THE POWER OF THE SERVANT TEACHER

Joshua R. Brandon

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2016

APPROVED:

Karen Anderson-Lain, Major Professor
Brian Richardson, Committee Member
    and Chair of the Department of
    Communication Studies
Ifthekar Ahmed, Committee Member
David Holdeman, Dean of the College of
    Arts and Sciences
Victor Prybutok, Vice Provost of the
    Toulouse Graduate School

Brandon, Joshua R. *The Power of the Servant Teacher*. Master of Science (Communication Studies), August 2016, 72 pp., 4 tables, references, 83 titles.

An instructor's power in the classroom is constructed and sustained through communication. The aim here is to examine how a teacher's power can be negotiated through a lens of servant leadership in hopes of furthering modes in which communication scholars can train future teachers to utilize their power in the classroom. I hypothesize that a teacher utilizing a servant leadership framework employs more pro-social behavioral alteration techniques (BATs). Participants were asked to answer an online survey with questions regarding a chosen instructor's attributes of servant leadership and behavioral alteration messages (BAMs). My hypothesis was partially supported in that that are perceived to use persuasive mapping a specific dimension of servant leadership engage in significantly more pro-social BATs; however, instructors with higher levels of emotional healing engage in significantly more anti-social BATs. Additionally, the gender of the participant and rank of the instructor evaluated influenced students' perceptions of compliance-gaining strategies. The discussion examines the specific dimensions of servant leadership as they relate to power and explores future directions for research examining professional development and training for future faculty and the need to examine gender of participant and instructors with an experimental research design.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Instructors, by nature, must establish and maintain their power in the classroom. Researchers (French & Raven, 1959; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983) have discussed how teachers' powers are constructed and sustained through communication, while others (Hofmeyer, Sheingold, Klopper, & Warland, 2015; Quinlan, 2014) have described teachers as designated leaders because they serve as facilitators of learning and knowledge for students. I aim to investigate and interrogate current understandings of power in the classroom in order to determine new approaches for educating and training teachers on how to better utilize and sustain their power in the classroom. Robert Greenleaf (1977/2002) proposed a framework of servant leadership that explores the role of power in various contexts including education. His sustainable approach attempts to create a better society for all by placing others' needs ahead of one's own. My guiding premise for studying power in the classroom is to examine to what extent instructors can adopt a framework of servant leadership while simultaneously maintaining power in the classroom.

To date, scholars (Envicki, 2015; Herman & Marlowe, 2005; Wenig, 2014) have limited the expansion and application of servant leadership in higher education primarily to religious private universities. I seek to understand the ways in which servant leadership may be at work in a large southwestern public university. Additionally, scant research of power and servant leadership at higher educational institutions exists. Thus, the motivating goal here is to understand the extent to which servant leadership is utilized in the classroom at public higher educational institutions as well as how instructors might frame their power from a lens of servant leadership via compliance-gaining strategies.

In examining servant leadership in the context of public higher education, I aim to understand how servant leadership guides a communicative initiation and sustained approach to power in the classroom. In this study, I hope to add to the existing body of how instructors use power in the classroom and how instructors can understand their power within the classroom. To begin, I examine the relevant literature on power and compliance-gaining in the classroom followed by an examination of Greenleaf's (1977/2002) framing of servant leadership as well as the utilization of servant leadership in educational institutions.

CHAPTER 2

RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Power and Compliance-Gaining

Power, leadership, and compliance are intertwined in that followers grant an individual the right to influence them either by allocating or impeding another's goals. For the purposes of my study, I define power as the manner in which individuals can produce or influence effects on others (Wheeler, 2012). Individuals given power by their followers inherently then possess the capability to ask their followers to perform tasks because of the leader's position. Leaders are asking their followers to comply with the request. Boster (1995/1998) posited that the study of compliance gaining concerns persuasion, but more specifically how power is communicatively constructed and maintained. He stated that "the scope of compliance-gaining was broadened to . . . allow [scholars] to study the ways in which messages help or hinder us in getting our way, regardless of whether attitudes are affected" (p. 96). Garko (1990) discussed two main perspectives of compliance-gaining research. He differentiated between the social exchange perspective and the power perspective. Individuals utilizing the social influence model of compliance-gaining institute a reward and punishment system, while those who institute a power perspective do so by allocating resources to others. Garko (1990) critiqued both of the above perspectives and posited that one who is desiring to gain compliance from subordinates must remember that communication is key to instituting and sustaining compliance. The range of research in compliance-gaining does extend into various academic fields, but I will focus primarily on the studies cultivated and centered within instructional development in communication studies.

The nature and implementation of power and the classroom was conceptualized by the series of projects begun by McCroskey and Richmond (1983) on power in the classroom. In this section, I want to briefly review the bases of power as posited by French and Raven (1959), followed by a summary of the series on power in the classroom studies ((McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, 1984; Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1985; Kearney, Plax, Richmond, & McCroskey, 1984; McCroskey, Richmond, Plax, & Kearney, 1985; Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, & Richmond, 1986; Richmond, McCroskey, Kearney, & Plax, 1987), and finally the extensions of compliance-gaining in the classroom research to the present day. To begin I discuss the bases of power.

