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ABSTRACT

Investigating the Relationships Between Family Communication Patterns, Academic Resilience, and Students’ Classroom Communication Behaviors

Jordan Atkinson

This dissertation served two purposes. The first purpose was to examine the relationships between the two dimensions of family communication patterns (i.e., conversation orientation and conformity orientation) and four student classroom communication behaviors (i.e., out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, instructional dissent, and students’ motives to communicate with their instructors). The second purpose of this dissertation was to investigate academic resilience as a mediator in the relationship between family communication patterns and student classroom communication behaviors. It was discovered that students’ family conversation orientation was associated positively with their oral participation and the relational, functional, participatory, and excuse-making motives to communicate with instructors. Conversation orientation was associated negatively with vengeful dissent. Students’ conformity orientation was positively associated with their use of vengeful dissent and the relational, participatory, excuse-making, and sycophantic motives to communicate with instructors. It was also discovered that conformity orientation moderated the relationship between conversation orientation and academic resilience. Additionally, a conditional indirect effect was discovered in the relationship between conversation orientation and the functional motive to communicate with instructors through academic resilience, as it was conditional upon levels of conformity orientation. These results and implications were discussed in light of existing research findings on family communication patterns, academic resilience, and students’ classroom communication behaviors. The results of this dissertation should be interpreted with caution due to the structural validity issues of the instruments and the data collection procedures.
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CHAPTER I
Introduction

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2015), more diverse populations of students are entering colleges and universities such as non-traditional students, Hispanic students, first-generation students, and students from underserved communities. In addition to these demographic changes in student populations, current cohorts of college students are experiencing attitudinal changes as well. Compared to previous student cohorts, it has been found that current students are less motivated to learn, spend less time on their schoolwork, possess an external locus of control toward their education, and experience increased pressure from their families to perform well academically (Alexitch & Page, 2001; Howe & Strauss, 2007; Purcell, 2009). In a recent special issue of Communication Education, scholars identified several qualities that are commonly associated with contemporary college students, such as having helicopter parents (Frey & Tatum, 2016), possessing a grade orientation toward their education (Buckner & Strawser, 2016), exhibiting excessive self-confidence (McAllum, 2016), and having increased levels of academic entitlement (Goldman & Martin, 2016), all of which reflect these attitudinal changes. As such, Mazer and Hess (2016) advocated that instructional communication researchers should focus their research efforts on how these qualities influence the ways in which students approach their college education. One mechanism that encapsulates these qualities is young adults’ communication with their parents.

Although research conducted on parental involvement at the primary and secondary educational levels is abundant, much less is known about parental involvement
at the post-secondary level (Pizzolato & Hicklen, 2011). Through children’s formative years, parents greatly affect their children’s attitudes toward school (Dauber & Epstein, 1993), with students often receiving advice about navigating college from their parents and other family members (Kranstuber, Carr, & Hosek, 2012; Nanzione et al., 2001; Wang, 2014). The effects of family communication does not stop during children’s formative years, however, as communication researchers have begun to explore how family communication influences young adults’ adjustment to college (Orrego & Rodriguez, 2001) and how they cope with the transition to college (Burns, Burke, & Waldbuesser, 2016). As such, one parsimonious and useful theoretical framework to assess how family communication affects adult children’s approach to their college education is Family Communication Patterns Theory (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002b; Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990).

Family Communication Patterns Theory is a theory used to assess the role that communication plays within the family (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002b). The theory provides a two-dimensional model (i.e., conversation orientation, conformity orientation) and a four-category typology of family communication environments (i.e., consensual, protective, pluralistic, and laissez-faire) that explains how normative communicative behaviors develop within a family system. Given that the family is a primary socializing agent at the forefront of children’s education (Berns, 2013; Kranstuber et al., 2012), an area that has yet to be empirically explored is the relationship between family communication patterns and student classroom communication behaviors.

In this dissertation, student classroom communication behaviors are comprised of four related constructs: out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation,
instructional dissent, and students’ motives to communicate with their instructors. Thus, the primary purpose of this dissertation is to assess the relationship between family communication patterns and student classroom communication behaviors with their instructors, with a secondary purpose of examining whether academic resilience mediates this relationship.

This chapter is divided into three sections. In the first section, an explication of Family Communication Patterns Theory and its relevant research findings are provided. In the second section, the student classroom communication behaviors and their related research findings are explicated. In the third section, a rationale for this dissertation is provided, which includes the proposal of 8 hypotheses and 2 research questions.

**Family Communication Patterns Theory**

Family relationships play an incredibly important role in the lives of individuals, and these relationships represent the most enduring social institution (Koerner & Schrodt, 2014). Given that communication not only is a central feature in family systems, but also can be used as a form of socialization for family members, exploring the social interaction within families and how these interactions connect to various outcomes is necessary. One theory that has made significant contributions to the study of social interaction in families is Family Communication Patterns Theory. Generally, this theory states that families communicate through two specific orientations (i.e., conversation orientation and conformity orientation) to achieve a shared social reality.

To review Family Communication Patterns Theory, this section is divided into three parts. In the first part, the historical roots of Family Communication Patterns Theory and the three waves of family communication research are explained. In the
second part, the Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument is discussed and the dimensions of conversation orientation and conformity orientation, as well as their related research findings, are explicated. The third part describes the development and characteristics of the four family types.

**Historical Roots**

Family Communication Patterns (FCP) was developed in the early 1970’s by mass media researchers McLeod and Chaffee (1972, 1973). Since its inception, FCP has advanced through four waves of research (Baxter, Bylund, Imes, & Scheive, 2005). The first wave of FCP research was introduced by McLeod and Chaffee (1972) and focused on the information processing outcomes of children with regard to their socialization though mass media messages. McLeod and Chaffee were interested generally in how families arrive at shared social realities and more specifically in how parents socialize their children to process mass media messages and information from outside the family. Their notion of FCP was based on Heider’s (1946, 1958) cognitive theory of coorientation. Rooted in cognitive psychology, the cognitive theory of coorientation refers to the process of multiple individuals evaluating the same object in their social environment, leading to two different cognitions for each individual: the individual’s evaluation of the object and the individual’s perception of the other person’s evaluation of the object. When these two cognitions are combined, three attributes of coorientation are created: agreement, accuracy, and congruence. Agreement centers on the similarity between two individuals’ evaluation of the same object, accuracy refers to the similarity between an individual’s perception of the other person’s evaluation and the actual evaluation made by the other person, and congruence involves the similarity between an
individual’s evaluation of the object and his/her perception of the other person’s evaluation of the same object (Heider, 1958; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006). Through these three attributes, the coorientation process typically leads to shared social reality.

Though described by Heider in the context of interpersonal dyads, coorientation also can apply to larger groups such as families. Because coorientation refers to the perception of shared social reality, it is important to recognize that families do not always share the same social reality. Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2006) explained that balanced cognition is a psychological desire for individuals within families and that congruence, accuracy, and agreement are linearly dependent on each other. McLeod and Chaffee’s (1972, 1973) research extended Heider’s work by applying the concept of coorientation to family systems, thus forming FCP. Early FCP work focused on information processing in the family and advanced that two orientations can be utilized as families aim to achieve agreement: concept-orientation and socio-orientation. Concept-orientation occurs when individual family members focus on an object in the environment and discuss its attributes with each other. Family members achieve agreement about the object and a shared evaluation through family conversation and open flow of information, promoting the child’s development as an autonomous individual (McLeod & Chaffee, 1973; Ritchie, 1997). Socio-orientation occurs when a family member focuses on another family member’s evaluation of an object and adopts that member’s evaluation, basically conforming to the other family member’s evaluation (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006; McLeod & Chaffee, 1972). A restricted flow of information and a conformity to parental beliefs are associated with socio-orientation (Ritchie, 1997). To assess concept-orientation and socio-orientation, McLeod and Chaffee (1972) developed the 14-item
FCP instrument that focused primarily on information processing (7 items measured concept-orientation, 7 items measured socio-orientation); since its development, it has been used widely in mass media research (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006).

The second wave of FCP research was initiated by Ritchie and Fitzpatrick (Ritchie, 1991; Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). In 1990, they revised and renamed the FCP instrument the Revised Family Communication Patterns instrument (RFCP). This instrument consisted of 26 items and incorporated behavioral aspects into the measure in addition to the information processing questions associated with the original FCP instrument. Ritchie (1991) then reconceptualized the FCP instrument by changing the name of the “concept-orientation” dimension to “conversation orientation” (better capturing the characteristic of free and open communication between family members) and changing the name of the “socio-orientation” dimension to “conformity orientation,” due to its emphasis on compliance to parental authority. Later, Koerner and Fitzpatrick (1997) recognized that because family communication always contains a degree of both conversation orientation and conformity orientation, family communication can be delineated into one of four types based on these two orientations. That is, families can be considered to be either high or low in each orientation (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997; McLeod & Chaffee, 1973). As such, Koerner and Fitzpatrick (1997) proposed four family types: the consensual family type (i.e., high in conversation orientation, high in conformity orientation), the protective family type (i.e., low in conversation orientation, high in conformity orientation), the pluralistic family type (i.e., high in conversation orientation, low in conformity orientation), and the laissez-faire family type (i.e., low in conversation orientation, low in conformity orientation). The United States population’s
most common family type is the consensual type, followed by the pluralistic, protective, and laissez-faire types (Shearman & Dumlao, 2008).

During this second wave, FCP research focused heavily on both dimension-based work (i.e., conversation orientation and conformity orientation) and typology-based work (i.e., the four family types). Subsequent research conducted during this wave identified the differences in communicative outcomes that emerge as a result of either the two orientations or four family types. These communicative outcomes include family member effective communication (Koesten, 2004), conflict management (Dumlao & Botta, 2000; Shearman & Dumlao, 2008), adjustment (Hall, McNallie, Custers, Timmermans, Wilson, & Van den Bulck, 2017; Orrego & Rodriguez, 2001; Rueter & Koerner, 2008), privacy orientations (Bridge & Schrodt, 2013), and coparenting (Schrodt & Shimkowski, 2015), all of which have been investigated by family communication researchers.

The third wave of FCP research began with Koerner and Fitzpatrick’s (2002b) development of their theory of family relational schemata. They forwarded a theoretical model that identified three sources of relational knowledge: relationship-specific schema, relationship type schema, and general social schema. Because communication within husband-wife dyads and parent-child dyads are different, they developed the Family Communication Environment Instrument (FCEI) as a way to capture these differences. This instrument contains three dimensions: conflict avoidance, structural traditionalism, and expressiveness (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002b). Conflict avoidance (i.e., restraining the discussion of unpleasant topics) and structural traditionalism (i.e., adhering to the authority structure of the family) are representative of the aforementioned conformity orientation dimension, whereas the expressiveness dimension exhibits close resemblance
to the conversation orientation dimension. To date, while some studies have employed
the FCEI (Baxter et al., 2005; Caughlin, 2003; Koesten, Schrodt, & Ford, 2009; Schrodt,
2005), most research using FCP continues to utilize the RFCP instrument.

The fourth wave of FCP research has centered on reconceptualizing the
conformity orientation dimension of FCP. Hesse, Rauscher, Goodman, and Couvrette
(2017) examined the conformity orientation dimension and contended that previous
conceptualizations depict the dimension as a familial element that is negative. They
recommended that future research should examine both warm and cold elements of
conformity orientation. Instead of a negative representation, warm conformity centers on
parents communicating their ideas to children in ways that promote closeness and warmth
(Hesse et al., 2017).

Revised Family Communication Patterns

Recognizing that families are the primary socializing agents for children (Sillars,
1995) and that the family is where children learn to communicate (Fitzpatrick &
Caughlin, 2002), it is important to note that the family’s influence on children’s behavior
remains salient well after children emerge as adults (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002b).
Family communication scholars have dedicated considerable attention to studying the
influence of FCP as these patterns are related to an array of relational and individual
outcomes. In this section, the two dimensions (i.e., conversation orientation, conformity
orientation) of FCP are further examined as are the relevant research findings conducted
on these dimensions.

Conversation Orientation and Conformity Orientation. Conversation
orientation is conceptualized as the “degree to which families create a climate in which
all family members are encouraged to participate in unrestrained interaction about a wide array of topics” (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a, p. 85). Families who exhibit high conversation orientation discuss a breadth of topics, their communication is characterized as open and free, and members freely express and discuss their disagreements with each other. All members, regardless of age, are encouraged to participate in family decision making. Families that are low in conversation orientation have members who interact less frequently, do not share private thoughts or concerns, and participate less in activities with each other (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a, 2002b, 2006). Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2002a) stated that families with high conversation orientation, as compared to families who are low in conversation orientation, equip children with effective conflict management skills by teaching the skills needed to manage difficult communicative situations. Additionally, children immersed in a conversation orientation family develop communication competencies and broaden their relational schemas (Koesten, 2004). Conversation orientation also is positively associated with children’s perception of coparental communication quality (Schrodt & Shimkowski, 2015) and authoritative parenting (Youngvorst & Koerner, 2016). Moreover, high conversation orientation in families has been positively associated with young adults’ self-esteem and shyness (Huang, 1999), and negatively associated with reticent behavior (Kelly, Keaten, Finch, Duarte, Hoffman, & Michels, 2002) and communication apprehension (Elwood & Schrader, 1998).

Conversely, conformity orientation refers to the “degree to which family communication stresses a climate of homogeneity of attitudes, values, and beliefs” (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a, p. 85). Families high in conformity orientation have
hierarchical structures in place (e.g., parents make the rules, children comply) that emphasize the collective importance of the family rather than the importance of any one individual member. Families high in conformity orientation stress that the parent is the decision maker, and children typically do not participate in family decision making. Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2006) asserted that high conformity families stress interdependence and harmony among its members while simultaneously avoid family conflict, in part, because parents expect children to adopt their beliefs and to respect their decisions. Families low in conformity orientation emphasize equality among all family members, and encourage individual member growth by allowing children to express any beliefs that differ from other family members. Rather than exhibiting obedience to parental authority, families low in conformity orientation value the personal growth of children and promote autonomy among children.

In low conformity orientation families, children are allowed to express disagreements with their parents, unlike children from high conformity orientation families (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006). Children in families high in conformity orientation report lower quality coparental communication (Schrodt & Shimkowski, 2015), more authoritarian parenting (Youngvorst & Koerner, 2016), and a stronger trait-like orientation to privacy (Bridge & Schrodt, 2013). Furthermore, adult children from families high in conformity orientation have reported higher levels of communication apprehension (Hsu, 1998) and unwillingness to communicate (Avtgis, 1999). More recently, helicopter parenting was found to be moderately and positively related to conformity orientation, although no relationship was found to exist between helicopter parenting and conversation orientation (Odenweller, Booth-Butterfield, & Weber, 2014).
**Relevant Research Findings.** Several researchers have established connections between FCP and behavioral (i.e., family conflict, consumption patterns, deception, aggression, confirmation, affection, demand/withdraw patterns, and rituals), psychosocial (i.e., perceived stress, anxiety, depression, mental health, self-esteem, reticence, relational satisfaction, commitment, and family cohesion), and information processing (i.e., informational reception apprehension, cognitive flexibility, attitudes toward advertising, skepticism, and political identification) outcomes. In a meta-analysis of empirical studies employing FCP, Schrodt, Witt, and Messersmith (2008) found small to moderate effect sizes between these three sets of outcomes and both conversation orientation and conformity orientation, suggesting that family communication patterns have meaningful associations with relational behaviors, cognitive processing, and well-being.

Behavioral outcomes and their relationships with FCP have been addressed extensively in family communication research and has examined positive communication (e.g., affection, confirmation, and openness), communication competence, and social support. Family openness about various topics has been examined through a FCP theoretical lens. Thorson and Horstman (2014) explored emerging adults’ openness about credit card behaviors and found that family conversation orientation was positively related to emerging adults’ financial openness with parents about their credit card behaviors. Kennedy-Lightsey and Frisby (2016) used FCP and communication privacy management theory to investigate parental privacy invasions. They discovered that FCP shapes privacy management for parents as conformity orientation was positively related to perceived ownership of children’s information and self-reported privacy invasion. They explained that as emerging adults separate from their families of origin, parents of
conformity-oriented families might feel a loss of control and authority and believe they have a right to know their child’s private information. Together, these two studies suggest that adult children learn how to communicate about these potentially difficult situations based on their family communication and socialization. Young and Schrodt (2016) determined that young adults from families with a high conversation orientation more frequently communicate in confirming ways to their own romantic partner, whereas young adults from families high in conformity orientation engage in confirming communication with their romantic partner to a lesser extent.

FCP, particularly conversation orientation, has been positively related to an array of positive communication outcomes. For example, families that encourage honest and open communication are more likely to experience feelings of personal growth after the death of a loved one, as evidenced by the positive relationship that exists between conversation orientation and personal growth and the negative relationship that exists between conversation orientation and detachment (Carmon, Western, Miller, Pearson, & Fowler, 2010). Schrodt and Ledbetter (2007) found that conversation orientation was positively related to the mental well-being of young adults from divorced families, whereas conformity orientation was negatively related to young adults’ mental well-being and positively linked with parents’ demand/withdraw patterns. Kim, Lee, and Tomiuk (2009) established that a positive link exists between mothers’ conformity orientation and their children’s confusion in decision making. Schrodt, Ledbetter, and Ohrt (2007) discovered that conversation orientation is positively associated, and conformity orientation is negatively associated, with parental confirmation. They further discovered that parental confirmation and parental affection partially mediated the relationship
between conversation orientation and young adult children's mental well-being (i.e., self-esteem, perceived stress), whereas parental confirmation and parental affection fully mediated the relationship between conformity orientation and mental well-being.

