the current context, for student expectation fulfillment or violation to have specific relationships with the outcome variables of affective learning and perceived instructor credibility. Using the framework of expectancy violation theory and norm violation theory, the following hypothesis was developed.

\( H4: \) Students whose initial expectations of the instructor are perceived as being exceeded (positively violated) will report (a) higher levels of affective learning, and (b) perceptions
of higher instructor credibility than those students whose expectations were not met or were just met.

This hypothesis deals directly with whether or not expectations of instructor behavior are met or violated (positively or negatively), but it is also the goal of the current study to explore what specific communication behaviors students actually expect of their instructors, as well as which behaviors are most important to students’ classroom experience. The importance of instructor behaviors will be explored with the third research question in this study.

RQ3: Which specific communication behaviors do students perceive to be most important?

To examine students’ expectations, specific communicative behaviors have been pulled from the literature on immediacy, affinity-seeking, and motivational behaviors in the classroom, and will be discussed subsequently.

Instructor Behavior

Extensive research in the areas of teacher immediacy, affinity-seeking, and motivational and demotivational behaviors, provide us with a wealth of knowledge regarding the outcomes associated with these communication behaviors. We know, therefore, that students consider certain behaviors associated with immediacy, affinity-seeking, and motivational behaviors to be positive (e.g., Folwell, 2000; Frymier & Thompson, 1992), and demotivational behaviors and misbehaviors to be negative (e.g., Kearney et al., 1991). This knowledge provides us with a framework for gauging students’ expectations of these same behaviors as a way of exploring whether expectancy violation plays a role in shaping the outcomes previously found to be associated with these areas of communication in the classroom.

Immediacy has been one of the most often studied variables in the instructional communication literature. Immediacy is the level of perceived physical and/or psychological distance between communicators, and can include aspects of both verbal and nonverbal communication (Witt, Wheeless, & Allen, 2004). Nonverbal immediacy includes such specific behaviors as vocal variety, smiling, eye contact, and gestures (Folwell, 2000; Richmond, 1990). Verbal immediacy includes things such as inclusivity (“we” vs. “I”), voluntarism (“want” vs. “have to”), and mutuality (“Judy and I do X” vs. “I do X with Judy”) (Gorham, 1988). While Gorham (1988) developed a scale for verbal immediacy, the method used and the validity of the
scale developed have subsequently been questioned. Robinson and Richmond (1995) point out that, because students were asked to think of the best teachers they had ever had, the scale may more accurately measure verbal effectiveness, and not verbal immediacy. Subsequent testing found that the verbal immediacy items developed by Gorham (1988) were not highly correlated with immediacy (Robinson & Richmond, 1995). Although this specific measure may not be a valid representation of verbal immediacy, some of the items included on the scale (humor, inclusive behavior toward students) are consistent with positive behaviors reported by students in affinity-seeking (Bell & Daly, 1984; McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986) and motivating behaviors (Gorham & Christophel, 1992), which will be discussed in more detail.

Teacher immediacy has been positively correlated with several student outcomes, including motivation (Comadena, Hunt, & Simonds, 2007; Frymier, 1994; Gorham & Christophel, 1992; Richmond, 1990), perceptions of instructor credibility (Thweatt & McCroskey, 1998), affective learning (Allen et al., 2006; Comadena et al., 2007; Comstock, Rowell, & Bowers, 1995; Folwell, 2000; Witt et al., 2004), instructor caring (Thweatt & McCroskey, 1998), cognitive learning (Comstock et al., 1995; Kelley & Gorham, 1988), responsiveness and assertiveness (Thomas, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1994), instructor clarity (Comadena et al., 2007), and perceived learning (King & Witt, 2009). Interestingly, a lack of immediacy was also found to be perceived as a misbehavior; teachers, who failed to employ immediacy behaviors, although they were not engaging in explicit misbehaviors, were still perceived as misbehaving (Thweatt & McCroskey, 1996). The body of research examining the relationship of immediacy with both positive and negative classroom outcomes is important to understand for instructors to be better aware of the realistic effects their behaviors have on students and their motivation and learning.

In addition to nonverbal and verbal immediacy, affinity-seeking is another construct that has been fruitfully explored in the classroom context. Bell and Daly (1984) conceptualize affinity-seeking as “the active social-communicative process by which individuals attempt to get others to like and feel positive toward them” (p. 91). In their original work on affinity-seeking, Bell and Daly (1984) developed a typology of 25 strategies used by people as a means of getting others to like them. In their subsequent study, it was found that people who were perceived as using more affinity-seeking behaviors were judged to be more likable, socially successful, and satisfied with their lives (Bell & Daly, 1984). In the classroom, research has found affinity-
seeking to be associated with student motivation (Frymier & Thompson, 1992; Richmond, 1990), perceptions of teacher character and competence (Frymier & Thompson, 1992), and affective (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986; Richmond, 1990) and cognitive (Richmond, 1990) learning. Nonverbal immediacy is included as an affinity-seeking strategy, and immediacy behaviors have been reported as some of the most frequently used behaviors in the classroom (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986; Richmond, 1990). Indeed, there seems to be quite a bit of overlap in behaviors between areas of study, including immediacy and affinity-seeking, as well as behaviors categorized as motivating and demotivating.

Motivating behaviors are teacher behaviors that positively affect students’ state motivation (Christophel & Gorham, 1995), while demotivating behaviors are instructor behaviors that have a negative impact on student attitude toward a class. Many of the motivating behaviors that have appeared in research are directly related to teacher immediacy. For example, Gorham and Christophel (1992) found that teacher immediacy accounted for 34% of the variance in overall motivators, while nonimmediate behaviors accounted for 32% of overall demotivators. Subsequently, Christophel and Gorham (1995) found similar results, with a strong association between demotivation and nonimmediate behavior. Frequently reported behaviors resulting in student motivation include teacher’s enthusiasm, organization, feedback from the instructor, teacher competence and knowledge, and use of humor (Gorham & Christophel, 1992). The most frequently listed demotivators were teachers either boring or confusing students, or exhibiting a lack of enthusiasm and clarity (Gorham & Christophel, 1992). Clarity, in addition to being identified by students as a factor in their motivation, is also significantly correlated with verbal and nonverbal immediacy (Powell & Harville, 1990), and humor is also related to verbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988; Robinson & Richmond, 1995).

While students’ evaluations of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and motivational behaviors are generally positive, not much is known about how these behaviors meet or violate student expectations. It is possible that high immediacy, affinity-seeking, and motivational behaviors are evaluated so positively because they positively violate student expectations, while demotivators and misbehaviors (Kearney, Plax, Hays, & Ivey, 1991) negatively violate, or fail to meet student expectations. Pogue and AhYun (2006) acknowledge this possibility: “if students’ education expectations of their teachers do not include engaging with them interpersonally, then taking a class from a teacher who is immediate would be a bonus, not an expectation” (p. 341). Student
expectations are important to consider in developing training programs for instructors, as well as managing student expectations that may not be possible to meet. For example, being aware of which behaviors students have the highest expectations might be helpful for instructors who may recognize one or more of these behaviors as a weakness in their personal teaching style. They can then proceed to either develop and incorporate these communication behaviors, or attempt to change their students’ expectations regarding them. Sander et al. (2000) point out that education has mostly adopted an “inside out” approach, “with those on the inside assuming they know what students need and what they expect the teacher to give” (p. 309). However, thinking “outside in” could be a more valuable approach. In addition, Appleton-Knapp and Krentler (2006) emphasize the role of hindsight bias in studies where students are asked to recall their initial expectations while simultaneously evaluating whether they were met or not. This highlights the importance of exploring what expectations students are coming into classes with initially, in order to more accurately measure expectancy violations. Thus, the current study aims to avoid hindsight bias by collecting data at two separate times; first, measuring behavioral expectations at the beginning of the semester, and second, measuring the perceived fulfillment or violation of these expectations and their subsequent outcomes at a later point in the course.

