Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Message Framing in the Classroom: The Relationship Between Message Frames and Student Perceptions of Instructor Power

Joseph L. Chesebro & Matthew M. Martin

This study examined the role of message framing in the classroom and the relationship between different frames and students' perceptions of instructor power use. Requests or expectations offered by instructors may have various meanings for students, depending on the way in which these messages are framed. In turn, these frames may influence various student perceptions and behaviors. Students were presented with the same set of instructor expectations in the form of a hypothetical syllabus, but in one condition, the students' right to choose to comply with the expectations was made more explicit than in the other condition. Students' behavioral intent and their perception of the instructor's use of power bases were measured. The low-choice condition resulted in greater student perceptions of instructor coercive and legitimate power and greater reported intent to comply with one of the three instructor requests that were presented.

Keywords: Instructor Power Bases; Message Framing; Student Perceptions

Teachers often encounter situations in which they can choose to frame a message in a variety of ways. For example, when denying a request, different teachers may utilize any one of the following strategies (among others): "That's tough, deal with it," "I'm sorry, but I have to follow policy," "No," "I've denied this request before, so to

Joseph L. Chesebro (EdD, West Virginia University, 1999) is an associate professor in the Department of Communication at the State University of New York Brockport. Matthew M. Martin (PhD, Kent State University, 1992) is an associate professor and chair in the Department of Communication Studies at West Virginia University. *Correspondence*: Joseph L. Chesebro, Department of Communication, State University of New York Brockport, 350 New Campus Dr., Brockport, NY 14420; E-mail: jchesebr@brockport.edu

remain consistent, I have to deny yours,'' ''I can't because it wouldn't be fair to the other students,'' or ''No way, I can't believe you'd even ask me!'' Regardless of the word choice and nonverbal expressions used in these examples, in each case, the substance of the answer is a ''no'' to the request. However, if we imagine students receiving the different denials, it is easy to envision the varied reactions they might have, the ways these different reactions might influence their learning experience, and the different ways they might evaluate the instructor (both formally and informally). For example, the frames an instructor uses may influence student perceptions of the power bases from which he or she is operating. This study sought to provide an initial investigation into message framing in the classroom and its relationship to students' perceptions of instructor use of power.

This study examined the possible role of high- or low-choice framed messages in the classroom. In any given instructional situation, students are able to make choices (to attend or not attend class, how to behave in class, how hard to study, etc.). However, these choices may or may not be explicitly referenced in an instructor's policies. Messages might be framed in a high-choice way to stress the fact that students have the ability and the responsibility to make choices, whereas low-choice messages do not explicitly reveal the choices students are able to make in a situation. High-choice frames draw attention to choice, whereas low-choice messages do not. Using attendance policies as an example, is not uncommon to see low-choice frames on syllabi, which often include something like, ''You are expected to attend all classes, and for each class you miss beyond the first two, there will be a reduction of your final grade.'' Even with this message, students can still choose whether to attend. However, the ability and responsibility to choose is even more salient when a message with the exact same literal meaning is delivered with a high-choice frame: ''Although you are expected to attend all classes, the choice of whether or not to attend ultimately is yours. For each class you choose to miss beyond the first two, there will be a reduction of your final grade.'' In this second example, the message is framed in a way that makes the students' choice-making ability much more salient. In addition, this high-choice frame may be a more prosocial way to communicate the message to students and, as a result, lead to perceptions of the use of more positive power bases by the instructor.

The importance of recognizing prosocial approaches to classroom situations is clear when considering outcomes like student resistance to instructors or students' perceptions of instructors. For example, students who perceive their teachers as using unfair procedures are more likely to resist those teachers and use hostility, as well as direct and indirect aggression, toward these teachers (Chory-Assad, 2002; Chory-Assad & Paulsel, 2004a, 2004b; Paulsel & Chory-Assad, 2004, 2005). Such research suggests that teachers wishing to avoid student resistance, hostility, and aggression should do whatever they can to use their power appropriately and in a way that students perceive as being fair. In addition, student perceptions of instructor confirmation also are related to student perceptions of cognitive and affective learning, as well as reduced student receiver apprehension (Ellis, 2000, 2004). Perceptions of instructor confirmation are positively related to perceptions of instructor prosocial

power use (Turman & Schrodt, 2006) and to more positive evaluations of instructors (Schrodt, Turman, & Soliz, 2006). Collectively, research in these areas thus points to the possible advantage of tactfully framing messages in ways that are prosocial while remaining likely to yield the desired outcomes for teachers.