Another aspect of communication that has been investigated using the FCP framework is interpersonal and communication competence. Ritchie (1991) suggested that children raised in a conversation-oriented family acquire the communicative abilities needed to manage relationships with both appropriate and supportive communication, while being able to defend their own ideas. Following Ritchie’s suggestion, Koesten and Anderson (2004) assessed cognitive complexity and interpersonal competence and its relationship to adolescent risk behaviors among college students. They discovered that adult children from high conformity-oriented families were less likely to develop cognitive complexity than those adult children from high conversation-oriented families. They did not find, however, that individuals from either conversation-oriented families or those having higher rates of interpersonal competence prevented them from engaging in risky behaviors. Schrodt, Ledbetter, Jernberg, Larson, Brown, and Glonek (2009) found that perceptions of mothers’ and fathers’ interpersonal communication competence were positive predictors of family conversation orientation, with conversation orientation mediating the influence of parental communication competence on young adults’ communication competence. No mediation occurred with conformity orientation, although mothers’ communication competence was inversely related to family conformity orientation. Rudi, Walkner, and Dworkin (2015) discovered that adolescents used text messaging with mothers less frequently in conformity-oriented families, with adolescents high in conversation orientation and low in conformity orientation reported
more e-mail communication with parents.

Seeking social support is an additional area of scholarship that has been explored using FCP. Individuals from high conversation-oriented families have increased motivation and greater communicative ability to seek social support than individuals from families low in conversation orientation (High & Scharp, 2015). Individuals from families high in conformity orientation also were motivated to seek social support, but reported a decreased communicative ability to seek the support. Similar to aforementioned research, Burleson and Kunkel (2006) discovered that the supportive talk in which parents engage with their child predicted their child’s own supportive talk. High and Scharp (2015) concluded that young adults from high conversation-oriented families are likely to be more skilled and motivated to directly seek social support from their parents, friends, and others because they have practice discussing both positive and negative experiences. They also claimed that these young adults are adaptable communicators due to the high conversation orientation of their family, supporting the widely recognized idea that the family system is the earliest form of socialization (Galvin, Braithwaite, & Bylund, 2015).

Psychosocial outcomes are an important set of outcomes that has been examined in FCP research. Two variables of empirical importance are reticence and unwillingness to communicate. Reticence occurs when “people avoid communication because they believe it is better to remain silent than to risk appearing foolish” (Keaten & Kelly, 2000, p. 168), whereas unwillingness to communicate is a predisposition representing a chronic tendency to avoid or devalue oral communication (Burgoon, 1976). Not surprisingly, individuals who are reticent score lower on conversation orientation, but do not differ
from non-reticent individuals on reports of conformity orientation (Kelly et al., 2002). Avtgis (1999) studied young adults’ unwillingness to communicate and found that communication reward (i.e., the degree to which individuals view communication as rewarding) for young adults was positively related to conversation orientation and negatively related to conformity orientation. Also, approach-avoidance (i.e., the degree to which individuals fear interpersonal communication) was negatively related to conversation orientation, but was not associated at all with conformity orientation (Avtgis, 1999).

Relatedly, families high in conversation orientation, regardless of their conformity orientation, raise children who have higher levels of emotional intelligence (Keaten & Kelly, 2008). Jones, Bodie, and Koerner (2017) found that conversation orientation positively predicted young adults’ use of the reappraisal emotion regulation strategy and negatively predicted the suppression emotional regulation strategy, whereas conformity orientation positively predicted the suppression emotional regulation strategy. Horstman, Colaner, and Rittenour (2016) discovered that the psychosocial outcomes of adult adoptees’ self-esteem and identity work were influenced by family communication patterns. They found that conversation orientation, but not conformity orientation, was positively associated with adoption communication openness. Additionally, they found that adoption communication openness mediated the relationship between adult adoptees’ conversation orientation and preoccupation with their adoption. Through examining psychological health factors, Curran and Allen (2017) found a positive relationship exists between conformity orientation and depressive symptoms through direct personalization of conflict, whereas a negative relationship exists between conversation orientation and
depressive symptoms through direct personalization of conflict. In a study of first-year college students, Hall, McNallie, Custers, Timmermans, Wilson, and Van den Bulck (2017) found that young adult families’ conversation orientation was negatively related to loneliness through its relationship with family support. Students were more self-efficacious when they belonged to conversation-oriented families and when their family members offered academic advice.

Information-processing outcomes is another avenue of research as these outcomes have been explored through the FCP lens. One information-processing outcome is informational reception apprehension (IRA), which is a cognitive anxiety that weakens an individual’s ability to manage information through the dimensions of listening anxiety and intellectual inflexibility (Wheeless, Preiss, & Gayle, 1997). Ledbetter and Schrodt (2008) discovered that conversation orientation was negatively associated with IRA and conformity orientation was positively associated with IRA. Another information processing outcome is children’s evaluative skills in informal reasoning (Chng, Wild, Hollmann, & Otterpohl, 2014). Chng and his colleagues found that autonomy-support behaviors (i.e., behaviors that encourage children to be autonomous in decision making) were negatively associated with conformity orientation, which then negatively predicted their evaluation skills. Control behaviors (i.e., making decisions for children) were strongly positively related to conformity orientation, which also negatively predicted children’s evaluation skills.

**Family Types**

FCP proposes that families can be classified into one of four types (i.e., protective, consensual, pluralistic, laissez-faire) based on their levels of each orientation.
Families high in conformity orientation and low in conversation orientation are categorized as *protective families*. Communication within a protective family accentuates obedience to parental authority and limited communication between family members. Because conflict is viewed as negative due to its emphasis on family member conformity (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006), children lack the ability to engage in effective conflict management and decision-making skills, and they are more likely to use an avoidance conflict management style (Shearman & Dumlao, 2008). Dumlao and Botta (2000) discovered that fathers from protective families promote both conflict avoidance and accommodation among their children. These families do not value open communication and parents do not consider communication as important to their children’s socialization (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). Bridge and Schrodt (2013) investigated the association between young adults’ privacy orientations and their reported family communication environment. They discovered that a stronger trait-like orientation to privacy was reported from young adults in protective families, compared with the other three family types. Shimkowski (2016) found that young adults from protective families are more likely to drink alcohol to cope and suppress their emotions more than young adults from other family types.

Families high in conformity orientation and high in conversation orientation are categorized as *consensual families*. These families encourage the open expression of ideas and discuss an array of topics; however, they adhere to the traditional familial hierarchy where parents make decisions and children comply with these decisions. Consensual families are most likely to use the obliging conflict management style, although consensual families also utilize the integrating and compromising conflict
management styles at high rates (Shearman & Dumlao, 2008). Children in these families are likely to value communication and adopt the beliefs and values of their family due to their adherence to the family structure (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997).

Low conformity orientation and high conversation orientation families are known as pluralistic families. Communication in pluralistic families is characterized as open and unrestrained across a host of topics. Children are encouraged to participate in family decision making and parents encourage children to develop their own opinions and ideas (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). Unlike families high in conformity orientation, pluralistic families do not exert overt pressure on their children to conform. These children value communication and they utilize stronger decision-making skills in adulthood (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006). In fact, Koesten (2004) found that young adults from pluralistic families are more able to enact effective communication skills in both romantic relationships and same-sex friendships than individuals from either protective or laissez-faire families. Relatedly, Buckner, Ledbetter, and Bridge (2013) found that employees from pluralistic families are more likely to express dissent with their superior whereas employees from protective and consensual families are less likely to do so. Dumlao and Botta (2000) discovered that young adults with a pluralistic father are more likely to collaborate better in times of conflict. Less antagonistic coparental communication was reported by young adults from pluralistic families compared to consensual, laissez-faire, and protective families (Schrodt & Shimkowski, 2015).

Low conformity orientation and low conversation orientation families are known as laissez-faire families. Communication between family members within a laissez-faire family is characterized as sparse and lifeless by all family members. Koerner and
Fitzpatrick (2006) explained that parents in laissez-faire families have the mindset that all family members should make their own decisions; these parents also have little interest in their child’s decisions. Members of laissez-faire families have been described as emotionally divorced from each other (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997). Individuals in laissez-faire families do not report consistently using a specific type of conflict management style (Dumlao & Botta, 2000). In comparison to the other three family types, young adults from laissez-faire families reported having the weakest orientation to privacy, indicating that these young adults have permeable privacy boundaries with individuals outside the family (Bridge & Schrodt, 2013).

**Summary**

The preceding research reviewed on FCP has established differences in communication outcomes between families with a conversation orientation and families with a conformity orientation, as well as differences among the four family types. Although FCP theory has been used extensively to examine outcomes related to young adults, most recently, the theory is beginning to be applied to the instructional communication context (Burns et al., 2016; Miller-Ott, 2016). One area of scholarship that may be useful to examine through a FCP theoretical framework is student classroom communication behaviors.

**Student Classroom Communication Behaviors**

Instructional communication researchers historically have been interested in investigating student communication behaviors and learning in the college classroom (Myers, Tindage, & Atkinson, 2016; Nussbaum & Friedrich, 2005; Staton-Spicer & Wulff, 1984; Waldeck, Kearney, & Plax, 2001), with more recent research exploring how
students’ predispositions toward college, their individual attributes, and their communication traits affect their classroom academic performance (Goldman & Martin, 2014; Goodboy & Frisby, 2014; Houser & Frymier, 2009; Williams & Frymier, 2007). Goodboy and Myers (2012) asserted that instructional communication researchers should examine college students’ predispositions toward their education, because it is likely that students’ prior academic experiences may affect their beliefs and attitudes toward the classroom environment. In their general model of instructional communication, McCroskey, Valencic, and Richmond (2004) forwarded that students are an essential part of the instructional system and noted that students vary greatly in terms of their temperament, personality, and intelligence. Researchers have noted that less instructional communication research has focused on students’ reports of their own traits and characteristics (when compared to reports of their learning and classroom behaviors), and that future research should examine these areas (Martin & Myers, 2010; Waldeck et al., 2001). Therefore, this section will review four student classroom communication behaviors: out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, instructional dissent, and students’ motives to communicate with their instructors.

**Out-of-Class Communication**

Out-of-class communication (OCC) refers to students and instructors participating in formal or informal interactions outside of the scheduled class time (Fusani, 1994). OCC includes meeting during office hours, sending e-mails to instructors, speaking with instructors at campus events or off campus, making telephone calls to the instructor, or having discussions before or after class meetings (Aylor & Oppliger, 2003; Fusani, 1994; Nadler & Nadler, 2000, 2001). Formal OCC includes office visits, phone calls, and e-
mail, whereas informal OCC includes speaking in the halls, at campus events, or other places on campus (Aylor & Oppliger, 2003; Jaasma & Koper, 1999). Although OCC offers multiple benefits for students, not all students engage in OCC with their instructors. In fact, Jaasma and Koper (1999) reported that only 50% of the students in their sample visited an instructor’s office hours, whereas 68% of the students in their sample spoke to their instructors before or after class during the semester. Aylor and Oppliger (2003) reported that 72% of the students in their sample engaged in at least one formal OCC encounter (e.g., office visit, phone call, or e-mail) with the instructor on whom they reported. The benefits of OCC include increases in learning (Dobransky & Frymier, 2004), feelings of self-confidence and self-worth (Kuh, 1995), intellectual development (Pascarella, Duby, Terenzini, & Iverson, 1983), greater satisfaction with college (Pascarella, 1980), and the development of stronger interpersonal relationships with their instructors (Dobransky & Frymier).

Jaasma and Koper (1999) discovered that certain aspects of OCC—frequency of informal contact, length of the office visit, student satisfaction, and socializing—were positively associated with instructor verbal immediacy and student state motivation. Aylor and Oppliger (2003) found that positive relationships exist between instructors’ humor orientation and OCC. They also discovered that instructor responsiveness, but not assertiveness, positively predicted informal OCC and student satisfaction with OCC.

Myers, Martin, and Knapp (2005) found that five instructor affinity-seeking strategies— inclusion of others, self-inclusion, sensitivity, comfortable self, and supportiveness—were associated positively with OCC. Sidelinger, Bolen, McMullen, and Nyeste (2015) discovered that instructor rapport positively predicted, and instructor clarity negatively
predicted, OCC. Sidelinger, Frisby, and Heisler (2016) discovered that OCC was associated positively with instructor rapport and students’ self-regulation (i.e., active participation in one’s own learning). Myers (2004) found that positive relationships exist between student OCC and perceived instructor credibility.

In addition to those instructor behaviors that are related to OCC, instructional communication scholars have explored the relationships between student communication traits and OCC. Martin and Myers (2006) discovered that students who were high in communication apprehension engaged in less OCC with their instructors. Additionally, they found that OCC was related positively to students’ cognitive flexibility, but not their levels of assertiveness, responsiveness, or talkaholicism. Mansson, Myers, and Martin (2012) found that OCC was associated positively with students’ argumentativeness and assertiveness, but OCC was not associated with students’ verbal aggressiveness or Machiavellianism. In regard to students’ educational orientations, Williams and Frymier (2007) discovered that students’ learning orientation was related positively to the relational motive to engage in OCC, whereas students’ grade orientation was related positively to the excuse-making and sycophantic motives to engage in OCC. Goodboy, Booth-Butterfield, Bolkan, and Griffin (2015) found that OCC was positively predicted by students’ learning orientation and instructor humor orientation, but negatively predicted by students’ grade orientation.

**In-Class Oral Participation**

Fassinger (1995) defined class participation as “any student comments offered or questions raised in class” (p. 86). She discovered that both student traits (e.g., gender, interest in subject, and confidence) and class variables (e.g., class size, graded
participation, emotional climate, and student-to-student interactions) influenced students’ participation in class. Specifically, she found that female students perceived themselves to be less participatory in class than male students, and that in-class participation decreased as class size increased. In American classrooms, although participation is highly valued (Remedios, Clarke, & Hawthorne, 2008), oral participation is just one behavior that indicates student engagement in the classroom (Frymier & Houser, 2016). Frymier and Houser (2016) discovered that instructor expectations for oral participation were associated positively with student self-reports of oral participation, indicating that when participation is graded or if the instructor expects students to orally participate, they often do. However, increased frequency of oral participation was not associated with engagement in the course.

Examining the relationships between instructor behaviors and oral participation has received empirical attention by instructional communication researchers. Goodboy et al. (2015) found that instructor humor orientation served as a positive predictor of student in-class participation. Also, students reported increased participation in class when their instructors are highly confirming (Goodboy & Myers, 2008) and increase the frequency of their self-disclosure (Goldstein & Benassi, 1994). But regardless of how instructors communicate, some students may never participate orally in class due to their own traits or characteristics. Frisby and Myers (2008) found that a positive relationship exists between oral in-class participation and state motivation. Consistent with these results, Frymier and Houser (2016) discovered that oral participation was associated positively with motivation to study and learning indicators. Clark and Yeager (1995) discovered that high school students were less likely to participate during class if they had high
levels of communication apprehension, but were more likely to participate if they had high levels of willingness to communicate. These results substantiate Chan and McCroskey’s (1987) findings that students higher in willingness to communicate participate more in class. Furthermore, students may feel intimidated to participate in front of their classmates and professors, emphasizing that student confidence is essential for oral participation (Fassinger, 1995; Karp & Yoels, 1976; Weaver & Qi, 2005). Moreover, students are more likely to participate if they possess a learning orientation and less likely to participate if they possess a grade orientation (Goodboy et al., 2015).

**Instructional Dissent**

Instructional dissent refers to student expression of disagreement or a contradictory opinion concerning a course-related practice (Goodboy, 2011b). Three types of instructional dissent students use are expressive, rhetorical, and vengeful (Goodboy, 2011a, 2011b). *Expressive dissent* refers to students’ desire to vent and express their feelings in an effort to improve their emotional state. Students tend to engage in expressive dissent with their friends, family, and classmates, with the eventual goal of gaining sympathy or using dissent as a form of cathartic therapy. *Rhetorical dissent* refers to students’ desire to convince their instructors to take action to remedy an issue. Rhetorical dissent is directed at instructors using open communication, such as attempting to persuade instructors to correct a wrongdoing or change a grade. Students utilize rhetorical dissent when they perceive that either a course policy or a grade they received is unfair. *Vengeful dissent* refers to student intentions to ruin an instructor’s reputation or attempt to get instructors fired from their job. Students direct vengeful dissent toward other students, instructors, and administrators in an attempt to seek
revenge on an instructor for a perceived wrongdoing. In his initial investigation of instructional dissent, Goodboy (2011a) uncovered multiple triggering agents of student dissent, which include unfair testing, unfair grading, teaching style, instructor offensiveness, classroom policies, syllabus violations, instructor indolence, and lack of feedback.

Students’ use of the three types of instructional dissent can be influenced by instructor communication behaviors. Buckner and Frisby (2015) found that students who engaged in both expressive dissent and vengeful dissent were less likely to have a confirming instructor. LaBelle, Martin, and Weber (2013) found that students who perceived their instructors as using clear teaching reported higher self-efficacy and thus reported using more rhetorical dissent and less expressive dissent. LaBelle and Martin (2014) discovered that the degree to which students perceived disagreements as caused by their instructor was positively associated with their use of expressive, rhetorical, and vengeful dissent.