Because of the similarity and overlap among the teacher communication behaviors included in immediacy, affinity-seeking, motivation/demotivation, and misbehaviors, the current study does not examine them as separate constructs. In addition, the instructional outcomes of these communicative behaviors are relatively consistent across constructs, further allowing them to be collapsed. Therefore, in the current study, several representative communication behaviors cited in one or more of these constructs have been compiled into a single measure of 22 specific instructor behaviors for student participants to consider. Since the emphasis here is on discovering what specific behaviors students expect of their teachers and how these expectations are then met or violated, it is the behaviors themselves that are focused on, instead of the constructs they represent (immediacy, affinity-seeking, misbehaviors, or motivational behaviors), leading to the fourth and final research question.

RQ4: To what extent do students initially expect their instructors to engage in communication behaviors representative of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and teacher motivators?
Chapter 2: Method

Participants
Participants consisted of students from Miami University enrolled in one of three introductory Communication courses (COM 134, COM 135, COM 136). Participants in the Time 1 survey \((n = 350)\) consisted of 133 males and 217 females. In the Time 2 data collection \((n = 288)\), there were 103 males and 185 females. Of the 153 participants whose Time 1 and Time 2 data could be matched up, 55 were males and 98 were females.

Measures – Time 1

Behavioral expectations. Behavioral expectations were operationalized by combining specific communication behaviors that have consistently been found to affect student outcomes across the literature in immediacy (Gorham, 1988; McCroskey et al., 1996), affinity-seeking (McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986), teacher misbehaviors (Kearney et al., 1991), and motivation (Gorham & Christophel, 1992) into a 22-item behavior scale \((M = 5.41, SD = .51)\). Of these 22 items, 8 are consistent with nonverbal immediacy behaviors, 4 with verbal immediacy, 7 with affinity-seeking, 8 with student motivators, and 2 with teacher misbehaviors. There is significant overlap between many of these items, with several behaviors that are consistent with more than one of the mentioned constructs. Table 1 outlines the 22-item behavioral expectation scale as well as with what constructs these items are consistent. Students were asked to identify how often they expect their instructor to engage in each of these behaviors on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (Never) to 7 (Very Often). The scale was found in this study to have an acceptable reliability of .76.

Behavioral importance. In addition to rating how often they expect instructors to engage in each of these 22 behaviors, participants were asked to indicate how important they view each of these behaviors to be for their overall classroom experience on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (Not at all Important) to 7 (Very Important). The 22 importance items \((M = 5.19, SD = .60)\) were found to have a reliability of .80.

Physical attractiveness. Physical attractiveness was operationalized using McCroskey and McCain’s (1972) interpersonal attraction scale. The scale was originally designed to measure overall interpersonal attraction using dimensions of social \((\alpha = .75)\), task \((\alpha = .86)\), and
physical ($\alpha = .80$) attractiveness. For the purposes of this study, where assessment of instructors’
physical appearance was the main focus of measurement, the scale was restricted to the ten
questions measuring the physical attraction dimension. Each item was measured using a 5-point
Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree). The 10-item scale had a
mean of 3.29 and standard deviation of .72. The current study found the reliability for the
physical attractiveness scale acceptable at .86, which is slightly higher than the reliability found
by McCroskey and McCain (1972) in their original development of this subscale.

Measures – Time 2

Power. Students were asked to evaluate their perceptions of teacher power use with
Schrodt, Witt, and Turman’s (2007) 30-item Teacher Power Use Scale (TPUS). The scale was
developed to measure student perceptions of instructor power use across five dimensions, (1)
coercive power ($\alpha = .82$), (2) referent power ($\alpha = .64$), (3) legitimate power ($\alpha = .84$), (4) expert
power ($\alpha = .76$), and (5) reward power ($\alpha = .70$) using 5-point frequency scales ranging from 1
(Never) to 5 (Very Often).

In the current study, participants were asked how often their instructor engaged in each of
the communication strategies representing the five bases of power using a Likert-type scale
ranging from 1 (Never) to 7 (Always). Each of the five power dimensions were found to be
reliable: coercive ($\alpha = .82$, $M = 2.61$, $SD = 1.23$), reward ($\alpha = .78$, $M = 4.11$, $SD = 1.16$), referent
($\alpha = .87$, $M = 4.72$, $SD = 1.19$), and expert ($\alpha = .83$, $M = 5.59$, $SD = 1.00$). On the legitimate
power scale, one item was dropped (“My teacher makes it clear that his/her decisions and
policies will be backed by the department chair”) in order to establish an acceptable reliability ($\alpha$ = .70, $M = 3.53$, $SD = .93$). With the exception of the subscale for legitimate power, all of the
other dimensions had higher reliabilities in the current study than previously found (Schrodt et
al., 2007).

Instructor behavior. Perceived instructor behavior was operationalized using the same
22 specific behavioral items as the Time 1 expectation scale, modified to reflect perceptions of
actual instructor behavior. Participants were asked to indicate how often their instructor actually
engaged in each of the 22 behaviors using Likert-type measures ranging from 1 (Never) to 7
(Very Often). The scale was found to have good reliability ($\alpha = .87$), with a $M = 5.30$ and $SD = .80$. 
Table 1: Behavioral Expectation Scale & Consistent Behavioral Constructs

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. *Use monotone/dull voice when talking to the class</td>
<td>Nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988; McCroskey et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Smile at the class while talking</td>
<td>Affinity-seeking (McCroskey &amp; McCroskey, 1986); Nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988; McCroskey et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. *Be critical of students in class</td>
<td>Affinity-seeking (McCroskey &amp; McCroskey, 1986); Verbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have an optimistic attitude</td>
<td>Affinity-seeking (McCroskey &amp; McCroskey, 1986)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Make eye contact with the class while talking</td>
<td>Affinity-seeking (McCroskey &amp; McCroskey, 1986); Nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988; McCroskey et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Give interesting lectures</td>
<td>Motivator (Gorham &amp; Christophel, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Use humor</td>
<td>Affinity-seeking (McCroskey &amp; McCroskey, 1986); Motivator (Gorham &amp; Christophel, 1992); Verbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Address students by name</td>
<td>Verbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Be enthusiastic about the course</td>
<td>Affinity-seeking (McCroskey &amp; McCroskey, 1986); Motivator (Gorham &amp; Christophel, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Be approachable in class</td>
<td>Motivator (Gorham &amp; Christophel, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Give clear guidelines for assignments</td>
<td>Motivator (Gorham &amp; Christophel, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Be knowledgeable about course content</td>
<td>Motivator (Gorham &amp; Christophel, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. *Stand in one place while teaching</td>
<td>Nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988; McCroskey et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Use gestures while talking to the class</td>
<td>Nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988; McCroskey et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Use examples to illustrate course concepts</td>
<td>Motivator (Gorham &amp; Christophel, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. *Be absent from or late to class</td>
<td>Misbehavior (Kearney et al., 1991)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Have a relaxed body position while teaching</td>
<td>Nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988; McCroskey et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. *Stand behind a podium or desk while teaching</td>
<td>Nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Refer to the class as “our” or what “we” are doing</td>
<td>Affinity-seeking (McCroskey &amp; McCroskey, 1986); Verbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. *Look at the board or their notes while teaching</td>
<td>Nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988; McCroskey et al., 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. *Make sarcastic comments</td>
<td>Misbehavior (Kearney et al., 1991)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Be available outside of class</td>
<td>Motivator (Gorham &amp; Christophel, 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates a reverse-coded item
**Affective learning.** Affective learning was measured using Mottet and Richmond’s (1998) Affective Learning Measure. This measure was developed by others and later revised by Mottet and Richmond (1998) to measure levels of positive affect students had for both the course ($\alpha = .97$) and instructor ($\alpha = .97$). The Affective Learning Measure used 6 separate constructs to measure course affect, in addition to 2 constructs designed to gauge instructor affect.

In the current study, three of the six course affect constructs were used ($\alpha = .93, M = 5.17, SD = 1.33$), in addition to the two constructs measuring instructor affect ($\alpha = .95, M = 5.20, SD = 1.57$). The constructs were chosen in order to best measure how students felt about both the course and its instructor after the majority of the semester had passed. Each of the five constructs considered here was measured using a series of 4 semantic differential items, resulting in a total scale composed of 20 items.

**Credibility.** Credibility was operationalized using McCroskey and Teven’s (1999) 18-item credibility scale, originally developed in order to accurately measure the multidimensional construct of an individual’s ethos, or credibility. Six 7-point bipolar adjective items are included for each dimension. The scale is composed of three dimensions: Competence ($\alpha = .85$), Trustworthiness ($\alpha = .92$), and Goodwill ($\alpha = .92$), with an overall scale reliability of .94.