Framing and Communication

Research on framing typically points to early uses of the term by Bateson (1972) and Goffman (1974). Bateson defined a psychological frame as a class or set of messages or meaningful actions that include some information and exclude other information. They are metacommunicative in the sense that they help the receiver understand the messages contained within the frame. Goffman conceptualized frames as schemata that help define situations and aid in the interpretation of situations. A more comprehensive definition suggests that "to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation" (Entman, 1993, p. 52). It is important to note that two different frames of a given situation, although they select different aspects of the situation, are "objectively equivalent descriptions of the same problem" (Levin, Schneider, & Gaeth, 1998, p. 149).

Two components involved in framing are selection and salience (Entman, 1993). In describing any situation, messages will feature (select) some aspects of the situation, which also means that other aspects of the situation will be excluded. The process of selection assures that some aspects of the situation will be made more salient for receivers, in the sense that the selected information will be more noticeable and likely to be remembered (Entman, 1993). For example, consider the difference between framing a difficult classroom situation for students either as a "problem" or a "challenge." The first frame implies that the situation is a nuisance to be dealt with, whereas the second implies that it is an opportunity to succeed. Even with the changing of only one word, certain aspects of the situation have been made more or less salient. Frames involving more complete descriptions would have an even greater opportunity to define a given situation.

Choice Framing

Technically speaking, students always have choices. Regardless of rewards such as grades or punishments such as reductions of grades, students can choose whether to attend class, submit work on time (if at all), to behave appropriately in class, and so forth. Even courses with strict policies have students who choose not to follow those policies. However, the ability to choose may not be made explicit to students, which suggests that it is possible to frame a message in terms of whether the amount of choice the receiver has is implicit ("If your conduct in class is disruptive, you will be asked to leave") or explicit ("If you choose to disrupt the class, you will be asked to leave"). This type of framing has not received much research attention, although it is mentioned in nonacademic literature, particularly in the area of parenting. It often

appears in the form of a suggestion to offer children choices (most notably in Dreikurs, 1992). Despite a lack of research, choice framing may offer a way for teachers to tactfully send difficult classroom messages in prosocial ways while achieving desired outcomes. One area of research that has distinguished between prosocial and antisocial approaches to teaching is that which examines instructors' use of power in the classroom.

Instructor Power

Since the early 1980s, the study of power in the classroom has received a considerable amount of attention by instructional communication researchers, and much of this early research was informed by French and Raven's (1959) categorization of power bases. Five key power bases include coercive power (the threat of administering punishing consequences or the removal of rewarding ones), legitimate power (based on the power one has been assigned by an individual or an organization), reward power (the use of positive consequences or removal of negative ones), referent power (which is based on good relationships and identification with those in power), and expert power (related to perceptions of one's knowledge and ability in a given area).

Research on power bases in the classroom has yielded a number of interesting findings. First, students perceive various forms of power usage differently. Turman and Schrodt (2006) provided support for the idea that some bases of power are prosocial and others antisocial, finding that dimensions of teacher confirmation were associated with expert, reward, and referent power, all of which are considered to be prosocial. This distinction is important when noting the benefits of more prosocial uses of power. Students perceive higher referent power and lower coercive and legitimate power to be associated with learning (Richmond & McCroskey, 1984). More recently, Golish and Olson (2000) found that instructor reward power was related to student use of prosocial behavior alteration techniques (BATs), whereas coercive power was related to student use of antisocial BATs. The power bases instructors choose to employ are related both to student perceptions and behavior.