All students bring certain characteristics with them to the classroom, which then affects their tendency to engage in dissent. Goodboy and Martin (2014) discovered that expressive dissent was predicted by the student traits of agreeableness, neuroticism, and extraversion; rhetorical dissent was predicted by students’ agreeableness and extraversion; and vengeful dissent was predicted by students’ agreeableness, openness, and conscientiousness. Goodboy and Myers (2012) found that although students’ verbal aggressiveness was related positively to their reports of using rhetorical and vengeful dissent, their argumentativeness was related positively to rhetorical dissent. Buckner and Finn (2013) found that students who possessed an internal academic locus of control (i.e.,
a greater control over their learning environment) were more likely to engage in vengeful dissent. Goodboy and Bolkan (2013) found that students who used the integrating, compromising, and dominating conflict-handling styles, but not the avoiding style, were more likely to engage in rhetorical dissent. Students who used the dominating style, but not the integrating or obliging styles, were more likely to engage in vengeful and expressive dissent.

**Students’ Motives to Communicate with Their Instructors**

Martin, Myers, and Mottet (1999) introduced the construct of students’ motives to communicate with their instructors by identifying five motives that guide student communication with instructors: relational, functional, participatory, excuse-making, and sycophancy. Students who are motivated to communicate for *relational* reasons want to learn more about their instructors in order to develop an interpersonal relationship with their instructors. Students who are motivated to communicate with their instructors for *functional* reasons want to obtain course or content information. Students who are motivated to communicate with their instructors for *participatory* reasons offer comments or ask a question to demonstrate that they understand the course material. Students who are motivated to communicate with their instructors for *excuse-making* reasons want to explain why their course assignments are late or incomplete. Students who are motivated to communicate for *sycophantic* reasons want to create a favorable impression on their instructors.

The behaviors that instructors use when communicating with their students in the classroom can certainly influence students’ motives to communicate with their instructors. Goodboy and Bolkan (2011) discovered that when instructors use referent,
reward, and expert power bases in the classroom, students were motivated to communicate with them for the relational, participatory, and functional motives and, to a lesser extent, the sycophancy and excuse-making motives. Cayanus, Martin, and Goodboy (2009) found that when students perceive instructor disclosure to be negative, they were motivated to communicate with their instructors for relational, participatory, sycophantic, and excuse-making reasons. When students perceived instructor disclosure as frequent and relevant, they were motivated to communicate with them for functional and participatory reasons. In regard to instructor misbehaviors, Goodboy, Myers, and Bolkan (2010) discovered that as students perceive their instructors to engage in offensiveness, indolence, and incompetence, they are less motivated to communicate for functional reasons. When students perceive their instructors to be incompetent, they are not motivated to communicate with their instructors for relational, participatory, or sycophantic reasons. Goodboy and Myers (2008) discovered that as instructors used high levels of confirmation in the classroom, students were motivated to communicate with them for relational, participatory, and functional reasons. Mottet, Martin, and Myers (2004) found that when students consider instructors to use verbal approach relational strategies, students were motivated to communicate for relational, participatory, excuse-making, and sycophantic reasons.

Instructor communication behaviors not only affect students’ motives to communicate with their instructors, but also perceptions of instructors’ traits. Myers, Edwards, Wahl, and Martin (2007) discovered that students who perceive their instructors to be verbally aggressive are less motivated to communicate for the relational, functional, participatory, and excuse-making motives. They also discovered that
perceived instructor argumentativeness was not related to any of the five motives to communicate. Myers, Mottet, and Martin (2000) found that the relational motive to communicate was predicted by the instructors’ impression leaving, friendly, and contentious communicator style attributes. The functional motive to communicate was predicted by the instructors’ friendly communicator attribute, whereas the participatory motive to communicate was predicted by the instructors’ animated, friendly, and contentious communicator attributes.

Research involving student traits and motives to communicate with instructors includes research conducted by Edwards and Myers (2010) who found that students’ verbal aggressiveness was related negatively with the functional motive and students’ argumentativeness was related negatively with the sycophantic motive. A negative relationship exists between students’ communication apprehension and their participatory, relational, and functional motives to communicate with instructors (Martin, Valencic, & Heisel, 2001). Jordan and Powers (2007) reported that student-instructor apprehension (i.e., students being hesitant to engage in casual conversations with instructors) was related negatively to students’ relational, functional, and participatory motives to communicate with instructors. Moreover, Martin, Myers, and Mottet (2006) found that students’ Machiavellianism is related positively to their motives to communicate with their instructors for functional, excuse-making, and sycophantic reasons. Recently, Myers (2017) discovered that the use of motives fluctuates over the course of a semester. He found that students are more motivated to communicate for relational and sycophantic reasons near the end of the semester, when compared to the beginning or mid-point of the semester. Additionally, students’ use of the functional
motive decreased throughout the semester.

**Rationale**

The primary purpose of this dissertation is to explore the relationship between the two dimensions of FCP (i.e., conversation orientation, conformity orientation) and students’ classroom communication behaviors (i.e., out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, instructional dissent, motives to communicate with their instructors). As a secondary purpose of this dissertation, this rationale also proposes how academic resilience might act as a mediator between FCP and students’ classroom communication behaviors.

The application of FCP to instructional communication outcomes is beginning to receive empirical attention from family communication scholars (Burns, 2015; Burns et al., 2016; Erdner & Wright, 2016; Hall et al., 2016; Miller-Ott, 2016; Orrego & Rodriguez, 2001). Collectively, this body of research has established that communicative differences exist between those students from conversation-oriented families and those students from conformity-oriented families in regard to self-efficacy, college adjustment, and out-of-class communication with instructors. In a recent meta-analysis of 28 research articles written using FCP, Keating (2016) discovered that the relationship between conversation orientation and conformity orientation was moderately negative. Given this finding, in conjunction with the fact that families with a high conversation orientation and families with a high conformity orientation differ historically in regard to many communicative outcomes (Schrodt et al., 2008), it stands to reason that students from conversation-oriented families and students from conformity-oriented families also will differ in their use of student classroom communication behaviors.
More specifically, family conversation orientation should affect the degree to which students engage in communication outside of class with their instructors and participate orally during class. Because young adults from conversation-oriented families are comfortable discussing an array of communication topics (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997), they should be more likely seek their instructors to discuss a variety of topics both in and out of the classroom. On the contrary, given that students from low conversation-oriented families are accustomed to not using open communication (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997), they likely will not seek their instructors to engage in OCC or orally participate in class. As established by prior researchers, instructor communication behaviors affect the degree to which students engage in OCC (Jaasma & Koper, 1999; Myers et al., 2005; Sidelinger, Bolen, McMullan, & Nyeste, 2015) and orally participate in class (Frymier & Houser, 2016; Goldstein & Benassi, 1994; Goodboy et al., 2015).

However, to date, only Miller-Ott (2016) has explored the relationship between family communication patterns and OCC. She found that college students from a conversation-oriented family are more likely than college students from a conformity-oriented family to engage in OCC with their instructors. Although the relationship between FCP and in-class oral participation has not been investigated, it is likely that a similar relationship will exist between college students’ conversation orientation and in-class oral participation. To investigate this notion, the following two hypotheses are posited:

**H1:** Conversation orientation will be positively related to students’ out-of-class communication with their instructors and students’ in-class oral participation.

**H2:** Conformity orientation will be negatively related to students’ out-of-class communication with their instructors and students’ in-class oral participation.
FCP forwards that children learn communication skills from observing and modeling parental communicative behaviors; thus, when children belong to a conversation-oriented family, they openly discuss disagreements (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997, 2006), effectively manage conflict (Dumlao & Botta, 2000), and broaden their relational schemas (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a). These characteristics should assist young adults when communicating with instructors and others about course-related problems or issues. Conversely, young adults from high conformity-oriented families are encouraged to comply with the common values of the family (Miller-Day, 2008) and their parents make all of the family decisions with little input from their children (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997, 2002a, 2002b). When it comes to instructional dissent, then, students from conversation-oriented families, who have been equipped with these conflict management skills in their family where disagreements are openly discussed, should be more likely to engage in rhetorical dissent rather than expressive and vengeful dissent.

Conformity-oriented students, on the other hand, may be more likely to engage in expressive or vengeful dissent due to limited experience engaging in rhetorical dissent. In an organizational communication study, Buckner et al. (2013) found that conformity-oriented young adults communicate more lateral dissent than upward dissent to their superiors about issues that need to change. To explore this notion, the following hypothesis is posited and the following research question is posed:

H3: Conversation orientation will be positively related to students’ use of rhetorical dissent, whereas conformity orientation will be negatively related to students’ use of rhetorical dissent.
RQ1: What relationships exist between FCP (i.e., conversation orientation, conformity orientation) and expressive and vengeful dissent?

Burns et al. (2016) reported that students from a high conversation-oriented family spoke to their families about college more frequently than students from a low conversation-oriented family. Because students from conversation-oriented families generally tend to be more comfortable with communication, they may be more likely to communicate with their instructors for relational, functional, participatory, and sycophantic reasons. Myers (2006) discovered that when students perceive in-group relationships (as opposed to students who perceive out-group relationships) with their instructors, they are more likely to communicate for relational, functional, participatory, and sycophantic reasons, although no significant difference existed between the groups in regard to the excuse-making motive. As students from conversation-oriented families also are typically more skilled in communicating effectively (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997), they should also be more motivated to communicate with their instructors for relational, functional, participatory, and sycophantic reasons than students from conformity-oriented families. College students belonging to a conformity-oriented family report more informational reception apprehension (Ledbetter & Schrodt, 2008) and they also tend to be less communicative and expressive in the family (Schrodt, 2005), all characteristics that would likely hinder their motives to communicate with their instructors for relational, functional, participatory, and sycophantic reasons. To investigate this idea, the following hypothesis is posited and the following research question is posed:

H4: Conversation orientation will be positively related to students’ relational,
functional, participatory, and sycophantic motives to communicate with instructors, whereas conformity orientation will be negatively related to students’ relational, functional, participatory, and sycophantic motives to communicate with instructors.

RQ2: What relationships exist between FCP (i.e., conversation orientation, conformity orientation) and the excuse-making motive to communicate with instructors?

A secondary purpose of this dissertation is to examine whether academic resilience acts as a mediator between FCP (i.e., conversation orientation, conformity orientation) and student classroom communication behaviors (i.e., out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, instructional dissent, motives to communicate with their instructors). Believed to originate in the family during childhood (Wang, Haertal, & Walberg, 1994), academic resilience has been described as students obtaining success and gaining accomplishment despite facing environmental adversities (Wang et al., 1994), such as a lack of family and peer support or membership in a disadvantaged family (Masten, 2001). As such, academically resilient students are considered to be those individuals “who sustain high levels of achievement motivation and performance despite the presence of stressful events and conditions that place them at high risk of doing poorly in school and ultimately dropping out of school” (Alva, 1991, p. 19). Until fairly recently, the research conducted on academic resilience focused primarily on economically disadvantaged youth or ethnic minority groups (Cappella & Weinstein, 2001; Finn & Rock, 1997; Roderick & Camburn, 1999). Martin and Marsh (2006) stressed, however, that academic resilience is relevant to all students across all learning
contexts, because any student can suffer from adversity, pressure, challenge, or poor performance.

Families serve as an important source in fostering academic resilience (Wang et al., 1994). By engaging in positive interactions, communicating high expectations, and facilitating caring environments, families exert a considerable influence in how their children deal with pressures and challenges. Overall, these patterns of family support lead students to experience a sense of control over their own success or failure in school (Kitano & Lewis, 2005; Masten, 2001). Hoffman (2010) forwarded that in resilience pedagogy, a central characteristic is for parents to assist their children in developing a set of emotional competencies, a characteristic that conversation-oriented families are more likely to develop effectively given the findings that conversation orientation is related positively to young adults’ mental well-being (Schrodt & Ledbetter, 2007) and related negatively to young adults’ depressive symptoms (Curran & Allen, 2017).

In a study assessing the relationships between FCP and academic resilience among high school students, Jowkar, Kohoulat, and Zakeri (2011) discovered that family conversation orientation was related positively to academic resilience, whereas conformity orientation was related negatively to academic resilience. Sabri, Fouladchang, Dahaghani, and Golzar (2015) found that high school students who belonged to a high conversation-oriented family reported an increase in both academic resilience and emotional intelligence. Likewise, Akbari, Khormaiee, Keshtkar, Mehboodi, and Amrai (2014) discovered that conversation orientation was related positively to academic resilience and related negatively to test anxiety. They also found that academic resilience mediated the relationship between conversation orientation and test anxiety. Therefore, it
is possible that students with a higher mental well-being and higher self-esteem—as evidenced by young adults from conversation-oriented families (Huang, 1999; Schrodt et al., 2007)—are likely able to recover from academic pressures and challenges, thereby promoting their academic resilience. Moltafet, Firoozabadi, Zarrincola, and Rad (2015) found that psychological needs (i.e., need for autonomy, relatedness, and competence) mediated the relationship between conversation orientation and teenagers’ overall resiliency. Conformity orientation was related indirectly to resiliency through satisfying needs for relatedness.

Though academic resilience has yet to be explored by instructional communication scholars, Hosek, Frisby, Waldbuesser, and Rubinsky (2016) recently investigated how students conceptualize academic challenges and how they cope with the challenges. They discovered that students experience three sets of academic stressors: stressors related to the course, stressors related to their perceived lack of skills or behaviors, and stressors related to their relationships with classmates and instructors. Because students from high conversation-oriented families are accustomed to seeking advice (Hall et al., 2016; Nanzione et al., 2001) and having difficult conversations (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a) with their family members, these students should have higher levels of resilience than students from high conformity-oriented families. Moreover, the independence that young adults from conversation-oriented families learn in their childhood (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997, 2002b) should assist in their management of academic resilience.

When compared to children from conversation-oriented families, Fitzpatrick and Koerner (1996) discovered that children from conformity-oriented families are not as
resilient to deal with adverse environmental influences. As such, conformity-oriented students who experience academic setbacks may not seek the social support or academic support necessary that may assist with their academic success, simply because they have not acquired the necessary skills to be resilient due to their belonging to a high conformity-oriented family. Overall, belonging to a conformity-oriented family has been related to a host of negative communicative outcomes for young adults (High & Scharp, 2015; Schrodt et al., 2008), therefore it is reasonable to assume that membership in a conformity-oriented family also would negatively affect students’ academic resilience.

Given the communicative differences in conversation orientation and conformity orientation, then, it is proposed that academic resilience should act as a causal mechanism in the relationship between FCP and students’ classroom communication behaviors (see Figure 1). Because it has been established that conversation orientation is related positively to academic resilience, students who are academically resilient should be more likely to talk to their instructors outside of class and participate in class. To explore this notion, the following two hypotheses are posited:

H5: The indirect effects of conversation orientation on out-of-class communication will vary systematically as a function of conformity orientation through academic resilience.

H6: The indirect effects of conversation orientation on in-class oral participation will vary systematically as a function of conformity orientation through academic resilience.

When students are resilient, they should engage in more rhetorical dissent if there is a course-related problem or issue. When students exhibit lower levels of academic
Note. Each of the student classroom communication behaviors (i.e., out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, rhetorical dissent, vengeful dissent, expressive dissent, relational motive, functional motive, participatory motive, excuse-making motive, and sycophantic motive) will be inserted as variable Y in the model.
resilience, they may become frustrated with course-related problems and communicate their dissent in more expressive or vengeful ways. To investigate this notion, the following hypothesis is posited:

**H7:** The indirect effects of conversation orientation on (a) expressive, (b) rhetorical, and (c) vengeful dissent will vary systematically as a function of conformity orientation through academic resilience.

Conversation-oriented students, as well as academically resilient students, should be more motivated to communicate with their instructors for the relational, functional, participatory, excuse-making, and sycophantic motives. Students who are academically resilient are able to withstand academic challenges (Hosek et al., 2016). As such, many academic challenges can be addressed and resolved with open communication with instructors in and out of the classroom. Therefore, it stands to reason that academically resilient students will be motivated to learn more about their instructor interpersonally, to ask about course content and assignments, to demonstrate understanding of the material, to communicate an excuse to an instructor, and to attempt to get the instructor to view them positively. To investigate this idea, the following hypothesis is posited:

**H8:** The indirect effects of conversation orientation on (a) relational, (b) functional, (c) participatory, (d) excuse making, and (e) sycophantic motives to communicate with instructors will vary systematically as a function of conformity orientation through academic resilience.

**Summary**

To understand better the parenting experiences of college students, this dissertation seeks to investigate how FCP influence the way college students
communicate with their instructors inside and outside of the classroom. Specifically, the primary purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the relationship between the two dimensions (i.e., conversation orientation, conformity orientation) of FCP and students’ classroom communication behaviors (i.e., out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, instructional dissent, and students’ motives to communicate with their instructors), with a secondary purpose of exploring academic resilience as a mediator in the proposed relationship between FCP and students’ classroom communication behaviors.
CHAPTER II
Methodology

To address the hypotheses posited in Chapter I, undergraduate students were asked to complete a questionnaire that included measures of family communication patterns, academic resilience, out of class communication with their instructor, in-class oral participation, dissent, and motives for communicating with their instructors. This chapter will discuss the participants included in this dissertation, the procedures that were followed to collect the data, the instruments included in the questionnaire, and the data analyses that were conducted to address the hypotheses and research questions.

Participants

Participants were 184 undergraduate college students enrolled in two introductory level Communication Studies courses at West Virginia University. The participants were solicited using a convenience volunteer sampling technique, which refers to “taking available samples at hand” (Kerlinger, 1986, p. 120). As a nonprobability sampling technique, convenience volunteer sampling is used when researchers survey participants who are easily accessible and who are willing to participate. The researcher contacted two instructors in the Department of Communication Studies and they agreed to allow the researcher to recruit participants from their courses. A copy of the recruitment script (Appendix A) also was placed on the research participant recruitment bulletin board and website of the Department of Communication Studies.