In the current study, the goal was to measure how credible students perceive their instructors to be along the three dimensions included in this operationalization of credibility: Competence ($\alpha = .94, M = 6.11, SD = .99$), Trustworthiness ($\alpha = .94, M = 5.96, SD = 1.14$), and Goodwill ($\alpha = .89, M = 5.11, SD = 1.33$). Due to error, one item (“understanding/not understanding”) under the subscale of goodwill was omitted, resulting in a 17-item scale. Each dimension was measured using 7-point bipolar adjectives, and both competence and trustworthiness were found to have slightly higher reliabilities than was originally found.

**Procedure**

Instructors of each section of three introductory Communication courses (COM 134, 135, and 136) were sent an email for them to forward to their students. This email included a brief description of the research, as well as a link directing them to the online survey (Appendix A). The study collected data at two separate times. Participants were informed in the initial email that they had to complete both measures in order to receive research credit for their classes. In
addition, they were informed that, once they completed both sections of the survey, their names would be entered in a drawing for one of ten $20 iTunes gift cards.

Once participants reached the survey, they were informed of their rights as a participant, and asked to give informed consent (Appendix B). Those who consented to participate were directed to the first page of the survey (Appendix C), while those who did not consent were directed to a debriefing page. They were then given instructions for the survey, asking them to think of the class they have directly before their Communication course, and to fill out each question with this course and its instructor in mind. The Time 1 data was collected during the first 10 days of the semester, so as to try and capture students’ initial expectations without them having had too much exposure to the instructor in question. At Time 1 participants completed a measure of expected instructor behaviors, as well as a measure of instructor physical attractiveness, and a few demographic questions, including sex of the student, and perceived age and sex of the instructor.

The Time 2 data were collected during weeks 9 and 10 of the semester. Students who completed the Time 1 survey were emailed a second invitation to participate (Appendix D); included in this email was a reminder about the research and the link to the second survey (Appendix E). At Time 2 participants reported the frequency with which instructors engaged in the same communication behaviors that were assessed in Time 1. Participants also completed measures of teacher power, affective learning, and instructor credibility.

Once participants completed these two surveys, they were directed to a link taking them to a separate survey, where they filled in all identifying information in order to receive credit for participating in the research (Appendix F). This survey was independent from their responses to the research measures, making the connection between each student and their responses very difficult to ascertain.

In order to link participant responses from the first survey to the second survey, students were asked to provide an identification number, consisting of their hometown’s 5-digit zip code and the last 4 digits of their phone number. This identification number maintained anonymity while still allowing the matching of survey responses from Time 1 and Time 2.

**Expectancy violation.** To create the expectancy violation variable used in this study, several steps were taken. First, the behavioral importance ratings were used to create weights for each of the 22 communication behaviors. To determine the weight of each behavior, the
importance of each was divided by the sum of the importance ratings for all 22 items. This allowed behaviors that students perceived as most important to have greater influence in the statistical analyses.

Second, the initial expectancy violation for each communication behavior was determined by subtracting the expectation rating for each item (provided in Time 1), from the corresponding report of the actual behavior (provided in Time 2). Next, the expectancy violation score for each individual item was multiplied by the weight for the same item. And finally, the weighted violations for all 22 behaviors were averaged to create an overall measure of expectancy violation.

These individual weighted violations, along with the computed average weighted expectancy violation, were the variables used in this study; therefore, whenever a reference to expectancy violations is made, these violations will always be weighted. This allows us as researchers and educators to give more meaning to the following results and their role in the overall classroom experience of students.
Chapter 3: Results

Preliminary Results

Previous research has found the behaviors consistent with affinity-seeking, immediacy, and motivation to be related to instructor credibility (e.g., Frymier & Thompson, 1992) and affective learning (e.g., McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986; Richmond, 1990). In order to make sure that the 22 behaviors chosen for the current study had the same expected relationship with these outcome variables, a Pearson correlation was run between each individual behavior and all dimensions of credibility (competence, goodwill, trustworthiness) and affective learning (course and instructor). Overall, the behaviors included in the current study are significantly and positively correlated with all five of these outcome components, indicating that they are valid measures of communicative behavior in the classroom and the relationship between instructor behavior and students’ perceptions of their credibility, as well as levels of affective learning, is consistent with previous literature in instructional communication (Allen et al., 2006; Comadena et al., 2007; Comstock et al., 1995; Folwell, 2000; Frymier & Thompson, 1992; McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986; Witt et al., 2004).

Three of the behaviors, however, have either nonsignificant or very small correlations with the outcome variables, and thus may have less impact in the current context than was previously suspected. These items have to do with addressing students by name, attendance and punctuality, and use of sarcastic comments. Other than these three items, however, all other correlations were significant and positive, indicating acceptable validity for the behaviors chosen to be included in the current research. All of the correlations for each of the 22 behavioral items (identified in Table 1) and the outcome variables are included in Table 2.

Data Analysis

The first hypothesis, which predicted that students of teachers who use predominantly prosocial power bases (expert, reward, referent) would experience more positive violations of their expectations than students of teachers who use predominantly antisocial power bases, was fully supported. To test this hypothesis, Pearson correlations were used. The more coercive and legitimate power students perceived their teachers to use, the more negative violations they experienced, with correlations of -.32 and -.31, respectively, both significant ($p < .01$), indicating
small but definite relationships. Conversely, higher ratings of reward, referent, and expert power use were associated with more positive violations of student expectations. Reward power had a small but definite relationship with positive violations \((r = .23, p < .01)\), while referent \((r = .66, p < .01)\) and expert power \((r = .68, p < .01)\) both were found to have a marked relationship with positive expectancy violations.

The second hypothesis, which posited that perceived level of attractiveness of instructors would be positively correlated with behavioral expectations as measured in Time 1, was supported. Overall expectations had a positive, although low, correlation with instructor attractiveness \((r = .22, p < .01)\). Specifically, physical attractiveness had significant associations with items involving vocal variety \((r = .22, p < .01)\), smiling \((r = .12, p < .05)\), optimism \((r = .17, p < .01)\), the interest level of instructor’s lectures \((r = .17, p < .01)\), the use of humor \((r = .15, p < .05)\), enthusiasm \((r = .20, p < .01)\), and clarity of guidelines \((r = .13, p < .05)\).

The third hypothesis, which predicted that level of attractiveness would be positively correlated with students’ perceptions of prosocial power use, was only partially supported. The relationship between physical attractiveness and reward power and expert power were non-significant. Ratings of instructor’s physical attractiveness were, however, significantly and positively correlated with perceptions of referent power \((r = .23, p < .01)\). Attractiveness had a small negative association with coercive power \((r = -.25, p < .05)\), although it did not have a significant relationship with legitimate power. It would appear, then, that attractiveness is not strongly associated with perceived power use in the classroom, although some limitations may influence these results, which will be discussed later.

The first research question sought to explore whether students have different behavior expectations for male and female teachers. Results of a \(t\)-test indicate that there is a small difference in expectations of positive instructor behaviors based on instructor sex \((t = -2.85, p < .01)\). Students expect slightly more from female teachers \((M = 5.49, SD = 5.49)\) than from male teachers \((M = 5.33, SD = 5.33)\), according to present results.

The second research question queried whether students’ perceptions of instructor age have any relation to their initial expectations of instructor communication behavior. A Pearson correlation was used to test the question, and results indicate that overall expectations have a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Course Affect</th>
<th>Instructor Affect</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Goodwill</th>
<th>Trustworthiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Affect | 1   | .65 | .50 | .47 | .45 |
Instructor Affect | .65 | 1   | .59 | .64 | .65 |
Competence | .50 | .59 | 1   | .46 | .64 |
Goodwill | .47 | .64 | .46 | 1   | .66 |
Trustworthiness | .45 | .65 | .64 | .66 | 1   |

**Bolded items indicate non-significant correlations**

All other items significant at the .05 level
small negative correlation with perceived age of instructor ($r = -.13, p < .05$). Specifically, there were significant correlations between instructor age and expectations of behaviors involving vocal tone and variety ($r = -.14, p < .01$), optimism ($r = -.13, p < .05$), interest level of lectures ($r = -.12, p < .05$), use of humor ($r = -.14, p < .05$), use of students’ names ($r = -.19, p < .01$), enthusiasm ($r = -.12, p < .05$), and approachability in class ($r = -.13, p < .05$). Overall, then, this suggests that students expect fewer positive behaviors from instructors whom they perceive to be older in age. Although these relationships are significant, none of them are very large, and therefore most likely do not account for much variance in student expectations in the classroom.