These studies provide a context in which we can examine the effect of different message frames on student perceptions of instructor power bases. Because low-choice frames are more ''to the point'' and directive of behavior by demonstrating a more authoritarian perspective, we would expect them to be associated with student perceptions of instructor use of coercive and legitimate power; and because high-choice frames suggest the positive outcomes of making good choices, we would expect them to be associated with student perceptions of instructor use of reward power:

> H1: *Students exposed to low-choice message frames will report greater perceptions of instructors' use of coercive and legitimate power than students exposed to high-choice frames.*
> H2: *Students exposed to high-choice message frames will report greater perceptions of instructors' use of reward power than students exposed to low-choice frames.*

Influence studies often examine outcomes related to the amount of anger aroused by the influence attempt (Dillard & Shen, 2005; Miller, Lane, Deatrick, Young, & Potts,

2007; Quick & Stephenson, 2007). Given that this study involves different ways of framing influence messages, it is worthwhile to examine the extent to which each message frame arouses the anger of respondents. Because high-choice frames are less directive and impersonal than low-choice frames, we expected high-choice frames to be less likely than low-choice frames to associate with perceptions of anger from respondents:

> H3: *Students exposed to high-choice message frames will report experiencing less anger than those exposed to low-choice message frames.*

Influence studies also commonly examine behavioral intent to comply with requests (Dillard & Shen, 2005). Although message framing may have important affective outcomes (e.g., anger), it also is important to assess its effectiveness. Because low-choice frames are direct, they may elicit greater perceived resistance and less intent to comply from respondents than high-choice frames, which may elicit greater intent to comply by generating less resistance:

> H4: *High-choice message frames will lead students to report a greater intent to comply with the instructor's expectations for attendance, in-class behavior, and quality of work.*

Method

Participants

Students ($N = 225$) from a large mid-Atlantic university were asked to participate in a study involving instructional communication. Students were offered an attendance credit that contributed to their total attendance score. Student participation was voluntary. Participants were drawn from general service courses, which are taken by students from most majors across the university.

Procedures

Students in a large-lecture environment randomly received one of two versions of a questionnaire packet (either high-choice or low-choice). Each packet contained what ostensibly was a page from a course syllabus, and students were told that we were seeking their feedback on syllabi. The syllabus page listed a few assignments, as well as the "instructor's" expectations for the students' attendance, in-class behavior, and work required to earn a good grade (see Figure 1 and the Appendix for a sample page). One syllabus made students' choice-making ability explicit, whereas the other outlined the same policies without mentioning choice. A total of 116 students were in the high-choice condition, and 109 students were in the low-choice condition. Upon reading the syllabus, students in each condition completed the following measures: (a) intent to attend class, behave constructively, and go beyond minimum expectations; (b) anger at the instructor's policies; (c) perceptions of instructors' coercive, legitimate, and reward power; and (d) the manipulation checks. The scenarios representing the low-choice and high-choice conditions appear in the Appendix.

CMC 273: Interpersonal Communication

This syllabus contains the policies and expectations I have established for CMC 273.
Please read the entire syllabus carefully before continuing in this course.

Course Objectives:

1. Explain the independent and combined roles that the following play in the interpersonal communication: personality, perception, emotion, verbal messages, nonverbal messages, and listening.

2. Explain the dynamics of a number of interpersonal processes, including: conflict, impression management, attraction, and relationship development, maintenance, and termination.

Assignments:

Assignment	Point Value
Quizzes (every other week)	7 @ 10 pts. Each
Tests	2 @ 50 pts. = 100 pts.
Participation	30 pts.
Group Project	50 pts.
Total	**250 Points**

Course Policies

These policies and expectations are intended to create a productive learning atmosphere for all students. Unless you are prepared to abide by these policies and expectations, you risk losing the opportunity to participate further in the course.

Attendance: Attendance is an important part of this class. In fact, researchers have found that the number one indicator of success in a given class is attendance. To encourage you to attend class, every class period I will take attendance and once you miss more than two classes, I will deduct five points from your final grade for each class that you miss.

In-Class Behavior: I will conduct this class in an atmosphere of mutual respect. More specifically, I will expect you to treat your peers with respect and refrain from interrupting each other, talking over each other, or any other disruptive behavior. You should expect that if your conduct during class discussions seriously disrupts the atmosphere of mutual respect I expect in this class, you will not be permitted to participate further.

Grading Policy: For each assignment in this course, I provide the expectations and assess whether you've met them. Work that meets my basic minimum expectations will earn a grade in the "C" range, while work that exceeds my expectations will earn in the "B" or "A" ranges. Your grade will depend on how much work you put into assignments. If you have questions or difficulty while completing course work, please see me for help.