Of the 184 participants, 66 were male, 109 were female, 1 participant indicated “other,” and 8 did not indicate their sex. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 27 years, with an average age of 19 years ($M = 19.7, SD = 1.7$). The majority of participants
was White/Caucasian ($n = 149; 81\%$), followed by Black/African American ($n = 17; 9.2\%$), Middle Eastern ($n = 5; 2.7\%$), Hispanic or Latino/a ($n = 5; 2.7\%$), Multiracial ($n = 5; 2.7\%$), and Asian/Pacific Islander ($n = 1; 0.5\%$). Two participants chose not to indicate their race/ethnicity. Eighty-two ($n = 82$) participants indicated they were currently in their first year of college, whereas 27 were sophomores, 34 were juniors, 39 were seniors, and 2 did not indicate their class rank. On average, the participants were enrolled in 6 courses ($M = 6.0$, $SD = 1.2$; range = 3-9 courses) across 15 credit hours ($M = 15.2$, $SD = 1.8$; range = 9-20 credit hours).

Each participant reported on the parent with whom they most recently interacted. The age of these parents ranged from 34 to 70 years, with an average age of 49 years ($M = 48.7$, $SD = 7.7$). The majority of participants reported on their mother ($n = 137; 74.5\%$), with less than a quarter of participants reporting on their father ($n = 42; 22.8\%$). Five participants did not indicate on which parent they were reporting. The majority of parents was White/Caucasian ($n = 163; 88.6\%$), followed by Black/African American ($n = 13; 7.1\%$), Middle Eastern ($n = 6; 3.3\%$), and Hispanic or Latino/a ($n = 2; 1.1\%$). Most of the parents were married ($n = 123; 66.8\%$), whereas 40 parents were divorced, 13 parents were widowed, 6 parents were never married, and 2 parents were engaged. With regard to the highest level of education that the parent completed, 42 had completed a graduate or professional degree, 48 had completed a four-year degree, 20 had completed a two-year degree, 30 had completed some college, 39 had completed high school or a GED, and 2 had completed some high school. Three participants did not report on their parent’s education level.

Participants also were asked about their own current living situation and the
frequency of their interaction with the identified parent. Many participants lived on campus \((n = 99)\), whereas 74 participants lived off campus without the parent and 11 participants lived at home with the parent. For those participants who were not living with their parent, the approximate average miles they lived away from their parent was 398 miles \((M = 398.1, SD = 976.5; \text{range} = 1-7507 \text{ miles})\). Participants reported seeing their parent face-to-face several times a year \((n = 53)\), followed by once a month \((n = 46)\), 2 to 3 times per month \((n = 43)\), once a week \((n = 15)\), daily \((n = 15)\), and 2 to 3 times per week \((n = 8)\). Four participants did not report the frequency of seeing their parent face-to-face.

**Procedures**

Following approval from the university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB) and adhering to the established departmental procedures for data collection, data were collected during the twelfth week of the Fall 2016 semester. Collecting data in the twelfth week provided time for the students of the two selected courses to reflect on their global student communication behaviors used during the semester. I entered the two courses and informed potential participants about the study by reading the recruitment script to them. The inclusion criteria for participation in this dissertation was being at least 18 years of age, being a college student, and having at least one living parent. The instructor of the course assigned a minimal amount of extra credit to students who agreed to participate in this study.

Once students agreed to participate in the study, they were provided with a cover letter (see Appendix B) stating the purpose of the study, identifying the procedures used to complete the study, and reiterating the anonymous nature of the study; an envelope;
and the questionnaire (see Appendix C). Participants took the questionnaire and envelope with them to complete outside of class. When I returned the following week, participants were instructed to (a) remove the cover letter and keep it for their records and (b) place the completed questionnaire in the provided envelope. Participants then sealed the envelope and brought it to the front of the classroom where they dropped the envelope in a large box I provided. For students who choose not to participate in the study, an alternative assignment was provided by the course instructors.

Instrumentation

Participants completed a battery of instruments and a series of demographic questions. The battery of instruments included the Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990), the Academic Resilience Scale (Martin & Marsh, 2006), the Out of Class Interaction Scale (Knapp & Martin, 2002), the Oral Participation Scale (Frymier & Houser, 2016), the Instructional Dissent Scale (Goodboy, 2011b), and the Student Communication Motives Scale (Martin et al., 2000). Participants also completed the Cognitive Flexibility Scale (Martin & Rubin, 1995), which was not used in this dissertation. Before beginning the questionnaire, participants were instructed to identify the parent with whom they most recently interacted (e.g., face-to-face, e-mail) and to reference this parent when completing the measures assessing family communication.

*The Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument* (RFCP; see Appendix D) is a 26-item, two-factor instrument intended to assess levels of conversation orientation and conformity orientation in the family. The instrument contains 15 items that assess conversation orientation (e.g., “My parents often say something like ‘You
should always look at both sides of an issue’’ and “My parents often ask my opinion when
the family is talking about something”) and 11 items that assess conformity orientation
(e.g., “My parents sometimes become irritated with my views if they are different from
theirs” and “When anything really important is involved, my parents expect me to obey
without question”). Responses are solicited using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1
(strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The RFCP instrument contains both a parent’s
and a child’s version of the scale; however, for the purpose of this dissertation, only the
child’s version was used. With the RFCP instrument, Cronbach’s alpha reliability
coefficients tend to be slightly higher for conversation orientation than for conformity
orientation, with Cronbach’s alpha reliabilities ranging from .81 to .93 for conversation
orientation and .73 to .80 for conformity orientation (Buckner et al., 2013; Kennedy-
Lightsey & Frisby, 2016; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002b; Ledbetter & Schrot, 2008;
Odenweller et al., 2013).

The Academic Resilience Scale (see Appendix E) is a 6-item, unidimensional
scale designed to measure students’ ability to effectively manage setbacks, challenges,
and pressures in academic settings. Responses are solicited using a 7-point Likert scale
ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Example items include “I think
I’m good at dealing with schoolwork pressures” and “I’m good at bouncing back from a
poor grade in my school work.” For this measure, Martin and Marsh (2006) obtained a
Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .89 whereas Martin (2008) obtained a
Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .88.

The Out of Class Interaction Scale (see Appendix F) is a 13-item, unidimensional
scale intended to assess students’ levels of interaction with their instructors outside of the
classroom. Example items include “I talk to my instructors outside of the classroom about topics that are not class related” and “I often talk to my instructors during their office hours.” Responses are solicited using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Previous Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for this instrument have been .86 and .87 (Martin & Myers, 2006; Miller-Ott, 2016).

The Oral Participation Scale (see Appendix G) is a 7-item scale that measures students’ reports of their oral participation during their classes. Example items include “I volunteer when I know the correct response or answer” and “I ask questions that solicit the teacher’s opinions about the content.” Responses are solicited using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 4 (very often). Frymier and Houser (2016) obtained a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .91 for the instrument.

The Instructional Dissent Scale (see Appendix H) is a 22-item, three factor scale that measures students’ frequency of complaints about class-related issues. The three factors are expressive dissent, rhetorical dissent, and vengeful dissent. Example items of expressive dissent include “I complain to others to express my frustrations with my courses” and “I talk to other students when I am annoyed with my teachers in hopes that I am not the only one.” Example items of rhetorical dissent include “I express my disagreements with my teachers because I want something to change in the course for the better” and “I have no problem telling my teachers what I need them to do for me to succeed in the course.” Example items of vengeful dissent include “I make sure that everyone knows how awful my teachers are to get revenge for the bad semester I had” and “I seek revenge on my teachers by trying to get them in trouble.” Responses are solicited using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). Previous
Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients have ranged from .83 to .96 for the three subscales (Goodboy, 2011, 2012; Goodboy & Frisby, 2014; Goodboy & Myers, 2012; Martin et al., 2015).

*The Student Communication Motives Scale* (see Appendix I) is a 30-item, five factor measure intended to assess students’ motives for communicating with their instructors. These five factors are relational (e.g., “To learn more about the teacher personally” and “Because we share common interests”), functional (e.g., “To get assistance on assignments/exams” and “To ask questions about the material”), excuse-making (e.g., “To explain why I do not have my work done” and “To explain why my work does not meet the instructor’s expectations”), participatory (e.g., “To appear involved in class” and “To show that I understand the material”), and sycophantic (e.g., “To give the impression that I’m interested in the course content” and “To get special permission or privileges not granted to all students”). Responses are solicited using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not like you at all*) to 5 (*exactly like you*). Martin et al. (2000) initially reported Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .86 to .90 across the five motives, with subsequent studies reporting similar reliability coefficients ranging from .82 to .92 (Goodboy, Myers, & Bolkan, 2010; Myers, 2006; Myers & Claus, 2012).

**Data Analysis**

This dissertation required both preliminary data analysis and primary data analysis. In the preliminary data analysis, the internal reliabilities of each instrument were assessed and a confirmatory factor analysis on each measure was conducted. In the primary data analysis, the hypotheses and research questions were assessed using Pearson
Product-Moment correlation analyses and a series of moderated mediation analyses.

**Preliminary data analysis.** The internal reliability of each instrument was assessed using Cronbach’s (1951) alpha reliability coefficient. A Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient measures the internal consistency of a scale, which is the extent to which all items within an instrument measure the same construct (Cortina, 1993). A confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) also was conducted on each instrument. A CFA confirms an *a priori* model of the underlying factor structure and tests to determine if the data accurately fit the model (Stevens, 2002). CFA specifies the variables that should load on particular factors, with the number of factors being fixed *a priori*. It provides fit statistics to determine if the model represents the observed data adequately (Kline, 2005). These model-fit statistics include the minimum fit function chi-square, the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR; Hu & Bentler, 1999), the comparative fit index (CFI; Hu & Bentler, 1999), and the normed fit index (NFI; Kline, 2011).

**Primary data analysis.** The first, second, third, and fourth hypotheses, as well as research question one and two, were explored using Pearson Product-Moment correlation analysis. Pearson Product-Moment correlations determine the linear relationship between two variables by providing a value between 1.0 and -1.0 (Stevens, 2002; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). For this analysis, the relationships between conversation orientation and conformity orientation and the outcome variables of out-of-class communication with instructors (H₁), oral in-class participation (H₂), the three dimensions of instructional dissent (H₃ and RQ₁), and the five student motives to communicate with instructors were assessed (H₄ and RQ₂).
The fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth hypotheses were explored using a series of first-stage moderated mediation analyses. A moderated mediation analysis examines the relationship between a predictor variable and an outcome variable that can be explained by their relationship, at least in part, with a third (or mediating) variable (Hayes, 2013). There also is a moderator present in the model to determine if systematic differences exist in the relationship between the predictor variable and each outcome variable based on the moderator. The moderated mediation produces indirect effects (ab) for each of the values of the moderator. These hypotheses were tested using Model 7 (moderated mediation) in the PROCESS macro in SPSS (Hayes, 2013). Moderated mediation was conducted using Hayes’s (2015) index of moderated mediation, which is the slope of the line relating the indirect effect to the moderator. For these hypotheses, the predictor variable was conversation orientation with conformity orientation serving as the moderator, the mediating variable was academic resilience, and the outcome variables were out-of-class communication with instructors (H5), oral in-class participation (H6), instructional dissent (H7), and student motives to communicate with their instructors (H8).

Summary

Chapter II outlined the methods that were employed to address the hypotheses proposed in Chapter I. A total of 184 participants participated in this study. These participants were undergraduate college students who were 18 years or older, enrolled in at least one college course, and had at least one parent living. The procedures to collect data involved recruiting a convenience volunteer sample from students enrolled in two Communication Studies classes and providing them with a cover letter, an envelope, and a questionnaire to complete anonymously. The questionnaire was comprised of a battery
of instruments intended to measure their family communication patterns, academic resilience, out-of-class communication with instructors, oral in-class participation, instructional dissent, and student motives to communicate with instructors. To analyze the data, preliminary data analyses included assessing internal reliability and the internal factor structure of each instrument and the primary data analyses included a series of one-tailed, Pearson Product-Moment correlation analyses, a moderation analysis, and a series of moderated mediation analyses.
CHAPTER III

Results

The purpose of this chapter is to present the research findings from the preliminary data analyses and the primary data analyses conducted in this dissertation. For the preliminary data analysis, the internal reliability of each instrument was assessed using Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient, the underlying factor structure of each instrument was assessed using confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), and correlations among all the variables were examined using two-tailed, Pearson Product-Moment correlation analyses. For the primary data analysis, the eight hypotheses and the two research questions presented in Chapter 1 were assessed using either a series of one-tailed, Pearson Product-Moment correlation analyses, a moderation analysis, or a series of moderated mediation analyses.

Preliminary Data Analysis

Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient Analysis

The internal consistency of each instrument was assessed using Cronbach’s (1951) alpha reliability coefficient. Generally, all of the instruments achieved acceptable levels, with these coefficients ranging from .78 to .92. Table 1 contains a summary of the Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient and the number of items, the item response range, the theoretical response range, and the mean score and standard deviation score for each instrument.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Each instrument was subjected to a CFA. A CFA is used when an explicit theory of the factor structure has been determined (Stevens, 2002); it provides fit statistics to
Table 1

Instrument Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Item Scale Range</th>
<th>Theoretical Response Range</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Communication Patterns</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>15-75</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>11-55</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resilience</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>6-42</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-Class Communication</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>13-65</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Participation</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-28</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Dissent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive Dissent</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-40</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical Dissent</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vengeful Dissent</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-24</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motives to Communicate with Instructors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Motive</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Motive</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Motive</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excuse-Making Motive</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sycophancy Motive</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>6-30</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The endpoints of the Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument, the Academic Resilience Scale, and the Out of Class Interaction Scale are strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). The endpoints of the Oral Participation Scale and the Instructional Dissent Scale are never (0) to very often (4). The endpoints of the Student Communication Motives Scale are not like you at all (1) to exactly like you (5).
determine if the CFA model represents the observed data adequately (Kline, 2005). For this dissertation, the minimum fit function chi-square, the root mean squared error of approximation (RMSEA; Steiger, 1990), the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR; Hu & Bentler), the comparative fit index (CFI; Hu & Bentler), and the normed fit index (NFI; Kline, 2011) were analyzed to determine model fit. For a CFA model to be accepted, the minimum fit function chi-square value should be non-significant, the RMSEA should be less than or equal to .08, the SRMR value should be less than or equal to .08, and the CFI and NFI values should be greater than or equal to .95 (Hu & Bentler; Kline, 2016).

In the communication studies discipline, it has been a commonly accepted practice for researchers to label their CFA model as good, acceptable, or poor fit. Browne and Cudeck (1993) suggested that when the RMSEA value is $\leq .05$, the model is a good fit, whereas if the RMSEA value is $\geq .10$, the model is a poor fit. An RMSEA value of .08 has been deemed as acceptable fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999; MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996), but Kenny, Kaniskan, and McCoach (2015) argued to neglect calculating RMSEA for models with low degrees of freedom. Kline (2016), however, suggested that analyzing the upper and lower bounds of the 90% confidence interval of the RMSEA is necessary because RMSEA is sensitive to the number of parameters of the model. With regard to the SRMR value, Hu and Bentler (1999) indicated a value $\leq .08$ as an acceptable fit, whereas a value $\geq .08$ indicates poor fit. For CFI values, Byrne (2010) deemed the model acceptable if the index exceeds .93 and if the NFI value exceeds .90. Schumacker and Lomax (2004) deemed the model acceptable if the NFI value exceeds .95. With regard to the minimum fit function chi-square value, the model is deemed
acceptable if the statistic is not significant (Kline, 2016). Therefore, if the chi-square value is significant at the .05 level, the model is regarded as unacceptable (Byrne, 2010; Kline, 2016). Listed below are the fit indices for each model.

**Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument.** The CFA model for the Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument provided the following fit to the data: \( \chi^2 (298) = 649.99, p < .001, \text{CFI} = .80, \text{NFI} = .69, \text{RMSEA} = .08 \) (CI: .072, .089), SRMR = .08 (see Figure 2).

**Academic Resilience Scale.** The CFA model for the Academic Resilience Scale provided the following fit to the data: \( \chi^2 (9) = 54.78, p < .001, \text{CFI} = .89, \text{NFI} = .87, \text{RMSEA} = .17 \) (CI: .126, .210), SRMR = .07 (see Figure 3).

**Out of Class Interaction Scale.** The CFA model for the Out of Class Interaction Scale provided the following fit to the data: \( \chi^2 (65) = 338.78, p < .001, \text{CFI} = .72, \text{NFI} = .68, \text{RMSEA} = .15 \) (CI: .136, .168), SRMR = .11 (see Figure 4).

**Oral Participation Scale.** The CFA model for the Oral Participation Scale provided the following fit to the data: \( \chi^2 (14) = 84.82, p < .001, \text{CFI} = .80, \text{NFI} = .79, \text{RMSEA} = .16 \) (CI: .133, .201), SRMR = .10 (see Figure 5).

**Instructional Dissent Scale.** The CFA model for the Instructional Dissent Scale provided the following fit to the data: \( \chi^2 (206) = 531.15, p < .001, \text{CFI} = .87, \text{NFI} = .81, \text{RMSEA} = .09 \) (CI: .083, .103), SRMR = .08 (see Figure 6).

**Student Communication Motives Scale.** The CFA model for the Student Communication Motives Scale provided the following fit to the data: \( \chi^2 (395) = 992.22, p < .001, \text{CFI} = .81, \text{NFI} = .72, \text{RMSEA} = .09 \) (CI: .084, .098), SRMR = .08 (see Figure 7).
Figure 2

Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument CFA

Note. Standardized factor loadings in italics.
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*Academic Resilience Scale CFA*

Note. Standardized factor loadings in italics.
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Out of Class Interaction Scale CFA

Note. Standardized factor loadings in italics.
Figure 5

*Oral Participation Scale CFA*

![Diagram showing Oral Participation Scale CFA with factor loadings.