The fourth hypothesis predicted that students whose initial expectations of instructors are perceived as being exceeded, or positively violated, would report higher levels of both affective learning and perceived instructor credibility. This hypothesis was supported. Students who experienced positive violations reported higher levels of affect for the course ($r = .45, p < .01$), as well as for the instructor ($r = .63, p < .01$), indicating that students’ overall affective learning is positively associated with expectations being exceeded, or positively violated. In addition, students who reported more positive violations also perceived their instructors to have higher levels of competence ($r = .53, p < .01$), goodwill ($r = .55, p < .01$), and trustworthiness ($r = .55, p < .01$). Thus, the results of the current study suggest that meeting and exceeding student expectations is related to positive outcomes in the classroom, benefiting both the student and the instructor.

The third research question examined which specific communication behaviors students perceive to be most important. Table 3 details the order in which behavioral importance was ranked in the current results. The top five behaviors students reported as the most important to their classroom experience are giving clear guidelines for assignments ($M = 6.72$), being knowledgeable about course content ($M = 6.70$), being enthusiastic about the course ($M = 6.48$), being approachable in class ($M = 6.39$), and being available outside of class ($M = 6.34$). These are the instructor behaviors that are most important to students. The five behaviors ranked least important to students are looking at the board or notes while talking ($M = 3.93$), using gestures while talking to the class ($M = 3.81$), making sarcastic comments ($M = 3.68$), standing behind the podium or desk while teaching ($M = 3.13$), and standing in one place while teaching ($M = 3.04$). It should be noted that four of these five least important behaviors were reverse coded items, which may have affected how students ranked them in terms of importance. The inconsistency
Table 3: Ranked Importance of Behaviors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give clear guidelines for assignments</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be knowledgeable about course content</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be enthusiastic about the course</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be approachable in class</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be available outside of class</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give interesting lectures</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use examples to illustrate course concepts</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an optimistic attitude</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make eye contact with the class while talking</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Be absent from or late to class</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Use monotone/dull voice when talking to the class</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use humor</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile at the class while talking</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address students by name</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Be critical of students in class</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a relaxed body position while teaching</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to the class as “our” or what “we” are doing</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Look at the board or notes while teaching</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use gestures while talking to the class</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Make sarcastic comments</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Stand behind a podium or desk while teaching</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Stand in one place while teaching</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates reverse-coded items

of results regarding these particular items suggests that the negative wording may have been confusing for participants.

The fourth and final research question looked at to what extent students initially expect their instructors to engage in the specific communication behaviors measured, all of which are representative of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and teacher motivators in the instructional literature. A table of the behavioral expectation ranking is provided for full results (Table 4). The top five communication behaviors that were most expected of instructors initially are being knowledgeable about course content ($M = 6.64$), being enthusiastic about the course ($M = 6.31$), making eye contact with the class while talking ($M = 6.20$), being absent from or late to class (reverse coded item; $M = 6.19$), and giving clear guidelines for assignments ($M = 6.16$). The five
communication behaviors that students least expect their instructors to engage in are using
gestures while talking to the class ($M = 4.85$), standing in one place while teaching (reverse
coded item, $M = 4.78$), making sarcastic comments (reverse coded item; $M = 4.65$), looking at
the board or their notes while teaching (reverse coded item; $M = 4.44$), and being critical of
students in class (reverse coded item; $M = 3.98$).

Table 4: Ranked Behavioral Expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Expectation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be knowledgeable about course content</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be enthusiastic about the course</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make eye contact with the class while talking</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Be absent from or late to class</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give clear guidelines for assignments</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be approachable in class</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be available outside of class</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have an optimistic attitude</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use examples to illustrate course concepts</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Use monotone/dull voice when talking to the class</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give interesting lectures</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to the class as “our” or what “we” are doing</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smile at the class while talking</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use humor</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a relaxed body position while teaching</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Stand behind podium or desk while teaching</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address students by name</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use gestures while talking to the class</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Stand in one place while teaching</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Make sarcastic comments</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Look at the board or their notes while teaching</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Be critical of students in class</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*indicates reverse-coded items
Chapter 4: Discussion

The overall goal of this research is to use expectancy violation theory (Burgoon & Hale, 1988) as a framework to explore instructor communication behavior from a student perspective. One factor of this particular theory relates to how students assign value to their teachers, or assess their communicator reward valence. Power, physical attractiveness, age, and sex of the instructor all related to expectancy violations, thus providing support for the tenets of expectancy violation theory. Further support was provided for this theory by the linear relationship found between expectancy violations and the positive outcome variables of instructor credibility and student affective learning. Finally, this study seeks to shed more light on which specific behaviors students expect the most, as well as which communication behaviors they find to be most important to their classroom experience. The results and implications of this study warrant further discussion.

Consistent with previous instructional research, the current study illustrates that how instructors enact power in the classroom is associated with many outcomes (McCroskey et al., 1985; McCroskey & Richmond, 1984; Plax et al., 1986; Richmond, 1990; Richmond et al., 1987; Roach, 1991). Also consistent with previous research, the three power bases considered prosocial (expert, referent and reward) are related to positive outcomes (Plax et al., 1986; Richmond, 1990; Richmond & McCroskey, 1983; Schrodt et al., 2008). Specifically, in the current study, these power bases were positively correlated with positive expectancy violations. Power bases considered to be antisocial, both coercive and legitimate, are associated with negative expectancy violations, also reinforcing previous research trends where antisocial power use is found to be negatively correlated with positive outcomes and/or positively correlated with negative outcomes (Plax et al., 1986; Richmond, 1990; Richmond & McCroskey, 1983; Schrodt et al., 2008).

Although the research design here does not allow for causal attributions, these results do tell us that there is a relationship here. Expectancy violation theory allows for components of the communicator reward valence to influence how we perceive our expectations to be positively or negatively violated (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon et al., 1989; Burgoon et al., 1995). It is possible that instructors’ use of these different power bases contributes to their overall communicator reward valence in the classroom, which may explain the relationship between
power and expectancy violation in the current study. Current results are consistent with the conceptualization of communicator reward valence put forward by expectancy violation theory, which includes derived interactional behaviors, such as perception of power use, in addition to initial impressions of a communicator (Burgoon & Hale, 1988).

Future research should explore this area more fully to understand better the role that power use plays in this context. It may be that the specific communication behaviors instructors use in the classroom contribute to student perceptions of which power bases are being practiced, consistent with Richmond and Roach’s (1992) conclusion that power and communication are inextricably linked. It is also possible that the type of power being primarily used could be influencing students’ recall of behaviors engaged by their teachers. For example, if an instructor is seen as using primarily referent power, students may view that teacher as engaging in positive behaviors more frequently than they actually do, while the opposite may be true of an instructor who frequently makes use of coercive power messages.

Future research would be needed in order to ascertain which of these explanations is more likely, but the relationship itself contributes to our knowledge of the interaction and consequence of power in the classroom. What we do know from the current results is that prosocial power use is somehow related to positive expectancy violations, which have positive associations with classroom outcomes. This knowledge makes the area worth further exploration. Both how we approach and violate student expectations of behavior and how we enact power are important to consider due to the positive or negative outcomes they both have on students’ perceptions and experience.

Expectancy violation theory specifically names physical attractiveness as another factor that individuals use to determine a person’s communicator reward valence (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon et al., 1989; Burgoon et al., 1995). This study indicates that the “what is beautiful is good” outlook (Dion et al., 1972) may in fact extend into the classroom, as students were found to have higher expectations of positive behaviors from the instructors that were evaluated as being physically attractive. According to Burgoon et al. (1982), EVT predicts that violations committed by a high reward communicator are more likely to be positively valenced, and thus their expectations positively violated. Much of the literature on physical attractiveness maintains that we perceive the behaviors of those we find attractive to be more positive than the same behaviors would be in an individual we do not find attractive. This would indicate that
students might perceive attractive instructors as positively violating their expectations more than instructors they find less attractive, regardless of the actual behavior. However, EVT also posits that the more we expect from someone, the easier it is for them to disappoint us, or negatively violate our expectations (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). This would mean that the higher expectations students have of teachers they evaluate as physically attractive would result in more negative violations.