Figure 1 ''Syllabus'' Used for This Study.

Manipulation Check

To assess the effectiveness of the manipulation of choice employed in the scenarios, students completed a total of six 5-point Likert-type items ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The comprehensive measure included items related to each of the three areas of the syllabus in which choice was manipulated. For instance, the two items related to attendance were as follows: ''The syllabus threatened my freedom to choose how often I want to attend class,'' and ''I would have a good amount of freedom to choose how often I want to attend class.'' The items for behavior and grading policy followed the same basic structure. Although we manipulated choice in different areas of the syllabus (attendance, behavior, and grading policy), our focus was on the *overall* extent to which the syllabus conveyed a theme of high- or

low-choice; thus, we employed a single six-item measure in the manipulation check as opposed to separate indexes for attendance, behavior, and grading policy. This is consistent with the way choice was examined in the analyses. This measure demonstrated acceptable reliability ($\alpha = .78$) in this study ($M = 29.14$, $SD = 5.45$).

A *t* test revealed a successful manipulation of frames with respect to choice. The high-choice frame was perceived as offering significantly more choice ($n = 116$; $M = 22.91$, $SD = 5.03$) than the low-choice frame ($n = 109$; $M = 17.53$, $SD = 4.47$), $t(223) = -8.49$, $p < .001$ ($d = -5.38$; 95% confidence interval $= -6.63$, -4.13). The manipulation was thus deemed acceptable and permitted subsequent testing of the hypotheses.

Instruments

Behavioral intent was measured by asking respondents to indicate their likelihood of engaging in behaviors related to the instructor's policies by providing a number between 0 and 100 that ''represents how likely you would be to do the following.'' One item assessed each area in which choice was manipulated; thus, each item enabled respondents to indicate their likelihood of engaging in a behavior of interest, resulting in single-item measures of intent to attend class ($M = 91.20$, $SD = 14.13$), behave constructively in class ($M = 94.90$, $SD = 11.60$), and exceed the instructor's minimum expectations ($M = 81.29$, $SD = 23.56$). This measurement approach has been used in previous research on persuasion (Dillard & Shen, 2005).

Anger arousal was assessed using four items on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*none of this feeling*) to 5 (*a great deal of this feeling*). Participants were asked to rate their reactions to the expectations outlined in the syllabus. The four items for this measure were angry, annoyed, irritated, and aggravated. This measure has been used in previous research (Quick & Stephenson, 2007) and achieved good reliability ($\alpha = .88$) in the current study ($M = 6.06$, $SD = 3.06$).

Student perceptions of instructor power were measured using items for coercive, legitimate, and reward power from the Power Base Measure (PBM; Roach, 1995).[1] Expert and referent power were not assessed because the research design did not permit students to gain a sufficient sense of the instructor's use of these power bases. Each power base was measured using four 4-point Likert-type items, ranging from 0 (*never*) to 4 (*very often*). An example of a coercive power item is, ''The student will be punished if she/he does not comply with instructor requests.'' A sample item for reward power is, ''The student will gain, short-term or long-term, from compliance with instructor requests.'' Finally, ''The student must comply because it is required by the department'' is an example of an item used to measure legitimate power. Descriptive statistics for each measure are as follows: coercive power ($M = 8.20$, $SD = 3.73$), legitimate power ($M = 9.16$, $SD = 3.75$), and reward power ($M = 10.28$, $SD = 3.16$). The PBM demonstrated acceptable reliability for two power bases: coercive ($\alpha = .71$) and legitimate ($\alpha = .74$). However, the reliability for reward power was less ideal ($\alpha = .59$). Any results related to reward power should thus be considered with this low reliability in mind.

Results

Each hypothesis was tested with a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). *H1* predicted that low-choice message frames would elicit greater perceptions of instructor's use of coercive and legitimate power. ANOVAs revealed a significant effect for the type of message frame on student perceptions of instructor coercive power, $F(1, 225) = 30.94$, $p < .001$ ($\eta^2 = .12$). Those exposed to low-choice frames perceived their instructor as using more coercive power ($M = 9.47$, $SD = 3.24$) than those exposed to high-choice frames ($M = 6.86$, $SD = 3.77$). ANOVAs revealed a significant effect for the type of message frame on student perceptions of instructor legitimate power, $F(1, 225) = 19.36$, $p < .001$ ($\eta^2 = .08$). Those exposed to low-choice frames perceived their instructor as using more legitimate power ($M = 10.19$, $SD = 3.31$) than those exposed to high-choice frames ($M = 8.07$, $SD = 3.90$). Although the effect was stronger with respect to coercive power, in each case, *H1* was supported.