**Note.** Standardized factor loadings in italics.
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Instructional Dissent Scale CFA

Note. Standardized factor loadings in italics.
Figure 7

*Student Communication Motives Scale CFA*

Note. Standardized factor loadings in italics.
Two-Tailed Correlation Analysis

A two-tailed, Pearson Product-Moment correlation analysis was conducted between all variables in this dissertation. Table 2 contains the correlation matrix.

Primary Data Analysis

Hypotheses 1-4 and research questions 1 and 2 were tested using a series of one-tailed, Product-Moment correlations. A series of moderated mediation analyses was conducted using the PROCESS macro in SPSS to address hypotheses 5-8.

Hypothesis 1

Hypothesis 1 predicted that conversation orientation would be positively related to both students’ out-of-class communication with their instructors and students’ in-class oral participation. This hypothesis was partially supported. Although conversation orientation was not significantly related to OCC, \( r(181) = .07, p = .19 \), it was positively related to students’ in-class oral participation, \( r(180) = .21, p < .01 \).

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted that conformity orientation would be negatively related to both students’ out-of-class communication with their instructors and students’ in-class oral participation. This hypothesis was not supported. Conformity orientation was not significantly related to either OCC, \( r(181) = .00, p = .49 \), or to students’ in-class oral participation, \( r(180) = .00, p = .49 \).

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that conversation orientation would be positively related to students’ use of rhetorical dissent and that conformity orientation would be negatively related to students’ use of rhetorical dissent. This hypothesis was not supported. Conversation orientation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conversation Orientation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Academic Resilience</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Out-of-Class Communication</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Oral Participation</td>
<td>.22†</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.28^</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Expressive Dissent</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rhetorical Dissent</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.42^</td>
<td>.40^</td>
<td>.42^</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vengeful Dissent</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.24^</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.41^</td>
<td>.60^</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Relational Motive</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.27^</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.44^</td>
<td>.40^</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.39^</td>
<td>.20†</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Functional Motive</td>
<td>.32^</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15†</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.31^</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.28^</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.35^</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Participatory Motive</td>
<td>.25^</td>
<td>.30^</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.26^</td>
<td>.51^</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.35^</td>
<td>.16^</td>
<td>.67^</td>
<td>.44^</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Excuse-making Motive</td>
<td>.19†</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26^</td>
<td>.26^</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.47^</td>
<td>.26^</td>
<td>.52^</td>
<td>.40^</td>
<td>.61^</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Sycophancy Motive</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33^</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.38^</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.32^</td>
<td>.21†</td>
<td>.68^</td>
<td>.34^</td>
<td>.79^</td>
<td>.59^</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p < .05. †p < .01. ^p < .001.*
was not significantly related to rhetorical dissent, \( r(180) = .09, p = .10 \), and conformity orientation was not significantly related to rhetorical dissent, \( r(180) = .10, p = .10 \).

**Research Question 1**

Research question 1 inquired about the relationship among conversation orientation, conformity orientation, expressive dissent, and vengeful dissent. Conversation orientation was not significantly related to expressive dissent, \( r(177) = .09, p = .13 \), but was negatively related to vengeful dissent, \( r(181) = -.13, p < .05 \). Conformity orientation was not significantly related to expressive dissent, \( r(177) = -.02, p = .36 \), but was positively related to vengeful dissent, \( r(181) = .16, p < .05 \).

**Hypothesis 4**

Hypothesis 4 predicted that conversation orientation would be positively related, and conformity orientation would be negatively related, to the relational, functional, participatory, and sycophantic motives to communicate with instructors. This hypothesis was partially supported. Conversation orientation was positively related to the relational motive, \( r(179) = .19, p < .01 \); the functional motive, \( r(180) = .31, p < .001 \); and the participatory motive, \( r(180) = .24, p < .001 \); but was not related to the sycophantic motive, \( r(180) = .12, p = .06 \). Conformity orientation was positively related to the relational motive, \( r(179) = .27, p < .001 \); the participatory motive, \( r(180) = .30, p < .001 \); and the sycophantic motive, \( r(180) = .33, p < .001 \); but was not related to the functional motive, \( r(180) = .12, p = .06 \).

**Research Question 2**

Research question 2 inquired about the relationship among conversation orientation, conformity orientation, and the excuse-making motive to communicate with instructors. Both conversation orientation \([r(179) = .20, p < .01]\) and conformity orientation \([r(179) = .21, p < .01]\)
were positively related to the excuse-making motive.

**Hypotheses 5-8**

Before analyzing hypotheses 5-8 for their indirect effects, a simple moderation analysis (i.e., Model 1 in PROCESS) was conducted to determine if the effect of conversation orientation on academic resilience differed systematically as a function of conformity orientation. After examining the interaction with conformity orientation, it was determined that significant moderation existed, explaining variation by a function of conformity orientation (see Table 3 for model coefficients). The $\Delta R^2$ was .05, indicating about a 5% increase due to the interaction of conversation orientation and conformity orientation. See Figure 8 for a visual depiction of the moderation analysis.

To determine which values of the moderator (i.e., conformity orientation) either were significant or not significant, the percentiles Pick-a-Point approach was utilized (Bauer & Curran, 2005). This approach was used to estimate conditional effects at very low $[\theta_{(X\rightarrow Y)} | M=2.00 = .546, SE = .206, p < .01]$, low $[\theta_{(X\rightarrow Y)} | M=2.36 = .356, SE = .159, p < .05]$, medium $[\theta_{(X\rightarrow Y)} | M=2.91 = .070, SE = .121, p = .57]$, high $[\theta_{(X\rightarrow Y)} | M=3.36 = -.169, SE = .139, p = .23]$, and very high $[\theta_{(X\rightarrow Y)} | M=3.82 = -.407, SE = .190, p < .05]$ values of the moderator. These conditional effects suggest that as conformity orientation increases, the significant positive relationship between conversation orientation and academic resilience decreases to nonsignificant and even becomes a significant, negative relationship at the highest levels of conformity orientation. The Johnson-Neyman technique (Bauer & Curran, 2005; Johnson & Neyman, 1936) determines which regions (ranges) of values of the moderator are significant and nonsignificant. The Johnson-Neyman technique revealed that the relationship transitions from significant and positive to nonsignificant when conformity orientation reaches a value of 2.494, $\theta_{(X\rightarrow Y)} = .287, SE = .146, p = .05$. The
Table 3

*Moderation Model for Academic Resilience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-2.41</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>-6.50</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-3.04</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. \( R^2 = .056, F(3, 176) = 3.48, p < .05. \) \( \Delta R^2 \) due to interaction = .05.
Figure 8

Effect of Conversation Orientation on Academic Resilience at Different Levels of Conformity Orientation

Note. “Low” represents 1 standard deviation below the mean. “Moderate” represents the mean. “High” represents 1 standard deviation above the mean. At low conversation orientation and low conformity orientation, the value of academic resilience was 3.64. At low conversation orientation and moderate conformity orientation, the value of academic resilience was 3.97. At low conversation orientation and high conformity orientation, the value of academic resilience was 4.30. At moderate conversation orientation and low conformity orientation, the value of academic resilience was 4.06. At moderate conversation orientation and moderate conformity orientation, the value of academic resilience was 4.11. At moderate conversation orientation and high conformity orientation, the value of academic resilience was 4.17. At high conversation orientation and low conformity orientation, the value of academic resilience was 4.47. At high conversation orientation and moderate conformity orientation, the value of academic resilience was 4.25. At high conversation orientation and high conformity orientation, the value of academic resilience was 4.04.
relationship transitions from nonsignificant to a significant, negative relationship at a value of $3.701, \theta_{X \rightarrow Y} = -0.346, SE = .175, p = .05$.

For hypotheses 5-8, a first-stage moderated mediation analysis was conducted. Indirect effects were calculated using 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals and 10,000 bootstrapped samples.

**Hypothesis 5.** Hypothesis 5 stated that conditional indirect effects would exist in the relationship between conversation orientation and out-of-class communication through academic resilience (i.e., mediator) based on varying levels of conformity orientation (i.e., moderator). This hypothesis was not supported (see Table 4) as the index of moderated mediation was 0.0004 (CI: -0.048, 0.048), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on out-of-class communication through academic resilience was not conditional upon conformity orientation. Additionally, the direct effect was not significant ($c' = 0.08, p = .24$).

**Hypothesis 6.** Hypothesis 6 stated that conditional indirect effects would exist in the relationship between conversation orientation and in-class oral participation through academic resilience (i.e., mediator) based on varying levels of conformity orientation (i.e., moderator). This hypothesis was not supported (see Table 5) as the index of moderated mediation was -0.037 (CI: -0.105, 0.005), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on in-class oral participation through academic resilience was not conditional upon conformity orientation. However, the direct effect was significant ($c' = 0.24, p < .001$).

**Hypothesis 7a-7c.** Hypotheses 7a-7c stated that conditional indirect effects would exist in the relationship between conversation orientation and the three types of instructional dissent (expressive, 7a; rhetorical, 7b; and vengeful, 7c) through academic resilience (i.e., mediator) based on varying levels of conformity orientation (i.e., moderator). Hypothesis 7a was not
Table 4

**OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 174) = 3.52, p &lt; .05, R^2 = .06$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($a$)</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-3.08</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out-of-Class Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2, 175) = 0.68, p = .51, R^2 = .01$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resilience ($b$)</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($c'$)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderated Mediation (through AR)**
IMM = 0.0004 (95% CI: -0.048, 0.048)

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator ($W =$ values of academic resilience) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
Table 5

*OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 173) = 3.50, p &lt; .05, R^2 = .06$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.51</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-6.63</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($a$)</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-3.07</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **In-Class Oral Participation**    |        |     |      |       |       |       |
| $F(2, 174) = 6.64, p < .01, R^2 = .07$ |        |     |      |       |       |       |
| Constant                           | .73    | .34 | 2.18 | <.05  | 0.07  | 1.39  |
| Academic Resilience ($b$)          | .07    | .05 | 1.54 | .13   | -0.02 | 0.16  |
| Conversation Orientation ($c'$)    | .24    | .07 | 3.28 | <.001 | 0.10  | 0.39  |

**Moderated Mediation (through AR)**
IMM = -0.037 (95% CI: -0.105, 0.005)

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator ($W = \text{values of academic resilience}$) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
supported (see Table 6) as the index of moderated mediation was 0.011 (CI: -0.043, 0.085), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on expressive dissent through academic resilience was not conditional upon conformity orientation. Additionally, the direct effect was not significant ($c' = 0.12, p = .21$).

Hypothesis 7b was not supported (see Table 7) as the index of moderated mediation was -0.022 (CI: -0.102, 0.032), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on rhetorical dissent through academic resilience was not conditional upon conformity orientation. Additionally, the direct effect was not significant ($c' = 0.14, p = .14$).

Hypothesis 7c was not supported (see Table 8) as the index of moderated mediation was 0.023 (CI: -0.027, 0.101), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on vengeful dissent through academic resilience was not conditional upon conformity orientation. Additionally, the direct effect was not significant ($c' = -0.14, p = .09$).

Hypothesis 8a-8e. Hypotheses 8a-8e stated that conditional indirect effects would exist in the relationship between conversation orientation and the five student motives to communicate with instructors (relational, 8a; functional, 8b; participatory, 8c; excuse-making, 8d; and sycophantic, 8e) through academic resilience (i.e., mediator) based on varying levels of conformity orientation (i.e., moderator). Hypothesis 8a was not supported (see Table 9) as the index of moderated mediation was -0.012 (CI: -0.077, 0.038), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on the relational motive through academic resilience was not conditional upon conformity orientation. However, the direct effect was significant ($c' = 0.24, p < .01$).

Hypothesis 8b was supported (see Table 10) as the index of moderated mediation was -0.057 (CI: -0.152, -0.008), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on the
Table 6

**OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-6.33</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation (a)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressive Dissent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resilience (b)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation (c')</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderated Mediation (through AR)**

IMM = 0.011 (95% CI: -0.043, 0.085)

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator (W = values of academic resilience) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
Table 7

**OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 173) = 3.42, p &lt; .05, R^2 = .06$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.42</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-6.55</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($a$)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-3.03</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhetorical Dissent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2, 174) = 1.37, p = .26, R^2 = .02$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resilience ($b$)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($c'$)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderated Mediation (through AR)**

IMM = -0.022 (95% CI: -0.102, 0.032)

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator ($W =$ values of academic resilience) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
Table 8

**OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 174) = 3.45, p &lt; .05, R^2 = .06$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.43</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-6.54</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($a$)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-3.04</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vengeful Dissent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2, 175) = 1.74, p = .18, R^2 = .02$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resilience ($b$)</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($c'$)</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-1.67</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderated Mediation (through AR)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMM = 0.023 (95% CI: -0.027, 0.101)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator ($W =$ values of academic resilience) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
Table 9

**OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(3, 172) = 3.40, p &lt; .05, $R^2 = .06$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.31</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-6.37</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($a$)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relational Motive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2, 173) = 3.50, p &lt; .05, $R^2 = .04$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resilience ($b$)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($c'$)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderated Mediation (through AR)**

IMM = -0.012 (95% CI: -0.077, 0.038)

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator ($W =$ values of academic resilience) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
functional motive through academic resilience was conditional upon conformity orientation. To probe the moderated mediation, three values of the moderator (i.e., the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean) were estimated to assess the conditional indirect effects. Students who reported higher levels of conversation orientation and lower levels of conformity orientation were more motivated to communicate for the functional motive through academic resilience. As reported in Table 10, there was no indirect effect through academic resilience when conformity orientation was moderate \([\theta(ab)|_{W = 2.91} = 0.007 (CI: -.013, .050)]\) or high \([\theta(ab)|_{W = 3.60} = -0.032 (CI: -.101, .002)]\); however, the indirect effect was significant when conformity orientation was low \([\theta(ab)|_{W = 2.22} = 0.047 (CI: .004, .130)]\). Moreover, the direct effect was significant \((c' = 0.38, p < .001)\).

Hypothesis 8c was not supported (see Table 11) as the index of moderated mediation was \(-0.032 (CI: -0.106, 0.013)\), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on the participatory motive through academic resilience was not conditional upon conformity orientation. However, the direct effect was significant \((c' = 0.30, p < .001)\).

Hypothesis 8d was not supported (see Table 12) as the index of moderated mediation was \(-0.017 (CI: -0.092, 0.041)\), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on the excuse-making motive through academic resilience was not conditional upon conformity orientation. However, the direct effect was significant \((c' = 0.28, p < .01)\).

Hypothesis 8e was not supported (see Table 13) as the index of moderated mediation was \(-0.024 (CI: -0.092, 0.027)\), indicating that the indirect effect of conversation orientation on the sycophantic motive through academic resilience was not conditional upon conformity orientation. Additionally, the direct effect was not significant \((c' = 0.16, p = .09)\).
Table 10

**OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 173) = 3.47, p &lt; .05, R^2 = .06$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-6.39</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($a$)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-3.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Functional Motive** |        |     |      |      |      |      |
| $F(2, 174) = 12.79, p < .001, R^2 = .13$ |        |     |      |      |      |      |
| Constant | 1.55  | .38  | 4.07  | <.001 | 0.80 | 2.30 |
| Academic Resilience ($b$) | 0.11  | .05  | 2.13  | <.05 | 0.01  | 0.21 |
| Conversation Orientation ($c'$) | 0.38  | .08  | 4.56  | <.001 | 0.22 | 0.55 |

| **Moderated Mediation (through AR)** |        |     |      |      |      |      |
| Bootstrapped CI | $ab$ | $SE$ | LLCI | ULCI |
| IMM = -0.057 (95% CI: -0.152, -0.008) | 0.047 | .03 | 0.004 | 0.130 |
| Indirect Effect $\theta(ab)_{W=2.22}$ | 0.007 | .01 | -0.013 | 0.050 |
| Indirect Effect $\theta(ab)_{W=2.91}$ | -0.032 | .03 | -0.101 | 0.002 |

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator ($W = \text{values of academic resilience}$) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
Table 11

**OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(3, 173) = 3.47, p &lt; .05, R² = .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-6.39</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation (a)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participatory Motive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F(2, 174) = 6.72, p &lt; .01, R² = .07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resilience (b)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation (c’)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderated Mediation (through AR)**

IMM = -0.032 (95% CI: -0.106, 0.013)

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator (W = values of academic resilience) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
Table 12

*OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F</em>(3, 172) = 3.34, <em>p</em> &lt; .05, <em>R</em>² = .06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.25</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-6.35</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation <em>(a)</em></td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excuse-Making Motive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>F</em>(2, 173) = 4.30, <em>p</em> &lt; .05, <em>R</em>² = .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resilience <em>(b)</em></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation <em>(c’)</em></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderated Mediation (through AR)**

IMM = -0.017 (95% CI: -0.092, 0.041)

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator (*W* = values of academic resilience) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
Table 13

**OLS Path Model Coefficients (First-Stage Moderated Mediation Model with Conversation Orientation as the Independent Variable)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Resilience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(3, 173) = 3.47, p &lt; .05, R^2 = .06$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>-1.14</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-6.39</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($a$)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity Orientation</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation * Conformity</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sycophantic Motive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2, 174) = 1.73, p = .18, R^2 = .02$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Resilience ($b$)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Orientation ($c’$)</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderated Mediation (through AR)**
IMM = -0.024 (95% CI: -0.092, 0.027)

*Note.* IMM = index of moderated mediation. Conditional indirect effects are estimated at values of the moderator ($W =$ values of academic resilience) at the mean, 1 SD above the mean, and 1 SD below the mean. Bootstrapped CIs that do not include zero indicate mediated effects.
Summary

The purpose of Chapter III was to present the research findings the preliminary analyses (i.e., Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient, confirmatory factor analysis, two-tailed, Pearson Product-Moment correlation) and the primary analyses (i.e., a series of one-tailed, Pearson Product-Moment correlation analyses, a moderation analysis, or a series of moderated mediation analyses). Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients for each of the scales and subscales achieved acceptable levels, ranging from .78 to .92. Findings from CFAs provided fit indices for all six scales used in the dissertation. A series of one-tailed, Pearson Product-Moment correlations indicated that conversation orientation was positively related to in-class oral participation and four motives to motives to communicate with instructors (i.e., relational, functional, excuse-making, and participatory), but was negatively related to vengeful dissent. A series of one-tailed, Pearson Product-Moment correlations indicated that conformity orientation was positively related to vengeful dissent and four motives to motives to communicate with instructors (i.e., relational, excuse-making, participatory, and sycophantic). Nine of the 10 moderated mediation analyses were not significant, however, one test was significant which indicated that conformity orientation moderated the relationship between conversation orientation and the functional motive to communicate with instructors through academic resilience.
Chapter IV
Discussion

Two purposes guided this dissertation. The first purpose was to investigate the relationships between the dimensions of Family Communication Patterns (FCP; Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a, 2002b; Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990) and students’ classroom communication behaviors (i.e., out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, instructional dissent, motives to communicate with their instructors). The second purpose was to examine how academic resilience might act as a mediator between FCP and student classroom communication behaviors. To address these purposes, this chapter will review the results of the dissertation, offer three implications for family communication and instructional communication scholarship, identify limitations of this dissertation, and provide several directions for future research that integrates FCP into the college classroom.