In order to determine whether either of these explanations applied here, in a post-hoc analysis, a Pearson correlation was run with overall physical attractiveness and violation scores, resulting in a small, but significant, relationship ($r = .17, p < .05$). This would suggest very small support for the contention that people may associate more positive behaviors with those they find more attractive, supporting the predictions of expectancy violation theory (Burgoon et al., 1982). Overall, expectancy violation theory provides a useful framework for how we view physical attractiveness of instructors. Ratings of how physically attractive an instructor was perceived to be were positively related with both expectations of positive communication behavior and reports of actual positive behavior. It would appear that physical appearance is indeed a factor, however small, that contributes to the communicator reward valence of instructors.

It should, however, be noted that several items on the physical attractiveness measure were left blank by more participants than any other section of this research. It may be that students feel awkward thinking about or reporting on their instructor’s attractiveness level. The correlation found between attractiveness and expectations was small. The current results leave much to be desired in a strong association, and the role of physical attractiveness in students’ assessments of instructors seems small and uncertain. Future research in this area should focus on gauging students’ perceptions of instructors’ physical attractiveness more accurately and completely.

Although physical attractiveness did have a small relationship with expectations, the third hypothesis was only partially supported; physical attractiveness was only found to be significantly related to one prosocial power base, that of referent power. On the surface it seems that physical attractiveness, based on its association with so many positive traits and behaviors in the classroom (e.g., Brosius & Smith, 1990; Goebel & Cashen, 1979; Hamermesh & Parker, 2005; Riniolo et al., 2006), would be associated with anything considered prosocial. However,
when looking at the specific power bases, it makes sense that it is related to referent power and not to expert or reward power.

Referent power is based on likability and a desire to identify with an individual (French & Raven, 1959). Physical attractiveness has been found to have a relationship with liking (Patzer, 1983) and social success (Abbott & Sebastian, 1981; Dermer & Thiel, 1975; Eagly et al., 1991). Both liking and success in social situations indicates an ability to relate to and identify with others, skills that may relate directly to influencing others’ desire to maintain a relationship, and thus, referent power. Reward power, on the other hand, while considered a positive power type, is based on the perception that an individual has the ability to disperse positive outcomes or remove negative ones (French & Raven, 1959). Schrodt et al.’s (2007) scale measuring teacher power use measures how often instructors actually use this ability. Regardless of whether or not an instructor is found attractive by his or her students, they may still have a tendency to use rewards in the classroom. Based on the ability of instructors to administer positive grades, comments, and letters of recommendation, or to remove extra homework, allow students to make up a grade, or mitigate any number of other assignments or consequences that may be considered negative, their reward power can be perceived by students independently of their physical appearance. The results of the current study also suggest that instructors, both those considered more attractive and those considered less attractive, may employ reward power to the same degree, which may be based largely on their shared roles in the classroom.

The third prosocial power base, expert power, is based on the perceived knowledge and experience of an instructor (French & Raven, 1959). Again, physical appearance need not have any impact on how capable and knowledgeable a teacher is perceived as being. An individual’s physical appearance does not seem to have any association with how they express their expertise. Overall, although there are many positive behaviors associated with physical attractiveness in the literature, when the prosocial power bases are looked at more closely, it makes sense for referent power to be the only one with a significant positive relationship with instructor appearance.

The final two variables here thought to be possible factors in communicator reward valence were instructor sex and perceived age. The current study sought to explore, briefly and simply, whether or not students had different behavioral expectations for male and female instructors overall. Results revealed that students expect slightly more positive communication behaviors from female teachers than their male counterparts. Instructor sex, as with physical
attractiveness, is a potential contributor to communicator reward valence (Burgoon & Hale, 1988; Burgoon et al., 1989; Burgoon et al., 1995), and thus may influence how students assess instructors and their behavior. The current study allows us some initial insight into the role of instructor sex in student expectations and classroom experience, but provides more questions than answers, indicating an area where future research is needed to further explore the implications of these higher expectations.

In addition to teacher sex, student’s perception of their age was also considered. The results indicate that, overall, age does not play a very large role in initial student expectations of instructor behavior. The relationship between age and expectations was small, but negative, which tells us that the slight implications of instructor age mean that students expect less from instructors they perceive to be older in age. Younger instructors are expected to engage in more positive immediacy, affinity-seeking, and motivating behaviors. What these results do not tell us is why this is the case. Do students expect instructors closer in age to themselves to identify more with them through more nonverbal and verbal connections? Items involving enthusiasm, humor, and optimism had among the highest in correlations, suggesting that perhaps students expect younger instructors to be more dynamic and energetic, with more positive attitudes. The item involving approachability in class was also among the highest correlations, which is interesting and an important factor to consider. Why do students perceive older teachers to be more unapproachable? Is it something about their rules or behaviors that puts students off? Do they seem busier? Or are students somehow biased? This is an area that may deserve further research, despite the low correlation. Approachability is an important aspect of the classroom climate and students’ comfort level in approaching their instructors is vital to their classroom experience and overall learning (Gorham & Christophel, 1992).

The fourth hypothesis dealt with the expectancy violations students experienced and classroom outcomes, including their affective learning and perceptions of instructor credibility. The current results found that positive expectancy violations were positively related to affective learning and instructor credibility. This is consistent with past research involving expectancy violation in the classroom, which has found positive violations and high communicator reward valence to be associated with positive evaluations of instructors (Calista, 1975) and student satisfaction (Appleton-Knapp & Krentler, 2006). The former is consistent with student’s positive ratings of instructor credibility. The latter would seem to go hand in hand with higher
levels of affective learning. Affective learning for students involves the development of positive attitudes, both for the course itself as well as the instructor (Mottet & Richmond, 1998). These positive attitudes mean that students enjoy the class, the content, and working with a particular teacher, which would seem to contribute to overall satisfaction. Affective learning, while important in its own right, has also been found to have both interactive and reciprocal effects with cognitive learning, or the “mental functioning involved in knowing and understanding subject matter content” (Stancato & Hamachek, 1990, p. 77). Past research has also found positive expectancy violations in the classroom to be correlated with higher levels of cognitive learning (Houser, 2006). Anything that could potentially enhance students’ learning, both affective and cognitive, is important to consider, and the current study suggests that being aware of students’ expectations and engaging in communication behaviors that result in positive violations of these expectations, can contribute to a positive learning and classroom experience.

Expectancy violation theory posits that, when our expectations are violated, the arousal we experience distracts us from the interaction itself and focuses our attention on the source of the arousal, or the person who has violated our expectations (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). The current study allows an examination of how students may evaluate their instructor (the violator) based on the violations they experience, whether they are positive or negative. The results illustrate the positive outcomes that can occur when expectations are exceeded by positive violations. Students who experience more of these positive violations evaluated their instructor’s credibility higher in competence, goodwill and trustworthiness. In the classroom, teachers often seek to establish credibility along all three of these dimensions. Awareness of the communication behaviors that are expected of them, in order to better fulfill students’ expectations, is a useful means of achieving this goal and enhancing their credibility and relationship with students.

Although the previous discussion has provided support for expectancy violation theory in the classroom, and shown how positive expectancy violations are related to positive outcomes, one of the most valuable contributions of this particular study is the glimpse into the perspectives of students. Without this perspective, it becomes impossible for instructors to approach the goal of positively violating students’ expectations; we must first know what these expectations are. In addition, being aware of what communication behaviors students find to be most important allows us to give more accurate weight to our behaviors.
Although, as researchers and scholars, we may be familiar with the pros and cons of certain behaviors, and how these behaviors relate to specific outcome variables, this study offers a chance to see what behaviors students themselves find to be most important to their classroom experience. The results indicate that many of the communication behaviors students rated as most important to them are behaviors that incorporate verbal communication, such as providing clear guidelines for assignments and being knowledgeable about course content. These also relate directly to students’ performance and learning experience in the course, which should indeed be very important. Also related to students’ ability to perform well and understand the material are the items involving approachability in class and availability out of class. This suggests that students want to be able to use their instructors as a resource above and beyond the lecture provided during class time, and desire a comfort level that allows them to feel confident asking questions and getting answers. These are incredibly important contributors to the educational experience, and it is heartening to know that students recognize them as such. These student ratings of importance are fairly consistent with what Sander et al. (2000) found to be most important to students, including knowledge, enthusiasm, and approachability. These results reiterate the vital need to establish open and available relationships between instructor and student in order to provide the best experience for all involved.