H2 predicted that high-choice message frames would elicit greater perceptions of instructor's use of reward power. ANOVAs revealed a significant effect for the type of message frame on student perceptions of instructor reward power, $F(1, 225) = 10.24$, $p < .01$ ($\eta^2 = .04$). Those exposed to low-choice frames perceived their instructor as using more reward power ($M = 10.92$, $SD = 3.20$) than those exposed to high-choice frames ($M = 9.60$, $SD = 2.98$). This is in the direction opposite of what was predicted; thus, *H2* was not supported.

H3 predicted that high-choice message frames would elicit perceptions of less anger than low-choice message frames. ANOVAs revealed a significant effect for the type of message frame, $F(1, 225) = 4.78$, $p < .05$ ($\eta^2 = .02$). Those exposed to low-choice frames were slightly more likely to be angry ($M = 6.49$, $SD = 3.27$) than those exposed to high-choice frames ($M = 5.61$, $SD = 2.75$). Although statistically significant, the relationship was weak, indicating only minimal support for *H3*.

H4 predicted that, compared to low-choice message frames, high-choice frames would lead participants to report a greater intent to comply with the instructor's expectations for attendance, in-class behavior, and quality of work. ANOVAs revealed a significant effect for the type of message frame on in-class behavior, $F(1, 225) = 8.71$, $p < .01$ ($\eta^2 = .04$). Those exposed to low-choice frames expressed a greater intent to comply with the instructor's expectations for in-class behavior ($M = 97.06$, $SD = 5.68$) than those exposed to high-choice frames ($M = 92.58$, $SD = 15.34$). The relationships between frame type and students' intent to meet the instructor's expectations for attendance or grades were nonsignificant. In other words, those exposed to low-choice frames were not significantly less likely to report an intent to comply with the instructor's expectations for attendance ($M = 92.00$, $SD = 15.23$) than those exposed to high-choice frames ($M = 90.34$, $SD = 12.87$). Similarly, students exposed to low-choice frames were not significantly less likely to exceed the instructor's minimum expectations ($M = 84.17$, $SD = 20.91$) than students exposed to high-choice frames ($M = 78.20$, $SD = 25.85$). Thus, *H4* received only partial support.

Discussion

This study yielded a number of outcomes associated with the use of low-choice frames. Students exposed to low-choice frames perceived the instructor to be using greater amounts of coercive, legitimate, and reward power, although the effect was stronger for coercive power (12% variance accounted for) than it was for legitimate (8% variance accounted for) or reward (4% variance accounted for) power. In addition, low-choice frames aroused slightly more anger in respondents than high-choice frames (although only accounting for 2% of the variance). All of these findings were in the expected direction, except for the one concerning reward power. It was hypothesized that high-choice frames would evoke a greater sense of reward power than low-choice frames, but the opposite was actually observed. It is possible that the more direct, low-choice method makes both punishments and rewards more salient to the message recipient. These findings suggest that the use of high-choice frames can help instructors exert influence without increasing students' perceptions of coercive or legitimate power—two antisocial forms of power.

Low-choice frames were also more likely than high-choice frames to influence students' intent to comply with the instructor's expectations for in-class behavior—a result that was counter to the hypothesized direction. This finding hints at a couple of possible problems with high-choice frames. First, they may not be powerful enough to exert a sufficient amount of influence on others—that is, they may be too indirect and not explicit enough to yield behavior change. Second, there may be an inherent paradox with high-choice frames: They may work well enough in communicating the possibility of choice, but individuals may choose not to do what is asked of them. With the available data, it is difficult to assess either of these possibilities, particularly in light of the strength of the manipulation of choice in this study. With a possible range of 6 to 30, the mean score of the high-choice manipulations was 22.91. Although the manipulation was statistically significant and the high-choice condition featured greater choice relative to the low-choice condition, respondents may not have perceived themselves as having a great amount of choice overall. In other words, the syllabus framed the rules and instructional processes in a way that positioned the students as relatively passive recipients who had to go along with procedures (rather than actively participating in creating them; Engle, 2006). In this way, although the current study demonstrated some drawbacks of low-choice frames (particularly their relationship to perceptions of coercive power), it did not sufficiently demonstrate clear benefits of using high-choice frames (beyond the fact that they help instructors avoid being perceived as using antisocial bases of power).