Review of Results

Hypotheses 1-4 and Research Questions 1-2

In this dissertation, the relationships between the two dimensions of FCP (i.e., conversation orientation, conformity orientation) and student classroom communication behaviors (i.e., out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, instructional dissent, motives to communicate with their instructors) were examined. The hypotheses predicted that (a) conversation orientation would be related positively with students’ out-of-class communication (hypothesis 1a); in-class oral participation (hypothesis 1b); rhetorical dissent (hypothesis 3); and the relational, functional, participatory, and sycophantic motives to communicate with their instructors (hypothesis 4); and that (b)
conformity orientation would be related negatively with students’ out-of-class communication (hypothesis 2a); in-class oral participation (hypothesis 2b); rhetorical dissent (hypothesis 3); and the relational, functional, participatory, and sycophantic motives to communicate with their instructors (hypothesis 4). The research questions investigated the potential relationships between the two dimensions of FCP and students’ expressive dissent, vengeful dissent (research question 1), and the excuse-making motive to communicate with instructors (research question 2).

Overall, several significant relationships were discovered among the aforementioned variables. It was found that conversation orientation was (a) related positively with in-class oral participation and the relational, functional, participatory, and excuse-making motives to communicate with instructors, but was (b) related negatively with vengeful dissent. Conformity orientation was related positively with vengeful dissent and the relational, participatory, excuse-making, and sycophantic motives to communicate with instructors. No other significant relationships were obtained.

In regard to hypothesis 1, no relationships were found between the two dimensions of FCP and OCC, despite Miller-Ott’s (2016) finding that students from conversation-oriented families are more likely than students from conformity-oriented families to engage in OCC with their instructors. There are two reasons possible for why conversation orientation and conformity orientation are not related to OCC. First, it is likely that when students have questions about the course or want to speak with their instructors outside of the classroom, they engage in OCC regardless of their family communication environment. It is logical to think that students from high conversation-oriented families would be more likely to seek their instructors to communicate outside
of class, however, rather than exposure to a particular family environment, OCC may be better explained by student traits or instructor behaviors. In regard to student traits, students who are less communicatively apprehensive, more cognitively flexible, and who subscribe to a learning orientation (Goodboy et al., 2015; Martin & Myers, 2006; Williams & Frymier, 2007) are likely to engage in OCC with their instructors. Instructional communication researchers also have discovered that instructor behaviors (e.g., humor orientation, responsiveness, credibility) can increase the amount of OCC in which students participate (Aylor & Oppliger, 2003; Myers, 2004). These studies suggest that OCC may be more contextually-based than influenced by family communication environments.

Second, it is important to note that the frequency of student-faculty interaction outside of the classroom typically increases from students’ first year through their senior year (Kuh & Hu, 2001), therefore the large representation of first-year students in this dissertation could possibly affect this finding. To address this issue, a post hoc ANOVA analyzing differences in OCC based on the 4 class rankings was significant \[ F(3, 176) = 7.73, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .12 \]. Juniors (\( M = 2.72, SD = .68 \)) and Seniors (\( M = 2.72, SD = .62 \)) engaged in more OCC than first-year students (\( M = 2.21, SD = .66 \)). No significant difference emerged regarding the Sophomore group (\( M = 2.41, SD = .67 \)).

In regard to hypotheses 1-2, although conversation orientation was related positively to in-class oral participation, conformity orientation was not at all related. A defining characteristic of conversation orientation is the free exchange of ideas among family members (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a, 2002b). Therefore, it stands to reason that this characteristic extends outside of the family environment to other relationships. Because conversation-oriented students likely are comfortable exchanging ideas with
others, they may be comfortable exchanging ideas and thoughts in academic environments which could explain why they orally participate in class. Conversely, young adults from families low in conversation orientation may experience an uncomfortable feeling in regard to orally participating in their classes. These findings extend Avtgis’s (1999) research study that discovered that when students report their unwillingness to communicate with their instructors, they belong to a low conversation-oriented family. The lack of a significant relationship between conformity orientation and oral in-class participation obtained in this dissertation corroborates what previous studies also have found— that conformity orientation is not a significant predictor of reticence (Kelly et al., 2002), shyness (Huang, 1999), unwillingness to communicate (Avtgis, 1999), or communication apprehension (Elwood & Schrader, 1998). Conformity orientation emphasizes strict adherence to family rules and hierarchy, which does not necessarily mean that college students will or will not participate in their classes. Therefore, it is possible that students’ likelihood to participate in class does not emerge from a conformity-oriented family climate characterized by controlling behaviors and strictness, but rather emerges from a conversation-oriented family climate characterized by the frequency of communication and breath of topics discussed.

With regard to instructional dissent (i.e., hypothesis 3 and research question 1), FCP was significantly related only to vengeful dissent, albeit negatively with conversation orientation and positively with conformity orientation. The finding that conformity-oriented students are more likely to engage in vengeful dissent can best be understood by Koesten et al.’s (2009) assertion that in “maintaining a strict conformity to parental rules and regulations, families that avoid conflict are less likely to produce
young adults who are cognitively flexible” (p. 91). When situations arise that produce negative emotions, individuals who are cognitively flexible are attentive to situational factors and can recognize that adjustments in their behavior may need to be made (Martin & Rubin, 1995). Therefore, conformity-oriented college students who are less cognitively flexible may demonstrate behaviors such as vengeful dissent in light of a negative academic situation. Instead of dissenting rhetorically or expressively, these conformity-oriented students may jump to extreme measures, such as degrading the reputation and character of their instructor, because they have not learned how to either express their emotions (Gottman, Katz, & Hooven, 1996) or argue effectively (Shearman & Dumlao, 2008). It is worthy of noting that the lack of a significant relationship obtained between both FCP dimensions and expressive dissent and rhetorical dissent in this dissertation was surprising. According to FCP, young adults from high conversation-oriented and low conformity-oriented families are more comfortable with expressing disagreements and are more likely to have strong argumentation skills (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a, 2002b; Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990). Because rhetorical dissent utilizes open communication and persuasion, it was assumed that students from these family types would engage in rhetorical dissent.

With hypothesis 4 and research question 2, the relationships between FCP and students’ motives to communicate with their instructors were explored. Conversation orientation was related positively with the relational, functional, participatory, and excuse-making motives to communicate with instructors, whereas conformity orientation was related positively with the relational, participatory, excuse-making, and sycophantic motives to communicate with instructors. It is common for high conversation-oriented
individuals to frequently communicate with others and to discuss an array of topics, therefore students from high conversation-oriented families should be more motivated to develop a relationship with their instructor that extends beyond the classroom (Martin et al., 2002) because they are accustomed to engaging in conversations and are more interpersonally competent (Koesten & Anderson, 2004). Koerner and Fitzpatrick (2002a) noted that young adults from high-conversation oriented families have family members that provide models on how to interact with other individuals and develop relationships. Because students from high conversation-oriented families are accustomed to open communication and acquiring information, the finding that they are more likely than their low conversation-oriented counterparts to ask for assistance on assignments or ask about a procedure is not surprising. Students who communicate with their instructors for functional reasons aim to do well in classes, and their belonging to a high-conversation oriented family helps aid their communication about course-related material. The finding that conversation orientation was related positively with the participatory motive to communicate with instructors is plausible because high conversation-oriented students have a greater tendency to participate in conversations with others (Avgtis, 1999). Students who are more communicatively apprehensive are less likely to be motivated to communicate for participatory reasons (Jordan & Powers, 2007; Martin et al., 2001), so it makes sense for students who are high in conversation orientation to be motivated to participate in class. Myers and colleagues (2002) asserted that students’ use of the excuse-making motive may be a reflection of their own personality traits and communication traits instead of the traits of their instructors. Therefore, the finding that conversation orientation was positively associated with the excuse-making motive to
communicate is plausible because these students feel comfortable in voicing concerns and making excuses in order to lessen perceptions of learner incompetence (Goodboy, Myers, & Bolkan, 2012).

In regard to conformity orientation, it was hypothesized that because students from families high in conformity orientation are less skilled in communication and less expressive (Schrodt, 2005), they would be less motivated to communicate with their instructors. However, the findings on conformity orientation were quite similar to the findings on conversation orientation with regard to students’ motives to communicate with their instructors. High conformity-oriented students were more likely than low conformity-oriented students to be motivated to communicate with their instructors for relational reasons. Though this finding was different that Avgtis’s (1999) finding that conformity-oriented young adults did not view communication with others as rewarding, perhaps these students were motivated to communicate with their instructors because they enjoy them personally or want to get to know them better. It was also discovered that high conformity-oriented students were motivated to communicate with their instructors for participatory reasons. Since high conformity-oriented young adults typically do not participate in family decision making or family conversations (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a, 2006), it was hypothesized that they would also be less motivated to communicate with their instructor for participatory reasons. However, these students were also motivated to participate, likely because they want their instructor to know that they understand the course material. It is interesting that while students may not participate in their family conversations, they can be motivated to participate in academic settings. With regard to the excuse-making motive, Myers and Claus (2012) asserted that
the excuse-making motive is dependent on the student rather than the instructor or classroom environment. Therefore, FCP can certainly be an influential factor when it comes to students making excuses in the classroom. In this case, students who are high in conformity orientation are likely to make excuses. Finally, students who are from families high in conformity orientation are motivated to communicate for sycophantic reasons. Recognizing that students want to be viewed favorably by their instructors (Myers et al., 2002), students who are high in conformity orientation are more likely than their low conformity-oriented counterparts to enact sycophantic behaviors. This can possibly be explained by the fact that high conformity-oriented parents place various pressures on their children to conform to the family values and to perform well academically (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 1997), therefore these students may be more motivated to communicate for sycophantic reasons to ensure their instructor views them favorably.

In sum, the findings from hypotheses 1-4 and research questions 1–2 demonstrate that students’ family communication environment slightly influences their classroom communication behaviors. Overall, the conversation orientation and the conformity orientation dimensions were helpful in influencing whether students orally participated in class, vengefully dissented about their instructors, and were motivated to communicate with their instructors for several reasons.

**Hypotheses 5-8**

In this dissertation, hypotheses 5-8 focused on determining whether conditional indirect effects existed in the relationship between conversation orientation and the outcome variables (i.e., out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation,
instruct

ional dissent, motives to communicate with their instructors) through the mediating variable of academic resilience moderated by conformity orientation. It was hypothesized that conversation orientation would have an indirect effect (through academic resilience) on out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, instructional dissent, and students’ motives to communicate with their instructors. A series of 10 moderated mediation models was computed. In all 10 models, the relationships between the mediator (i.e., academic resilience) and the outcome variables were weak. With the model assessing the functional motive to communicate producing the only meaningful indirect effect, this significant model is plausible because academically resilient students should be more comfortable communicating with their instructors about course content so they can learn and perform better in their courses. For instance, if students are having difficulty understanding complex course material and they are motivated to communicate for functional reasons, then they are taking precautionary measures to avoid doing poorly on tests or assignments. A student may perceive a poor test grade or negative feedback from an instructor as an academic challenge (Hosek et al., 2016). However, some students may demonstrate academic resilience in responding to that challenge while other students may be less resilient, which hinders their academic success.

The remaining nine moderated mediation analyses did not produce significant models. This finding can be explained by the lack of significant correlations obtained between the academic resilience variable and the nine outcome variables; that is, academic resilience was not significantly related to out-of-class communication; in-class oral participation; expressive, rhetorical, or vengeful dissent; and the relational,
participatory, excuse-making, and sycophantic motives to communicate with instructors. Because academic resilience pertains to students rebounding from academic pressures, it simply may have little to do with their in-class communication behaviors. Martin and Marsh (2006) asserted that academically resilient students are characterized as confident, persistent, and composed; they also create plans on how to deal academic pressures and challenges. However, when students elect to enact these resilient behaviors, they are not required to communicate with their instructors either inside or outside of the classroom when doing so.

In addition to examining the 10 moderated mediation analyses addressed in hypotheses 5-8, the relationships between FCP and academic resilience also were investigated. A first-stage moderation analysis was conducted and it was determined that the relationship between conversation orientation and academic resilience differed systematically as a function of conformity orientation. More specifically, the relationship between conversation orientation and academic resilience was significant and positive at low levels of conformity orientation; however, as conformity orientation increased, the relationship between conversation orientation and academic resilience became nonsignificant, but then became significant and negative at the highest levels of conformity orientation. The significant moderation obtained in this dissertation corroborates Wang et al.’s (1994) finding that families exert a considerable influence in how their children deal with pressures and challenges. As evidenced by the significant moderation analysis, students experience the highest amounts of academic resilience when they belong to a family that is high in conversation orientation and low in conformity orientation (i.e., the pluralistic family). Recall that parents who foster a high
conversation orientation through facilitating a caring environment and engaging in positive interactions likely promote an environment where their adult children feel as if they can share details about their lives and come to their parents for emotional support, but those parents who also foster a low conformity orientation likely socialize their children to have their own views and ideas and these children do not feel pressured to conform to the views and ideas of their parents (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a, 2002b, 2006). Furthermore, Schrodt and Ledbetter (2007) reasoned that children’s overall resiliency might be diminished due to belonging to a high conformity-oriented family because children are less likely to develop competent conflict management and problem-solving skills.

Additionally, five models produced a meaningful direct effect. In this dissertation, a direct effect measured the relationship between conversation orientation (i.e., independent variable) and the various student classroom communication behaviors (i.e., dependent variables) while holding academic resilience and conformity orientation constant. Conversation orientation had a direct effect on in-class oral participation and the relational, functional, participatory, and excuse-making motives to communicate with instructors, which, not surprisingly, mirrored the correlations obtained in hypotheses 2 and 4 and research question 2.

In sum, the findings from hypotheses 5-8 demonstrated that only one moderated mediation model was significant. Students who belonged to families high in conversation orientation and low in conformity orientation were more motivated to communicate with their instructors for functional reasons through academic resilience. Also, direct effects were found between the conversation orientation dimension and in-class oral
participation and the relational, functional, participatory, and excuse-making motives to communicate with instructors. Finally, conformity orientation also mediated the relationship between conversation orientation and academic resilience. Students were more academically resilient when they belonged to families high in conversation orientation and low in conformity orientation.

**Implications for Family and Instructional Communication Scholarship**

From the results obtained in this dissertation, three implications for family communication and instructional communication scholarship arise. First, the results of this dissertation demonstrated that regardless of conversation orientation or conformity orientation, students are motivated to communicate with their instructors. The conversation orientation FCP dimension was related positively to the relational, functional, participatory, and excuse-making motives to communicate with instructors; the conformity orientation FCP dimension was related positively to the relational, participatory, excuse-making, and sycophantic motives to communicate with instructors. Of the four outcomes in this dissertation, student motives to communicate with their instructors was the prevalent behavior linked to both dimensions of FCP. With conversation orientation being correlated positively with four of the five motives to communicate with instructors, this family communication pattern dimension emerges as a potential indicator of how young adults may communicate in academic environments. These findings support previous research findings obtained on conversation orientation in that young adults who belong to conversation-oriented families are more likely to be communicatively competent (Schrodt et al., 2009) and enact a greater number of interpersonal skills (Koesten, 2004). Hence, it is possible that parents who maintain a
family climate that highlights conversation orientation may help their children be motivated to communicate with their instructors for relational, functional, participatory, and excuse-making reasons. On the other hand, conformity-oriented students also are motivated to communicate with their instructors. Though they adhere to a family environment that stresses a homogeneity of beliefs and following rules (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2002a), they still are motivated to form a relationship with their instructor (i.e., relational motive), to demonstrate that they are familiar with the course material (i.e., participatory motive), to make excuses about their work being incomplete or late (i.e., excuse-making motive), and to make a favorable impression on their instructor (i.e., sycophantic motive).