The third most important behavior, as rated by students, was enthusiasm about the course. Although the workload and responsibility that comes along with post-secondary instruction can be exhausting, this rating is just a reminder that keeping our enthusiasm for the subjects being taught, as well as for the assignments and learning process in general, is a valuable skill and something that should take precedence.

The least important behaviors, as rated by students, were almost all of the items that were reverse coded in the current study. This may indicate a weakness in the design, as it is possible that asking students to rate the importance of negatively worded items was confusing and misleading. All five of the lowest rated behaviors were related to nonverbal behaviors (eye contact, gestures, movement), except for one (making sarcastic comments). Sarcasm is an interesting item in this study, and in the future should most likely be taken out and studied on its own. It did not achieve consistent results with the rest of the items, suggesting that there are unique qualities to both the use and interpretation of sarcasm that would be best understood when looked at individually. Considerations such as the relationship between the instructor and
the student, how the sarcasm is used, or at whom or what the sarcasm is directed are all factors that could, and most likely do, affect how sarcasm is interpreted (as a negative or positive behavior).

In order to create a more student-centered classroom, instructors must first start where the students are, considering what is important to them and what they wish to experience and gain during their time in the course. This study begins to give us the tools to use the perspectives of students as a starting point upon which to build. Of course, in order to begin where the student is, we must not only consider what is important to them, but also what expectations they have of us as teachers.

The final research question explored the extent to which students initially expect teachers to engage in specific communication behaviors. Interestingly, three of the top five behaviors most expected were consistent with the behaviors considered most important to students (being knowledgeable about course content, being enthusiastic about the course, and giving clear guidelines for assignments). It makes sense that students would expect someone entrusted with the instruction in a certain topic to be knowledgeable about it. And, in order for students to understand what is expected of them and to perform well, they would need clear guidelines on what they are supposed to do. It also makes sense that, should an individual devote themselves to a particular field of study, they would also be enthusiastic about it. The other two behaviors most expected by students initially are that instructors come to class regularly and on time (an expectation educators hopefully have of themselves as well), and that their instructors make eye contact with the class while talking.

It is interesting that students expect their instructors to make eye contact more than most other behaviors, and yet, the reverse coded item of “looking at the board or notes while talking” was rated as one of the least expected behaviors (after reverse coding had been completed). This essentially indicates that students rated eye contact both as one of the most and least expected behaviors, which is very confusing. This suggests that the reverse coded behavioral items may have been a limitation in the current study, and future research may wish to eliminate the reverse coding, at least when attempting to measure expectations or importance. Another indicator of the weakness of these items is that reverse coded items make up the entire bottom of the list, with students expecting these behaviors the least (even after reverse coding had been applied).
Again, the least expected behaviors are fairly consistent with the least important behaviors, with the exception of being critical of students in class, which is the very least expected communication behavior for instructors to engage in. Sarcasm again makes the bottom of the list, as does using gestures, movement, and eye contact.

It is important to note that, even the least expected item had a mean of 3.98 on a 7-point Likert scale, indicating that students expect all of these communication behaviors to be employed to some significant extent. This is notable, and consistent with the literature on these behaviors and their original constructs of verbal and nonverbal immediacy, affinity-seeking, motivational/demotivational behaviors, and misbehaviors (Allen et al., 2006; Christophel & Gorham, 1995; Comadena et al., 2007; Comstock et al., 1995; Folwell, 2000; Frymier & Thompson, 1992; Kearney et al., 1991; McCroskey & McCroskey, 1986; Richmond, 1990). What we are discussing here are expectations of degree; not only do we now know how important and influential these behaviors are in the context of many instructional communication variables and outcomes, but we also know that students actually expect us to engage in them. This means that, should instructors neglect to employ these communication behaviors, it may not simply affect classroom outcomes directly, but could also have an undesirable influence via negative expectancy violations. The linear relationship indicated by current results suggests that, while positive violations correlate with positive outcomes, negative violations correlate with more negative violations (i.e., less perceived credibility and lower levels of affective learning). Being aware that specific communication behaviors representative of immediacy, affinity-seeking, and motivators not only contribute to positive outcomes in the classroom, but are also expected by students is important. This underscores the significance of instructors’ awareness of their behavior, in addition to their awareness of student expectations. The results of this study overall are consistent with expectancy violation theory in that how students’ expectations are violated significantly relates to their overall classroom experience and their perception of their teacher.

Limitations

There were a few limitations in the current study that should be mentioned. First and foremost, the study used a correlational design, so none of the results can be interpreted as causal. Second, due to participant attrition between Time 1 and Time 2, as well as participant
error, the sample size was not as large as was desired. A larger sample size would have had greater power to detect smaller effects, and would make the results more generalizable than they are currently. In addition, several of the behavioral items, both in the expectation scale and the behavior scale, were reverse-coded items. This may have been confusing for participants, as many of the associations were not as strong or significant for these items as the others, and were also often inconsistent with results for other behavioral items.

It should also be noted that expectations are dynamic and therefore may constantly be changing. Indeed, the very first day of class is often a platform for laying out expectations for the course, which may already contribute to altering students’ expectations of their instructors. Therefore, although it is acknowledged that the expectations reported here may not be students’ initial expectations before they even entered the classroom, they are as close to them as possible while still providing a practical and functional data collection. As expectations are continuously changing and shifting, it is difficult to capture them at any one point as purely uninfluenced.

Finally, the report of instructor behavior was based solely on the observations and perceptions of the students; there was no objective record kept of how often their instructors actually engaged in each specific communication behavior. Although this study was consciously focused on the perspective of the student, future research could also explore how students perceive instructor behavior compared with actual records of the instructor’s communication.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

The results of the current study suggest several areas that are ripe for future research. Primarily, the exploration of students’ expectations prior to even entering a classroom is an important area of study in order to understand where students are coming from. For instance, understanding more about where and how students are forming specific expectations would be an interesting area to learn more about. Do social norms provide the primary basis for specific expectations? Are they based mostly on past experience in the classroom? If this is the case, then how do students among the different education levels compare in terms of their expectations and their subsequent violations. For instance, instructor behavior and the overall classroom experience is often different between high school and college; if first-year students are basing their expectations on their personal experiences in high school, then these students may be
experiencing stronger violations, either positive or negative, in the post-secondary classroom. This is in contrast to upper-class students, who may be more familiar with the structure of the post-secondary classroom and behaviors of instructors, and therefore their expectations may align more closely with the actual communication behaviors observed. In addition, students may be developing specific expectations based on observations made by friends and acquaintances who have had classes with a specific teacher before, or perhaps even online rating systems where students share information and opinions about college instructors. This is an area that requires additional research in order to be more fully understood. How students form their expectations may influence how instructors approach these expectations. For instance, keeping in mind the transition that students make between high school and college, there may be specific communication behaviors that are more effective in easing this transition for first-year students.

Additionally, the current study has shown that initial expectations and their subsequent violation are significantly related to outcome variables in the classroom. However, only 22 specific communication behaviors were examined here. What other expectations do students have entering a new course? How are these expectations met or violated, and what relation does this have to their classroom experience and success? These are questions that, if explored, could provide further insight into student perspectives, and thus aid educators in providing a more student-centered classroom experience. Students may expect different lecture styles or organization, frequency, type, and/or depth of examples, or communication styles, to name a few possibilities. Some of these have been previously explored, but violations of these expectations and outcomes have been an area lacking in the research. In addition, although we know that there is a relationship between expectancy violations and instructors’ use of different power types, it would be interesting to explore what types of power use students expect from their instructors and how these expectations are met or violated. This is an area that needs further research in order to more fully understand what students expect from their teachers and therefore how to approach students in a way that will positively violate these expectations.