Limitations

There were a number of limitations in this investigation. First, the manipulation of choice, although statistically significant, was not particularly robust. This may be because the stimulus material lacked issue importance for the students who participated in the study. It was a contrived situation of little consequence to students.

Second, the scenarios were ostensibly from syllabi and, given that some instructors wonder whether students in *real* courses consider their syllabi to be important and worth following, we should question whether students would give much thought to the gravity of a syllabus offered in an experimental setting. In addition, it may be problematic to use written scenarios to represent classroom situations in which teachers are attempting to exert influence on their students. Such scenarios may not be sufficiently salient to students, and they omit the many important nonverbal cues that teachers use when trying to influence students. In addition, the reliability of the measure of the reward power base was weak; therefore, results related to reward power should be considered with caution. Finally, demographic characteristics of the participants were not measured, so any role that specific characteristics (gender, age, and year in school) might have played are not known.

Future Research in this Area

A first step for future research in this area would be to address the limitations of this study. For example, it would be worthwhile to develop stimulus materials that had greater issue involvement for students and promote a greater sense of choice in the high-choice condition, perhaps by using live instructors or videos of instructors trying to influence their students. This is important to pursue, as there is likely a considerable interaction between the frames teachers use and the nonverbal behaviors they display when using them. For example, frames might be communicated with varying levels of immediacy, dominance, and message intensity.

Beyond examining frames that are related to choice, researchers might also consider other types of frames, such as attributional frames. Rothman, Salovey, Turvey, and Fishkin (1993) found that frames emphasizing an internal attribution (vs. a situational one) for behavior were more likely to influence a significant number of study participants to engage in healthy behavior by getting a mammography. Perhaps there are other areas of framing such as this that are at work in the instructional setting.

In the meantime, this study has provided support for the idea that altering the frame of messages slightly to enhance students' perceptions of choice can help instructors avoid being perceived as using antisocial bases of power, although further research is needed to sufficiently explore the effects of using high-choice frames.

Note

[1]   This instrument has been used in a number of studies on power bases in the classroom and, because the data were collected before Schrodt, Witt, and Turman (2007) advanced their own measure, it was the best available measure for our study.

References

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Chory-Assad, R. M. (2002). Classroom justice: Perceptions of fairness as a predictor of student motivation, learning, and aggression. *Communication Quarterly*, *50*, 58–77.

Chory-Assad, R. M., & Paulsel, M. L. (2004a). Antisocial classroom communication: Instructor influence and interactional justice as predictors of student aggression. *Communication Quarterly*, *52*, 98–114.

Chory-Assad, R. M., & Paulsel, M. L. (2004b). Classroom justice: Student aggression and resistance as reactions to perceived unfairness. *Communication Education*, *53*, 253–274.

Dillard, J. P., & Shen, L. (2005). On the nature of reactance and its role in persuasive health communication. *Communication Monographs*, *72*, 144–168.

Dreikurs, R. (1992). *Children: The challenge.* New York: Plume.

Ellis, K. (2000). Perceived teacher confirmation: The development and validation of an instrument and two studies of the relationship to cognitive and affective learning. *Human Communication Research*, *26*, 264–291.

Ellis, K. (2004). The impact of perceived teacher confirmation on receiver apprehension, motivation, and learning. *Communication Education*, *53*, 1–20.

Engle, R. (2006). Framing interactions to foster generative learning: A situative explanation of transfer in a community of learners classroom. *Journal of the Learning Sciences*, *15*, 451–498.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, *43*, 51–58.

French, J. R., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience.* New York: Harper & Row.

Golish, T. D., & Olson, L. N. (2000). Students' use of power in the classroom: An investigation of student power, teacher power, and teacher immediacy. *Communication Quarterly*, *3*, 293–310.