Second, the findings obtained regarding the vengeful dissent outcome are noteworthy because it is possible that whether students decide to defame their instructors is linked to their family communication patterns. Recall that when students engage in vengeful dissent, instead of approaching the instructor with a course-related issue or question, they turn to extreme measures such as ruining their instructor’s reputation, spreading negative publicity, or getting revenge (Goodboy, 2011). The conversation orientation FCP dimension was discovered to have a negative relationship with vengeful dissent, whereas the conformity orientation FCP dimension was discovered to have a positive relationship with vengeful dissent. (Interestingly, FCP was not significantly related to expressive dissent or rhetorical dissent.) It is possible that perhaps FCP is influential only for vengeful dissent because of how conflict is viewed in conversation-oriented and conformity-oriented families. In conversation-oriented families, children are equipped with skills to handle conflict effectively and to discuss disagreements, whereas
in conformity-oriented families, children lack the ability to engage in effective conflict management because conflict is viewed as negatively and typically is avoided (Koerner & Fitzpatrick, 2006; Shearman & Dumlao, 2008). Students from conversation-oriented families may refrain from vengeful dissent because they are accustomed to handling conflict openly and effectively, whereas students from conformity-oriented families may engage in vengeful dissent because they do not know how to express their concerns effectively.

To dissuade students who are high in conformity orientation from engaging in vengeful dissent, college instructors should clearly communicate that they are available to students who have questions or concerns so these questions or concerns can be addressed before students make the decision to engage in vengeful dissent. Additionally, it would be helpful for college instructors to present clear guidelines on disputing assignment grades, engage in appropriate classroom communication, avoid misbehaviors (Kearney, Plax, Hays, & Ivey, 1991), and provide instructional feedback (King, Schrodt, & Weisel, 2009; Witt & Kerssen-Griep, 2011), which includes the dimensions of utility (i.e., viewing the feedback as useful), sensitivity (i.e., feeling threatened during feedback), confidentiality (i.e., receiving feedback privately), and retention (i.e., remembering specific elements of feedback).

Third, though significant findings were discovered between academic resilience and family communication patterns, most of the relationships between academic resilience and the instructional communication variables were not significant. Perhaps a different mediating variable should have been selected for this dissertation. Recently, instructional communication researchers have investigated constructs similar to academic
resilience that are more inherently communication-based, such as academic challenges (i.e., events that a student perceives as stress-inducing or contradictory to their academic goals; Hosek et al., 2016) and college student coping techniques (i.e., dealing with problems and difficulties related to academic or personal issues; Burns et al., 2016). Also, Martin and March (2008) introduced the concept of academic buoyancy, which is “students’ ability to successfully deal with academic setbacks and challenges that are typical of the ordinary course of school life” (p. 54). Recognizing that college students do face academic challenges, the need for identifying how students overcome those challenges and demonstrate resilience is necessary because it will help students achieve the ultimate goal of education, which is learning. However, because academic resilience had no significant relationships with student classroom communication behaviors, perhaps focusing on the particular academic challenges students face or the coping techniques they use can better explain how students communicate in the academic arena. By studying academic challenges and student coping, these findings can be particularly helpful for faculty, administrators, retention specialists, and student service personnel in aiding their retention efforts and promoting student success.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

When interpreting the findings obtained in this dissertation, there are four limitations that should be considered. First, the six instruments used in this dissertation all suffered from at least one structural validity issue (i.e., non-significant minimum fit function chi-square value, a RMSEA value ≤ .08, a SRMR value ≤ .08, or CFI and NFI values ≥ .95). When subjected to CFA analysis, three instruments (i.e., The Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument, The Instructional Dissent Scale, The Student
Communication Motives Scale) violated one or two of the structural validity issues. Three instruments (i.e., The Academic Resilience Scale, The Out of Class Interaction Scale, The Oral Participation Scale) violated three or more of the structural validity issues. Given these structural issues, scholars must continue to reevaluate these instruments when employing them in future research efforts.

Second, for hypotheses 5-8, instead of exploring academic resilience as the mediating variable, perhaps another mediating variable should have been investigated. Despite the plausible prediction that academic resilience would act as a causal mechanism between FCP and student classroom communication behaviors, only in one instance (i.e., functional motive to communicate with instructors) did academic resilience produce a causal model. Future research should consider employing either self-efficacy or cognitive flexibility as mediators in the relationships between FCP and student classroom communication behaviors. Self-efficacy, which is conceptualized as individuals’ perceptions of their own cognitive and behavioral abilities and their confidence in these abilities to achieve a goal (Bandura, 1977), may mediate the relationship between FCP and student classroom communication behaviors because families certainly affect the level of self-efficacy their child possesses. Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, and Pastorelli (1996) forwarded that self-efficacy is the pervasive element to an individual’s perception of control over his or her level of functioning. Cognitive flexibility, which is conceptualized as individuals’ awareness of the alternatives available in any given situation and their willingness to be flexible and adaptable in the situation (Martin & Rubin, 1995), is another possible mediator because flexibility in students’ cognitions would likely predict communication with their
instructors. Previous research has established that both self-efficacy (Stubbs & Maynard, 2017) and cognitive flexibility are linked to the family (Koesten, 2009). Perhaps, then, students’ levels of self-efficacy or cognitive flexibility, rather than academic resilience, are a more appropriate predictor of student classroom communication behaviors.

Third, although the data were collected later in the semester (i.e., during the twelfth week), it is possible that student classroom communication behaviors fluctuate over the course of the semester. Myers (2017) gathered data at three points during a semester (i.e., week 2, week 8, week 14) and discovered that students’ motives to communicate with their instructors fluctuate over these three points. He found that (a) students are motivated to communicate for relational and sycophantic reasons at a higher rate toward the end of the semester (as compared to earlier in the semester), (b) students are less motivated to communicate for functional reasons as the semester progresses, and (c) students did not fluctuate over the course of a semester in either their participatory or excuse-making motives to communicate with their instructors. Because student out-of-class communication, in-class oral participation, and instructional dissent could certainly fluctuate during the semester, these fluctuations could have affected the findings obtained in this dissertation in some way. Furthermore, because time order is involved in longitudinal data, it would be possible for causal claims to be made (Myers, 2017), which would be insightful for instructional communication scholars.

Fourth, when reporting their FCP, participants were asked to refer to the parent with whom they most recently interacted, which limited the holistic nature of FCP to the one parent. The decision to have participants refer to the parent with whom they most recently interacted was made because it would provide a concrete referent for students to
recall their most recent parental interaction. However, to gain a thorough understanding of how FCP influences participants’ classroom communication behavior, participants should have been asked to refer to either both of their parents or to their overall family communication environment when completing the Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument. Additionally, participants heavily reported on their mothers (i.e., 74.5%) in this dissertation, which produces an underrepresentation of fathers in the sample and possibly skews the influence of parental communication on participants’ in- and out-of-class communication with their instructors. This influence is compounded further by Richie and Fitzpatrick’s (1990) finding that preteen children report their mothers higher in conversation orientation than their fathers and their fathers higher in conformity orientation than their mothers; however, by their middle teen years, these communication patterns are reversed. And, in high conformity-oriented families, fathers more frequently pressure their children, are more confrontational, and are less conciliatory than mothers (Sillars, Holman, Richards, Jacobs, Koerner, & Reynolds-Dyk, 2014). Future research, then, should consider having participants reference both parents rather than just one parent. Child (2018) forwarded that in future research efforts, scholars should conduct analyses for both male parents and female parents to examine if communicative differences may exist.

In future research efforts, instructional communication scholars should continue to study college students’ predispositions toward their education (Goodboy & Myers, 2012) as their communication traits and academic beliefs affect the learning environment. Hendrix, Jackson, and Warren (2003) stated that “it is absolutely naïve for [instructors] to believe that we, or our students, enter classrooms across the world tabula rasa” (p. 181).
One specific direction for future research is to examine the relationships between FCP and student characteristics. Myers, Tindage, and Atkinson (2016) found that student characteristics is a commonly studied research area in the field of instructional communication. Student characteristics are “the attributes that students bring with them to the classroom” (Myers et al., 2016, p. 32) and include, among others, communication and personality traits (e.g., argumentativeness, willingness to communicate), social identities (e.g., ethnicity), attitudes (e.g., academic entitlement, LO/GO, academic locus of control, intent to persist), and demographics.

One student characteristic in particular that would be advantageous to study is academic locus of control. Academic locus of control is conceptualized as an individual characteristic in which students evaluate the amount of perceived control they have in a particular learning environment (Arlin & Whitley, 1978) and has three levels (i.e., internal, external, moderate). An internal locus of control is when students perceive to have control over the learning environment and take greater responsibility for their academic performance, whereas an external locus of control is when students perceive to not have control over the learning environment and thus attribute their academic performance to their instructors. (Moderate locus of control contains characteristics of both internal and external.) This student characteristic is one variable that may be affected by family communication because parents often communicate messages about grade expectations to their children. Helicopter parenting is a phenomenon where a parent is overly invested in the life of their child (Howe & Strauss, 2007), which can manifest itself in parents making academic decisions for their child, being in constant communication with their child, and helping them be successful in college. This
helicopter parenting behavior could certainly influence the locus of control of a college student. In the future, researchers should consider exploring whether (and how) students’ academic locus of control is influenced by their families’ conversation orientation and conformity orientation.

A second specific area of focus should examine particular family communication variables that help explain how students communicate in the academic arena. Specifically, future research should examine the role that parental use of supportive behaviors or parental involvement plays in the way students communicate with their instructors. If instructional communication researchers are interested in exploring how the family domain influences students’ classroom communication behaviors, then scholars must identify particular family communication constructs that have plausible applications. Exploring parental use of supportive behaviors is applicable because, in previous research, parental support (as well as advice quality) mediated the relationship between FCP and students’ academic self-efficacy and reports of college stress (Hall et al., 2017). Those families with a high conversation orientation are more likely than their high conformity-oriented counterparts to offer open lines of communication and to provide advice to their young adult college student. Additionally, a healthy level of involvement by parents can assist students with knowing that they have a supportive family who is willing to provide assistance, while also not being overly involved.

Because it has been established that families are a primary source of instrumental and emotional support for college students (High & Scharp, 2015; Hosek et al., 2016; Kranstuber et al., 2012), these two constructs (i.e., parental use of supportive behaviors and parental involvement) can certainly be useful in helping to identify familial
influences on college student communication behaviors.

**Conclusion**

In instructional communication research, one avenue that is beginning to receive empirical attention is the influence of family communication on college student academic outcomes (Burns et al., 2016; Erdner & Wright, 2016; Hall et al., 2017; Miller-Ott, 2016). This dissertation sought to extend this research by specifically investigating relationships between college students’ family communication patterns, academic resilience, and their classroom communication behaviors. Overall, evidence emerged that demonstrated the manner in which families communicate with their children did influence somewhat the manner in which students communicate with their instructors in the college classroom. This dissertation aimed to answer the call forwarded by Mazer and Hess (2016) that instructional communication researchers should focus their research efforts on how college students are evolving and their communicative influences outside of the classroom that affect their classroom communication behaviors. As college students continue to evolve, instructional communication research will be enhanced by assessing how FCP affects students’ use of in-class and out-of-class communication behaviors.
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Appendix A:

Recruitment Script

“My name is Jordan Atkinson and I am conducting research for my dissertation to learn more about family communication and college students’ communication behaviors. You must be 18 years or older, currently enrolled in a college course, and have at least one parent living.

I am asking you to complete a survey, which will be kept anonymous. You should not place any marks of identification anywhere on the survey and you can stop at any point without fear of penalty. Your participation in this study is voluntary. Your class standing, your class grades, your job status, and your membership on an athletic team cannot be affected by either your refusal to participate in, or withdraw from participation in, this study. There are no risks associated with participation in this study. Completing and returning this survey indicates that you have agreed to participate in this study. This survey takes about 20 to 25 minutes to complete and you should make no identifying marks on the survey. I will distribute the study now and I will return in one week to collect the materials. When I return, you will need to detach the cover letter and have your survey placed in the sealed envelope that I provided. You will also need to detach the research receipt, which is the last page of the questionnaire. The information provided on the research receipt will not be associated with the responses on your questionnaire. The questionnaires and research receipts will be collected in class one week from today. You will give me the questionnaires and give the research receipts to your instructor. The instructor of your course will assign extra credit for your participation in this project. For students who choose not to participate in this research project, your instructor will have an alternative assignment that you may complete.

Should you have any questions about this letter or the research project, please feel free to contact the primary investigator Dr. Scott A. Myers by e-mail at scott.myers@mail.wvu.edu. This study has been acknowledged by West Virginia University’s Institutional Review Board and is on file. Thank you.”
Appendix B:

Cover Letter

September 13, 2016

Dear Participant:

This letter is a request for you to take part in a research project designed to learn more how family communication influences college student communication behaviors. This research study is being conducted by Principal Investigator Scott A. Myers, Ph.D., and co-investigator Jordan Atkinson, Ph.D. Candidate. This study is being conducted as a part of the co-investigators dissertation project research.

You must be 18 years or older, currently enrolled in at least one college course, and have at least one living parent to participate in this study. Please complete the following questionnaire regarding your family communication and communication as a college student. Read each statement carefully and respond by supplying the answer that best represents your attitude toward the statement. If you are unable to answer a question, leave the statement blank. There is neither a right nor a wrong answer to any question.

Do not place any marks of identification anywhere on this questionnaire. Your involvement in this project will be kept anonymous. Your class standing will not be affected by refusing to participate in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary. You may decide to skip any question or cease your participation at any point. There are no known associated risks with participating in this study. This questionnaire takes approximately 20-25 minutes to complete. When you finish this questionnaire, detach this cover letter and place the completed questionnaire in the provided envelope. You will also need to detach the research receipt, which is the back page of the questionnaire. The information provided on the research receipt will not be associated with the responses on your questionnaire. The questionnaire and research receipt will be collected in class one week from today. The instructor of your course will assign extra credit for your participation in this project should you choose to participate. For students who choose not to participate in this research project, your instructor will have an alternative assignment that you may complete.

Should you have any questions about this letter or the research project, please feel free to contact the primary investigator Dr. Scott A. Myers at (304) 293-3905 or by e-mail at scott.myers@mail.wvu.edu. This study has been acknowledged by West Virginia University’s Institutional Review Board and is on file. Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Scott A. Myers, Ph.D.                Jordan Atkinson
Professor                           Ph.D. Candidate
scott.myers@mail.wvu.edu             jtatkinson@mix.wvu.edu
Appendix C:

Questionnaire

**PLEASE READ THE INFORMATION BELOW BEFORE COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE**

This questionnaire asks you about the communication within your family and your own communication behaviors as a college student. For the purpose of this study, you need to identify the parent with whom you most recently interacted (e.g., face-to-face, text). You will refer to this identified parent when answering questions about communication with your parent in this questionnaire.

The age of this parent is: _______

The sex of this parent is (circle one): Male   Female   Other

Please indicate the race/ethnicity of this parent (check one):

___ White/Caucasian
___ Black/African-American
___ Middle Eastern
___ Hispanic or Latino/a
___ Asian/Pacific Islander
___ Native American
___ Other (please specify:_________)

Is this parent? (check one):

___ Married
___ Divorced
___ Never Married
___ Widowed
___ Other (please specify:_________)

Where do you live? (check one):

___ On campus
___ Off campus without this parent
___ At home with this parent

If you are currently living on campus or off campus without this parent, approximately how many miles away do you live from this parent? _______
What is the highest education level that this parent completed? (check one):
___Some high school
___High school or GED
___Some college
___Two-year degree
___Four-year degree
___Graduate or professional degree

How often do you see this parent face-to-face? (check one):
___Several times a year
___Once a month
___2-3 times per month
___Once a week
___2-3 times per week
___Daily

How often do you use the channels listed below when communicating with this parent? (Use the scale below.)
If you never use this channel, write a 0 in the blank.
If you rarely use this channel, write a 1 in the blank.
If you sometimes use this channel, write a 2 in the blank.
If you often use this channel, write a 3 in the blank.
If you very often use this channel, write a 4 in the blank.

___Face-to-face contact
___Telephone/cell phone
___Skype or FaceTime
___Facebook or other social networking site
___Text messaging
___E-mail
___Instant messenger
___Write letters
___Send cards

*******************************************************************************************************************************************

**At this point, you may proceed to the next page and begin the questionnaire. Remember, when completing the following scale, you are referencing the parent that you just identified.**
Instructions: Below is a series of statements that describes communication within families. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement about the communication with the parent you identified on page 1. For each statement, use the following response format and place the appropriate number in the blank.

If you strongly disagree with the statement, write a 1 in the blank.
If you disagree with the statement, write a 2 in the blank.
If you are neutral with the statement, write a 3 in the blank.
If you agree with the statement, write a 4 in the blank.
If you strongly agree with the statement, write a 5 in the blank.