**Conclusion**

Students, whether they are aware of it or not, enter the classroom at the beginning of a new semester with a myriad of expectations. And, whether they know it or not, how these expectations are met or violated can have an impact on several outcomes involving their
perception of the instructor and their own personal experience and learning. The current study has contributed further support for the consideration of expectancy violation theory in the classroom. It has also allowed us a view into the perspective of students regarding the communication behaviors of their teachers in the college classroom. Although there are many areas that need further research in order to understand and apply this knowledge more fully, it is important to consider student expectations as a way of creating a more student-centered classroom. Development and training for new instructors may include information on student expectations and the importance of their consideration, as well as the reasons why positive expectancy violations are valuable, both for the teacher’s image and the student’s educational experience and success. There are many communication behaviors that have been shown to have positive or negative outcomes in the classroom, but it may need to be considered how not only the employment of these behaviors, but also how they measure up to students’ expectations may play a part in instructional outcomes.
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Appendix A
Survey Invitation One

Dear Student:

My name is Jessalyn Vallade and I am a graduate student in the Department of Communication. I am conducting a research project for my thesis on student expectations and instructor behavior. This study is a two-part study, which means that you will be asked to complete a survey at this time, and then again later in the semester. Participating in this research project will satisfy the research requirement in your COM 134, 135, and/or 136 class. If you are enrolled in two of these classes, participation will count in both classes. If you choose not to participate in this study, there will be several other opportunities available this semester for you to satisfy this course requirement.

*You must complete both parts of the study to receive credit.* In addition, once you have completed both parts of the study, your name will be automatically entered to win one of ten $20 iTunes gift cards.

To participate in this research project, just click on this link (www. Prezza.com), and follow the directions. After completing each survey you will have the opportunity to provide your name and your communication instructor’s name so that I can notify them when you have earned the research credit. This identifying information will NOT be linked to your survey responses. In addition, please note that you are NOT being asked to report on your communication instructor, but an instructor that will remain anonymous. In addition, your responses will not be shown directly to any of the instructors. The privacy of survey responses will prevent them from affecting your grade in any way. The only effect your participation will have on your grade is through the satisfaction of a research requirement.

If you have questions about this research please contact me or my faculty advisor, Dr. Ann Bainbridge Frymier at 529-7473 or frymieab@muohio.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as participants in a research study please contact the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship at 529-3600. Thank you for your time and effort, it is much appreciated.

Sincerely,
Jessalyn I. Vallade
Graduate Student
Department of Communication
Miami University
(513) 529-7182
valladji@muohio.edu
Appendix B
Informed Consent

Introduction: I appreciate you taking the time to complete this questionnaire. This is a two-part study, which means that you will be asked to fill out a short questionnaire today, and then will be contacted via email mid-semester and asked to complete a second survey. In order to be eligible to receive credit and be entered into the drawing for a prize, you must complete BOTH parts of the study. You should be able to complete today’s portion of the study in 15 minutes or less. The second portion should take you approximately half an hour to complete. You must be 18 years or older to participate in this study.

Purpose of the Study The purpose of this study is to examine student expectations and instructor behavior, and the effects these have on students’ educational experience and perceptions of instructors.

Safeguarding your Identity The responses you provide today are being collected with online survey software that is designed to secure your data and provide you with confidentiality. Nevertheless, despite these safeguards, there is always a remote possibility of hacking or other security breaches that could compromise the confidentiality of the information you provide. Thus, you should remember that you are free to decline to answer any question that makes you uncomfortable for any reason.

1. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I have the right to withdraw from this study at any time without penalty; all I have to do is close out of the survey without submitting my answers.

2. I understand that I can refuse to answer specific questions.

3. The purpose of this research has been explained to me, and I understand the explanation.

4. I understand that I have the right to have this study explained to my satisfaction upon completion of the questionnaire.

5. I understand that the information I give in this study is confidential, and will in no way be available to people outside of the research process.

6. I understand that the data I provide in this study may be used by other scientists for secondary analysis. Again, these data will be treated in the strictest confidence. Future scientists will not be able to identify individual responses.

7. I understand that a copy of the research report for this study will be made available to me upon request.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship at 529-3600. If you have questions regarding this
research project, ask the researcher, Jessalyn Vallade at 529-7182 or valladji@muohio.edu, or
the faculty advisor, Dr. Ann Bainbridge Frymier at 529-7473 or frymieab@muohio.edu.

Agree Disagree

Given these statements, I freely consent to participate in this research project within the Department of Communication.
Appendix C
Participant Survey (Time 1)

Instructions: We all have expectations for what is normal and appropriate in certain situations. Think of the class you have directly before your Communication class.

What department is this class in? (Ex: ENG, MKT, CHM, etc.) ______

Think back to the first day of class and how you expected the instructor to behave. Answer the following items by selecting the number closest to how often you expect your instructor to engage in each of these behaviors. In addition, select the number closest to how important you feel each of these behaviors is to you and your classroom experience.

I EXPECT MY INSTRUCTOR TO:

1. Use monotone/dull voice when talking to the class
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Often
   Not at all Important  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Important

2. Smile at the class while talking
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Often
   Not at all Important  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Important

3. Be critical of students in class
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Often
   Not at all Important  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Important

4. Have an optimistic attitude
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Often
   Not at all Important  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Important

5. Make eye contact with the class while talking
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Often
   Not at all Important  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Important

6. Give uninteresting lectures
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Often
   Not at all Important  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Very Important
7. Use humor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Address students by name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Be unenthusiastic about the course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Be approachable in class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Give clear guidelines for assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Be knowledgeable about course content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Stand in one place while teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Use gestures while talking to the class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Use examples to illustrate course concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Be absent from or late to class
17. Have a relaxed body position while teaching
   \[\text{Never} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Often}\]
   \[\text{Not at all Important} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Important}\]

18. Stand behind a podium or desk while teaching
   \[\text{Never} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Often}\]
   \[\text{Not at all Important} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Important}\]

19. Refer to the class as “our” or what “we” are doing
   \[\text{Never} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Often}\]
   \[\text{Not at all Important} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Important}\]

20. Look at the board or their notes while teaching
   \[\text{Never} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Often}\]
   \[\text{Not at all Important} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Important}\]

21. Make sarcastic comments
   \[\text{Never} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Often}\]
   \[\text{Not at all Important} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Important}\]

22. Be available outside of class
   \[\text{Never} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Often}\]
   \[\text{Not at all Important} \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \text{ Very Important}\]

Instructions: Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about your instructor by selecting the number that most closely describes your level of agreement.

1. I think he/she is quite handsome/pretty.
   \[1 \text{ (Strongly Disagree)} \quad 2 \text{ (Disagree)} \quad 3 \text{ (Neutral)} \quad 4 \text{ (Agree)} \quad 5 \text{ (Strongly Agree)}\]

2. He/she is very sexy looking.
   \[1 \text{ (Strongly Disagree)} \quad 2 \text{ (Disagree)} \quad 3 \text{ (Neutral)} \quad 4 \text{ (Agree)} \quad 5 \text{ (Strongly Agree)}\]
3. I find him/her attractive physically.
   1 (Strongly Disagree)  2 (Disagree)  3 (Neutral)  4 (Agree)  5 (Strongly Agree)

4. I don’t like the way he/she looks.
   1 (Strongly Disagree)  2 (Disagree)  3 (Neutral)  4 (Agree)  5 (Strongly Agree)

5. He/she is somewhat ugly.
   1 (Strongly Disagree)  2 (Disagree)  3 (Neutral)  4 (Agree)  5 (Strongly Agree)

6. He/she wears neat clothes.
   1 (Strongly Disagree)  2 (Disagree)  3 (Neutral)  4 (Agree)  5 (Strongly Agree)

7. The clothes he/she wears are not becoming.
   1 (Strongly Disagree)  2 (Disagree)  3 (Neutral)  4 (Agree)  5 (Strongly Agree)

8. He/she is not very good looking.
   1 (Strongly Disagree)  2 (Disagree)  3 (Neutral)  4 (Agree)  5 (Strongly Agree)

9. She/he is not very well groomed.
   1 (Strongly Disagree)  2 (Disagree)  3 (Neutral)  4 (Agree)  5 (Strongly Agree)

10. He/she is repulsive to me.
    1 (Strongly Disagree)  2 (Disagree)  3 (Neutral)  4 (Agree)  5 (Strongly Agree)

________________________________________

Your sex:     Male    Female

Instructor sex:  Male    Female

Estimated Instructor age (2 digits): ____________

________________________________________

The following information will be your unique identifier. You will be asked to supply these same numbers again on the second survey later in the semester in order to match your responses up without identifying you specifically to the researcher.