Levin, I. P., Schneider, S. L., & Gaeth, G. J. (1998). All frames are not created equal: A typology and critical analysis of framing effects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *76*, 149–188.

Miller, C. H., Lane, L. T., Deatrick, L. M., Young, A. M., & Potts, K. A. (2007). Psychological reactance and promotional health messages: The effects of controlling language, lexical concreteness, and the restoration of freedom. *Human Communication Research*, *33*, 219–240.

Paulsel, M. L., & Chory-Assad, R. M. (2004). The relationships among instructors' antisocial behavior alteration techniques and student resistance. *Communication Reports*, *17*, 103–112.

Paulsel, M. L., & Chory-Assad, R. M. (2005). Perceptions of instructor interactional justice as a predictor of student resistance. *Communication Research Reports*, *22*, 283–291.

Quick, B. L., & Stephenson, M. T. (2007). The Reactance Restoration Scale (RRS): A measure of direct and indirect restoration. *Communication Research Reports*, *24*, 131–138.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power in the classroom II: Power and learning. *Communication Education*, *33*, 125–136.

Roach, K. D. (1995). Teaching assistant argumentativeness: Effects of affective learning and student perceptions on power use. *Communication Education*, *52*, 259–276.

Rothman, A. J., Salovey, P., Turvey, C., & Fishkin, S. A. (1993). Attributions of responsibility and persuasion: Increasing mammography utilization among women over 40 with an internally oriented message. *Health Psychology*, *12*, 39–47.

Schrodt, P., Turman, P. D., & Soliz, J. (2006). Perceived understanding as a mediator of perceived teacher confirmation and students' ratings of instruction. *Communication Education*, *55*, 370–388.

Schrodt, P., Witt, P. L., & Turman, P. D. (2007). Reconsidering the measurement of teacher power use in the college classroom. *Communication Education*, *56*, 308–332.

Turman, P. D., & Schrodt, P. (2006). Student perceptions of teacher power as a function of perceived teacher confirmation. *Communication Education*, *55*, 265–279.

Appendix

The scenario representing the low-choice condition is as follows:

Attendance: Attendance is an important part of this class. In fact, researchers have found that the number one indicator of success in a given class is attendance. To encourage you to attend class, every class period I will take attendance and once you miss more than two classes, I will deduct five points from your final grade for each class that you miss.

In-Class Behavior: I will conduct this class in an atmosphere of mutual respect. More specifically, I will expect you to treat your peers with respect and refrain from interrupting each other, talking over each other, or any other disruptive behavior. You should expect that if your conduct during class discussions seriously disrupts the atmosphere of mutual respect I expect in this class, you will not be permitted to participate further.

Grading Policy: For each assignment in this course, I provide the expectations and assess whether you've met them. Work that meets my basic minimum expectations will earn a grade in the "C" range, while work that exceeds my expectations will earn in the "B" or "A" ranges. Your grade will depend on how much work you put into assignments. If you have questions or difficulty while completing course work, please see me for help.

The scenario representing the high-choice condition is as follows:

Attendance: Attendance is an important part of this class, and I hope you will choose to come to class consistently. In fact, researchers have found that the number one indicator of success in a given class is attendance. Although I do not deduct points for missing class, I've found that once students miss more than two days in any of my classes, each additional absence results in the loss of a few (about 5) points from their final grade. But I recognize that this is your choice to make, and I will leave it up to you to decide how important attending this class is to your success.

In-Class Behavior: I encourage you to do what you can to contribute to an atmosphere of mutual respect in this class. More specifically, we all will gain more from this class to the extent that you choose to treat your peers with respect and refrain from interrupting each other, talking over each other, or any other disruptive behavior. I hope you will choose to maintain your good standing in the class by adhering to these expectations, though I respect that this is your choice to make.

Grading Policy: You have considerable control over your grade in this course. I simply provide the expectations and assess whether you've met them. Work that meets my basic minimum expectations will earn a grade in the "C" range, while work that exceeds my expectations will earn in the "B" or "A" ranges. Only you can determine how much work you will choose to put into assignments, or whether you will seek me out if you have questions or difficulty while completing course work. With this in mind, I hope you will choose to proceed in a way that will enable you to earn the grades and learning outcomes you are seeking for this course, and that you will choose to see me for help if you experience any difficulties.