_____ 1. My parent and I often talk about topics like politics and religion where some persons disagree with others.
_____ 2. My parent often says something like “Every member of the family should have some say in family decisions.”
_____ 3. My parent often asks my opinion when the family is talking about something.
_____ 4. My parent encourages me to challenge their ideas and beliefs.
_____ 5. My parent often says something like “You should always look at both sides of an issue.”
_____ 6. I usually tell my parent what I am thinking about things.
_____ 7. I can tell my parent almost anything.
_____ 8. My parent and I often talk about our feelings and emotions.
_____ 9. My parent and I often have long, relaxed conversations about nothing in particular.
_____ 10. I really enjoy talking with my parent, even when we disagree.
_____ 11. My parent encourages me to express my feelings.
_____ 12. My parent tends to be very open about their emotions.
_____ 13. My parent and I often talk about things we have done during the day.
_____ 14. My parent and I often talk about our plans and hopes for the future.
_____ 15. My parent likes to hear my opinion, even when I don’t agree with them.
_____ 16. When anything really important is involved, my parent expects me to obey without question.
_____ 17. In our home, my parent usually has the last word.
_____ 18. My parent feels that it is important to be the boss.
_____ 19. My parent sometimes becomes irritated with my views if they are different from theirs.
_____ 20. If my parent doesn’t approve of it, they don’t want to know about it.
_____ 21. When I am at home, I am expected to obey my parents’ rules.
_____ 22. My parent often says things like “You’ll know better when you grow up.”
_____ 23. My parent often says things like “My ideas are right and you should not question them.”
_____ 24. My parent often says things like “A child should not argue with adults.”
_____ 25. My parent often says things like “There are some things that just shouldn’t be talked about.”
_____ 26. My parent often says things like “You should give in on arguments rather than risk making people mad.”
Instructions: The following statements deal with your beliefs and feelings about your own behavior. Read each statement and respond by identifying what best represents your agreement with each statement. For each statement, use the following response format and place the appropriate number in the blank.

If you strongly disagree with the statement, write a 1 in the blank.
If you disagree with the statement, write a 2 in the blank.
If you slightly disagree with the statement, write a 3 in the blank.
If you slightly agree with the statement, write a 4 in the blank.
If you agree with the statement, write a 5 in the blank.
If you strongly agree with the statement, write a 6 in the blank.

1. I can communicate an idea in many different ways.
2. I avoid new and unusual situations.
3. I feel like I never get to make decisions.
4. In any given situation, I am able to act appropriately.
5. I can find workable solutions to seemingly unsolvable problems.
6. I seldom have choices to choose from when deciding how to behave.
7. I am willing to work at creative solutions to problems.
8. My behavior is a result of conscious decisions that I make.
9. I have many possible ways of behaving in any given situation.
10. I have difficulty using my knowledge on a given topic in real life situations.
11. I am willing to listen and consider alternatives for handling a problem.
12. I have the self-confidence necessary to try different ways of behavior.

Instructions: Below is a series of statements that describes students enrolled in college courses. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement concerning your views about your college education. For each statement, use the following response format and place the appropriate number in the blank.

If you strongly disagree with the statement, write a 1 in the blank.
If you disagree with the statement, write a 2 in the blank.
If you somewhat disagree with the statement, write a 3 in the blank.
If you neither agree nor disagree with the statement, write a 4 in the blank.
If you somewhat agree with the statement, write a 5 in the blank.
If you agree with the statement, write a 6 in the blank.
If you strongly agree with the statement, write a 7 in the blank.

1. I believe I am mentally tough when it comes to exams.
2. I don’t let study stress get on top of me.
3. I’m good at bouncing back from a poor grade in my schoolwork.
4. I think I am good at dealing with schoolwork pressures.
5. I don’t let a bad grade affect my confidence.
6. I’m good at dealing with setbacks at school (such as a bad grade or negative feedback on my work).
Instructions: The following questions deal with talking to your instructors. Based on the current semester here at West Virginia University in all of your courses, please answer the following questions. For each statement, use the following response format and place the appropriate number in the blank.

If you strongly disagree with the statement, write a 1 in the blank.
If you disagree with the statement, write a 2 in the blank.
If you are neutral with the statement, write a 3 in the blank.
If you agree with the statement, write a 4 in the blank.
If you strongly agree with the statement, write a 5 in the blank.

____ 1. I often talk to my instructors during their office hours.
____ 2. If I see my instructors on campus, I often talk to them.
____ 3. I rarely talk to my instructors outside of the classroom.
____ 4. If I see my instructors in the hallway, I often stop to talk to them.
____ 5. I only talk to my instructors outside of the classroom once-in-a-while.
____ 6. I talk to my instructors outside of the classroom about topics that are not class related (e.g., sports, movies).
____ 7. I talk to my instructors outside of class about myself and my life.
____ 8. I frequently talk to my instructors outside of the classroom.
____ 9. There is no reason for me to talk to my instructors outside of the classroom.
____ 10. I talk about non-class problems I have with my instructors.
____ 11. When I see my instructors around town, I usually spend some time talking to them.
____ 12. When I see my instructors in public, I avoid talking to them.
____ 13. I never talk to my instructors outside of the classroom.

Instructions: The following questions deal with your communication behaviors in your classes. Based on the current semester here at West Virginia University in all of your courses, please answer the following questions. For each statement, use the following response format and place the appropriate number in the blank.

If you never do this, write a 0 in the blank.
If you rarely do this, write a 1 in the blank.
If you sometimes do this, write a 2 in the blank.
If you often do this, write a 3 in the blank.
If you very often do this, write a 4 in the blank.

____ 1. I volunteer when I know the correct response or answer.
____ 2. I avoid participating in class discussions.
____ 3. I ask follow-up questions until I fully understand someone.
____ 4. I say as little as possible during class.
____ 5. I ask questions that solicit the teacher’s opinions about the content.
____ 6. I don’t volunteer in class even when I know the correct response or answer.
____ 7. I express my personal opinion in class.
**Instructions:** The following questions deal with your communication about your instructors. Based on the current semester here at West Virginia University in all of your courses, please answer the following questions. For each statement, use the following response format and place the appropriate number in the blank.

If you **never** do this, write a 0 in the blank.
If you **rarely** do this, write a 1 in the blank.
If you **sometimes** do this, write a 2 in the blank.
If you **often** do this, write a 3 in the blank.
If you **very often** do this, write a 4 in the blank.

_____ 1. I complain to others to express my frustrations with my courses.
_____ 2. I tell my teachers when I disagree with them so I can do better in the course.
_____ 3. I hope to ruin my teachers’ reputation by exposing their bad practices to others.
_____ 4. I express my disappointment about my courses to other people because it helps me feel better.
_____ 5. I voice my concerns to my teachers to make sure I get the best grade possible.
_____ 6. I talk to other teachers and let them know my current teacher is inferior.
_____ 7. I talk to other students to see if they also have complaints about courses.
_____ 8. If want my teachers to remedy my concerns, I complain to them.
_____ 9. I hope one day my teacher gets fired as a result of my criticism of him/her.
_____ 10. I complain about my teachers and courses because it makes me feel better.
_____ 11. I voice my opinions to my teachers when there is a disagreement because I want to do better in the course.
_____ 12. I spread negative publicity about my teachers so that everyone knows how bad he/she is.
_____ 13. I attempt to feel better about my frustrations in my classes by communicating with other people.
_____ 14. I talk to other students when I am annoyed with my teachers in hopes that I am not the only one.
_____ 15. I express my disagreements with my teachers because I want something to change in the course for the better.
_____ 16. I make sure that everyone knows how awful my teachers are to get revenge for the bad semester I had.
_____ 17. I try to feel better about my courses by explaining my aggravations to others.
_____ 18. I complain about my teachers to get my frustrations off of my chest.
_____ 19. I have no problem telling my teachers what I need them to do for me to succeed in the course.
_____ 20. I seek revenge on my teachers by trying to get them in trouble.
_____ 21. I criticize my teachers’ practices to other students because I hope they share my criticism.
_____ 22. I talk to other students so we can discuss the problems we have in classes.
Instructions: The following questions deal with your motives for communicating with your instructors. Based on the current semester here at West Virginia University in all of your courses, please reflect on your own reasons for talking to your instructors. For each statement, use the following response format and place the appropriate number in the blank.

If this statement is **not like you at all**, write a **1** in the blank.

If this statement is **rarely like you**, write a **2** in the blank.

If this statement is **sometimes like you**, write a **3** in the blank.

If this statement is **often like you**, write a **4** in the blank.

If this statement is **exactly like you**, write a **5** in the blank.

---

1. To learn about the instructor personally.
2. To clarify the material.
3. To explain why my work is late.
4. To appear involved in class.
5. To pretend I'm interested in the course.
6. So we can develop a friendship.
7. To get assistance on assignments/exams.
8. To explain my absences.
9. To show I understand the material.
10. To give the instructor the impression that I like him/her.
11. To build a personal relationship.
12. To learn how I can improve in the class.
13. To explain why I do not have my work done.
14. To demonstrate my intelligence.
15. To give the impression that I think the instructor is an effective teacher.
16. To learn more about the instructor personally.
17. To ask questions about the material.
18. To challenge a grade I received.
19. Because my input is vital for class discussion.
20. To give the impression that I'm learning a lot from the instructor.
21. Because I find the instructor interesting.
22. To get academic advice.
23. To explain why my work does not meet the instructor's expectations.
24. Because my classmates value my contribution to class discussion.
25. To give the impression that I'm interested in the course content.
26. Because we share common interests.
27. To get more information on the requirements of the course.
28. To explain the quality of my work.
29. Because my instructor values class participation.
30. To get special permission or privileges not granted to all students.
Please complete the demographic questions below by writing or selecting the appropriate response.

Your age: ______ years

Your sex (circle one): Male    Female    Other

Please indicate your race/ethnicity (check one):

____ White/Caucasian
____ Black/African-American
____ Middle Eastern
____ Hispanic or Latino/a
____ Asian/Pacific Islander
____ Native American
____ Other (please specify:________________)

What is your class rank? (check one):

____ First-Year
____ Sophomore
____ Junior
____ Senior
____ Other (please specify:________________)

How many courses are you taking this semester? _______

How many credit hours are you taking this semester? _______

**Thank you for your participation in this study.**
Appendix D:

Revised Family Communication Patterns Instrument (Ritchie & Fitzpatrick, 1990)

If you strongly disagree with the statement, write a 1 in the blank.
If you disagree with the statement, write a 2 in the blank.
If you are neutral with the statement, write a 3 in the blank.
If you agree with the statement, write a 4 in the blank.
If you strongly agree with the statement, write a 5 in the blank.

1. In our family we often talk about topics like politics and religion where some persons disagree with others.
2. My parents often say something like “Every member of the family should have some say in family decisions.”
3. My parents often ask my opinion when the family is talking about something.
4. My parents encourage me to challenge their ideas and beliefs.
5. My parents often say something like “You should always look at both sides of an issue.”
6. I usually tell my parents what I am thinking about things.
7. I can tell my parents almost anything.
8. In our family we often talk about our feelings and emotions.
9. My parents and I often have long, relaxed conversations about nothing in particular.
10. I really enjoy talking with my parents, even when we disagree.
11. My parents encourage me to express my feelings.
12. My parents tend to be very open about their emotions.
13. We often talk as a family about things we have done during the day.
14. In our family, we often talk about our plans and hopes for the future.
15. My parents like to hear my opinion, even when I don’t agree with them.
16. When anything really important is involved, my parents expect me to obey without question.
17. In our home, my parents usually have the last word.
18. My parents feel that it is important to be the boss.
19. My parents sometimes become irritated with my views if they are different from theirs.
20. If my parents don’t approve of it, they don’t want to know about it.
21. When I am at home, I am expected to obey my parents’ rules.
22. My parents often say things like “You’ll know better when you grow up.”
23. My parents often say things like “My ideas are right and you should not question them.”
24. My parents often say things like “A child should not argue with adults.”
25. My parents often say things like “There are some things that just shouldn’t be talked about.”
26. My parents often say things like “You should give in on arguments rather than risk making people mad.”

Appendix E:

Academic Resilience Scale (Martin & Marsh, 2006)

If you strongly disagree with the statement, write a 1 in the blank.
If you disagree with the statement, write a 2 in the blank.
If you somewhat disagree with the statement, write a 3 in the blank.
If you neither agree nor disagree with the statement, write a 4 in the blank.
If you somewhat agree with the statement, write a 5 in the blank.
If you agree with the statement, write a 6 in the blank.
If you strongly agree with the statement, write a 7 in the blank.

1. I believe I am mentally tough when it comes to exams.
2. I don’t let study stress get on top of me.
3. I’m good at bouncing back from a poor grade in my schoolwork.
4. I think I am good at dealing with schoolwork pressures.
5. I don’t let a bad grade affect my confidence.
6. I’m good at dealing with setbacks at school (such as a bad grade or negative feedback on my work).
Appendix F:

Out of Class Interaction Scale (Knapp & Martin, 2002)

If you strongly disagree with the statement, write a 1 in the blank.
If you disagree with the statement, write a 2 in the blank.
If you are neutral with the statement, write a 3 in the blank.
If you agree with the statement, write a 4 in the blank.
If you strongly agree with the statement, write a 5 in the blank.

1. I often talk to my instructors during their office hours.
2. If I see my instructors on campus, I often talk to them.
3. I rarely talk to my instructors outside of the classroom. R
4. If I see my instructors in the hallway, I often stop to talk to them.
5. I only talk to my instructors outside of the classroom once-in-a-while. R
6. I talk to my instructors outside of the classroom about topics that are not class related (e.g., sports, movies).
7. I talk to my instructors outside of class about myself and my life.
8. I frequently talk to my instructors outside of the classroom.
9. There is no reason for me to talk to my instructors outside of the classroom. R
10. I talk about non-class problems I have with my instructors.
11. When I see my instructors around town, I usually spend some time talking to them.
12. When I see my instructors in public, I avoid talking to them. R
13. I never talk to my instructors outside of the classroom. R

Note. R indicates the item is reverse coded.
Appendix G:

Oral Participation Scale (Frymier & Houser, 2016)

If you never do this, write a 0 in the blank.
If you rarely do this, write a 1 in the blank.
If you sometimes do this, write a 2 in the blank.
If you often do this, write a 3 in the blank.
If you very often do this, write a 4 in the blank.

1. I volunteer when I know the correct response or answer.
2. I express my personal opinion in class.
3. I ask follow-up questions until I fully understand someone.
4. I ask questions that solicit the teacher’s opinions about the content.
5. I say as little as possible during class. R
6. I avoid participating in class discussions. R
7. I don’t volunteer in class even when I know the correct response or answer. R

Note. R indicates the item is reverse coded.
Appendix H:

Instructional Dissent Scale (Goodboy, 2011)

If you **never** do this, write a 0 in the blank.
If you **rarely** do this, write a 1 in the blank.
If you **sometimes** do this, write a 2 in the blank.
If you **often** do this, write a 3 in the blank.
If you **very often** do this, write a 4 in the blank.

1. I complain to others to express my frustrations with my courses.
2. I express my disappointment about my courses to other people because it helps me feel better.
3. I talk to other students to see if they also have complaints about courses.
4. I complain about my teachers and courses because it makes me feel better.
5. I attempt to feel better about my frustrations in my classes by communicating with other people.
6. I talk to other students when I am annoyed with my teachers in hopes that I am not the only one.
7. I try to feel better about my courses by explaining my aggravations to others.
8. I complain about my teachers to get my frustrations off of my chest.
9. I criticize my teachers’ practices to other students because I hope they share my criticism.
10. I talk to other students so we can discuss the problems we have in classes.
11. I tell my teachers when I disagree with them so I can do better in the course.
12. I voice my concerns to my teachers to make sure I get the best grade possible.
13. If want my teachers to remedy my concerns, I complain to them.
14. I voice my opinions to my teachers when there is a disagreement because I want to do better in the course.
15. I express my disagreements with my teachers because I want something to change in the course for the better.
16. I have no problem telling my teachers what I need them to do for me to succeed in the course.
17. I hope to ruin my teachers’ reputation by exposing their bad practices to others.
18. I talk to other teachers and let them know my current teacher is inferior.
19. I hope one day my teacher gets fired as a result of my criticism of him/her.
20. I spread negative publicity about my teachers so that everyone knows how bad he/she is.
21. I make sure that everyone knows how awful my teachers are to get revenge for the bad semester I had.
22. I seek revenge on my teachers by trying to get them in trouble.

*Note.* Items 1-10 measure Expressive Dissent. Items 11-16 measure Rhetorical Dissent. Items 17-22 measure Vengeful Dissent.
Appendix I:

Student Communication Motives Scale (Martin, Mottet, & Myers, 2000)

If this statement is **not like you at all**, write a 1 in the blank.
If this statement is **rarely like you**, write a 2 in the blank.
If this statement is **sometimes like you**, write a 3 in the blank.
If this statement is **often like you**, write a 4 in the blank.
If this statement is **exactly like you**, write a 5 in the blank.

1. To learn about the instructor personally.
2. So we can develop a friendship.
3. To build a personal relationship.
4. To learn more about the instructor personally.
5. Because I find the instructor interesting.
6. Because we share common interests.
7. To clarify the material.
8. To get assistance on assignments/exams.
9. To learn how I can improve in the class.
10. To ask questions about the material.
11. To get academic advice.
12. To get more information on the requirements of the course.
13. To explain why my work is late.
14. To explain my absences.
15. To explain why I do not have my work done.
16. To challenge a grade I received.
17. To explain why my work does not meet the instructor's expectations.
18. To explain the quality of my work.
19. To appear involved in class.
20. To show I understand the material.
21. To demonstrate my intelligence.
22. Because my input is vital for class discussion.
23. Because my classmates value my contribution to class discussion.
24. Because my instructor values class participation.
25. To pretend I'm interested in the course.
26. To give the instructor the impression that I like him/her.
27. To give the impression that I think the instructor is an effective teacher.
28. To give the impression that I'm learning a lot from the instructor.
29. To give the impression that I'm interested in the course content.
30. To get special permission or privileges not granted to all students.

*Note.* Items 1-6 measure the relational motive. Items 7-12 measure the functional motive. Items 13-18 measure the excuse-making motive. Items 19-24 measure the participatory motive. Items 25-30 measure the sycophantic motive.