The zip code of your hometown: _________________

The last 4 digits of your phone number: ________________
Appendix D
Survey Invitation Two

Dear Student:

My name is Jessalyn Vallade and I am a graduate student in the Department of Communication. I am conducting a research project for my thesis on student expectations and instructor behavior. This study is a two-part study, the first part of which you have already completed.

*You must complete both parts of the study to receive credit.* In addition, once you have completed both parts of the study, your name will be automatically entered to **win** one of **ten $20 iTunes gift cards.**

To continue participating in this research project, just click on this link (https://survey.muohio.edu/Checkbox/Survey.aspx?s=2279607569744e8fa92dcbcb7420a24) and follow the directions. Make sure you provide the identifying information at the beginning of the survey so that your responses can be matched up with the first survey you completed at the beginning of the semester.

After completing this survey you will have the opportunity to provide your name and the name of your communication instructor so that I can notify them that you have earned the research credit. In addition, please note that you are NOT being asked to report on your communication instructor, but an instructor that will remain anonymous.

If you have questions about this research please contact me or my faculty advisor, Dr. Ann Bainbridge Frymier at 529-7473 or frymieab@muohio.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as participants in a research study please contact the Office for the Advancement of Research and Scholarship at 529-3600. Thank you for your time and effort, it is much appreciated.

Sincerely,
Jessalyn I. Vallade
Graduate Student
Department of Communication
Miami University
(513) 529-7182
valladij@muohio.edu
Appendix E
Participant Survey (Time 2)

The following information makes up your unique identifier. These numbers are necessary in order to match your responses up to your first survey without identifying you specifically to the researcher.

The zip code of your hometown: _________________

The last 4 digits of your phone number: _________________

______________________________________________________________________________

Instructions: Think of the class you have directly before your Communication class.

What department is this class in? (ENG, MKT, CHM, etc.) ______

Keep the instructor of this class in mind while completing this questionnaire. Answer the following items by selecting the number closest to how often your instructor engages in each of these behaviors.

MY INSTRUCTOR:

1. Uses a monotone/dull voice when talking to the class
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Often

2. Smiles at the class while talking
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Often

3. Is critical of students in class
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Often

4. Has an optimistic attitude
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Often

5. Makes eye contact with the class while talking
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Often

6. Gives uninteresting lectures
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Often
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Uses humor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Addresses students by name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Is unenthusiastic about the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Is approachable in class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Gives clear guidelines for assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Is knowledgeable in course content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Stands in one place while teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Uses gestures while talking to the class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Uses examples to illustrate course concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Is absent from or late to class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Has a relaxed body position while teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Stands behind a podium or desk while teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Refers to the class as “our” or what “we” are doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Avoids looking at students while teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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21. Makes sarcastic comments
Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Often

22. Is available outside of class
Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Often

Instructions: Please indicate how frequently the following situations occur in your class by selecting the appropriate number below.

1. When a student demonstrates mastery of course material, my teacher commends and affirms the student.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

2. I feel that my teacher and I are “on the same page”
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

3. My teacher’s lectures are clearly organized and well delivered.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

4. My teacher makes it clear that his/her decisions and policies will be backed by the department chair.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

5. My teacher communicates in ways that demonstrate advanced knowledge/expertise in the content area of the course.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

6. If students question or challenge course policy, my teacher responds by acting dominant or dictatorial.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

7. My teacher rewards the class for complying with his/her requests.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

8. When students turn in assignments late, my teacher puts them on a guilt trip.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

9. My teacher demonstrates commitment to the class by being authentic and genuine when interacting with students.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always
10. My teacher uses his/her position as Professor to maintain complete and total control of the classroom.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

11. I can tell my teacher really knows how to teach this course by the way he/she organizes the class and delivers instruction.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

12. My teacher punishes students who do not follow his/her instructions.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

13. My teacher publicly recognizes students who exceed expectations in course performances.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

14. When students perform well, my teacher becomes more flexible and willing to negotiate details like assignment deadlines.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

15. My teacher builds rapport with the class by relating to students in an open and approachable manner.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

16. I see things from my teacher’s perspective
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

17. My teacher acts as though students ought never to disobey a teacher or fail to comply with teacher requests.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

18. My teacher discusses current theory and research in the class.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

19. When a student performs well in the course, my teacher gives him/her recognition in the class.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

20. My teacher belittles or puts down students if they do not perform up to expectations.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

21. My teacher glares at students who misbehave in class.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always

22. I find myself identifying with my teacher because we have a lot in common.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Always
23. My teacher relates to students in ways that are formal and distant.
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Always

24. My teacher says things like “If you don’t like the course policies, you can always drop this class and take a different one”
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Always

25. I can tell by the way my teacher speaks with the class that he/she is an expert in the content area of the course.
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Always

26. When a student follows my teacher’s instructions, he/she receives compliments or praise from the teacher.
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Always

27. When students do not perform at an acceptable level, my teacher embarrasses them in front of the class.
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Always

28. My teacher demonstrates that he/she considers the position of Professor to be superior to that of a student.
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Always

29. I feel that I can relate to my teacher as a person because of the personal stories and illustrations he/she shares with the class.
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Always

30. When my teacher discusses course information, I can tell he/she is a credible source in the content area.
   Never  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Always

**Instructions:** Please indicate your evaluations of the following five statements by circling the appropriate number between adjectives. The closer the number is to an adjective, the more certain you are of your evaluation.

*My attitude about the content of this course:*
1. Bad  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Good
2. Valuable  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Worthless
3. Unfair  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Fair
4. Negative  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Positive

*In “real life” situations, my likelihood of actually recalling and using some of the information from this class:*
9. Likely  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  Unlikely
My likelihood of actually enrolling in another course of related content if I had the choice and my schedule permits (if you are graduating, assume you would still be here):
17. Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Likely
18. Possible 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Impossible
19. Improbable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Probable
20. Would Not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Would

My attitude about the instructor of this course:
25. Good 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Bad
26. Worthless 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Valuable
27. Fair 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unfair
28. Positive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Negative

The likelihood of my taking another course with the teacher of this course, if I have a choice (If you are graduating, assume you would still be here):
29. Unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Likely
30. Possible 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Impossible
31. Improbable 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Probable
32. Would Not 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Would

Instructions: Please indicate your impression of your instructor by circling the appropriate number between the pairs of adjectives below. The closer the number is to an adjective, the more certain you are of your evaluation.

Intelligent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unintelligent
Untrained 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Trained
Inexpert 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Expert
Informed 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Uninformed
Incompetent 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Competent
Bright 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Stupid

Cares about me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Doesn’t care about me
Has my interests at heart 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Doesn’t have my interests at heart

Self-centered 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Not self-centered
Concerned with me 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unconcerned with me
Insensitive 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Sensitive
Not understanding 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Understanding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dishonest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrustworthy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Trustworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Dishonorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Immoral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unethical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ethical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Genuine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your sex: Male Female

Instructor sex: Male Female

Estimated instructor age (2 digits): ______
Appendix F
Student Credit Survey

The following information allows the researcher to keep track of who completes this research project for credit in their communication class. Your email address is necessary in order to email you the link to the second part of the study later in the semester. Please remember, you must complete BOTH parts of the study in order to receive research credit and a chance to win an iTunes gift card. The identifying information you provide here is an independent survey, and is therefore not connected to the responses you gave on the preceding questionnaire.

Your Name: _________________________________

Your Email Address: _________________________________

Please select all communication classes that you are currently enrolled in and provide your instructor’s last name for each. Select all that apply:

COM 134    Instructor: _________________________________

COM 135    Instructor: _________________________________

COM 136    Instructor: _________________________________