2.1.1 Power Bases

French and Raven (1959) noted five bases of power in which an individual may utilize in order to assert power. An individual may choose from one or a combination of multiple power bases including reward power, coercive power, legitimate power, referent power, and expert power. I begin describing the reward power base.

French and Raven (1959) defined reward power "as power whose basis is the ability to reward" (p. 156). An individual utilizing reward power offer an incentive or deny a desirable outcome so that they will comply with what is being asked of them. The true potency of reward power rests in the availability of resources that individuals will compete for the desired reward.

French and Raven stated that one's use of coercive power serves as the "flip-side" of the coin to reward power. French and Raven (1959) posited that coercive power may serve as an implicit or explicit use of power by the larger society to allow advancement or autonomy for individuals. In this sense, leaders using coercive power initiate fear as the driving force of manipulation in order to gain compliance.

Individuals who use the legitimate power base are appointed to the position or inherited the power. French and Raven (1959) posited that power utilization in this form may be considered "the right to influence" whether by the essence of differing elements such as culture and other demographics that dictate how power balances work within that area. People commonly associate this type of power with that of kings and queens in a monarchy who are put into the position on the basis of lineage. In common day, legitimate power may be used as a teacher telling her or his students that they must do something because they were instructed to do so.

The next base of power identified by French and Raven (1959) is referent power. The use of power here concerns "oneness" of identification with those in power. According to French and Raven (1959), identification may yield positive or negative results in the sense that the oneness shared between the leader and follower is dependent and placed again within the larger confines of societal expectations. Those in power and the 'subordinate' share common ground with one another and at times, allows the two groups to work in tangent on a particular task or endeavor.

The final power base identified by French and Raven (1959) is expert power whereby a particular group deems an individual has knowledge about a given topic that she or he may offer to those seeking it. Individuals utilizing expert power must negotiate the downside that expert power is limited or restricted to "cognitive" arenas and may not carry much weight beyond matters of informative exploration. McCroskey and Richmond (1983) argued that French and Raven's bases of power served as the starting point for the studies of power in the classroom. The scholars stated that power requires communication, and without communication, power cannot exist. Communication is what grants a teacher her or his power.

2.1.2 Power in the Classroom

In the following, I will briefly summarize the findings of research examining teacher's use of power in the classroom. In their first study, McCroskey and Richmond (1983) sought to determine whether the perception of power use among teachers was equal to that of the power use from the students' perspective. They found that there was a 20% variance in the perception between teachers and that students. Students perceived a teacher's use of power negatively in most situations (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983, p. 183). In a second study (Richmond & McCroskey, 1984), they noted that a student's perception is what gives a teacher her or his power. In this study, the authors sought to determine how power is associated to both affective and cognitive learning. They posited that coercive or legitimate power may "retard both cognitive as well as affective learning" (p. 125). Students prefer that instructors use referent power over any of the other power bases. Kearney, et al. (1985) considered behavior alteration techniques (BATs) in the classroom as well as the corresponding messages that are utilized in the classroom. The authors included and examined techniques similar to the power bases, but restricted the examination of power to the classroom including reward or punishment from the individual in power so to either reinforce positive behavior or alleviate negative outcomes. In the third study, Kearney et al. (1985) identified seven BATs including: "reward from behavior or source" in which the teacher rewards students for compliance, "personal responsibility" whereby students' compliance is derived from inward motivation to comply, "[teacher] expert[tise]," "self-esteem, in which the teacher designs a message to appeal to the students' self-worth, "altruism" which also appeals to the students' love and personal responsibility to comply with the instructor, and "duty" which places the student as part of the team in hopes that the student

will comply so to not fail her or his fellow classmates. Kearney et al. (1985) concluded that teachers who utilize pro-social BATs or BATs similar to expert or rewards were preferred.

In the fourth of the seven studies in the series on power in the classroom, Kearney, et al. (1984) extended research on BAT and BAM teacher use to primary and secondary school environments. The authors found that four BATs were found to be highly effective and frequently used by the teachers including immediate reward from behavior, deferred reward from behavior, self-esteem, and teacher feedback The authors explored how sex differences played a role in the implementation and effectiveness of the previously mentioned BAT's while also adding guilt, peer, and teacher modeling. They found that the use of BATs did increase affective learning depending upon grade level. In the fifth study, McCroskey, et al. (1985) examined how a teachers' BAT use impacts students' affective learning. The authors found that teachers can use BATs in order to assist affective learning in the classroom.

In their sixth study, Plax, et al. (1986) sought to determine and explicate a model of affective learning through the use of BATs and nonverbal immediacy. Plax et al. (1986) found that teachers who use pro-social BATs maintain a positive use of power and an overall positive relational environment between teachers and students. Conversely, teachers who use anti-social or punishment-oriented BATs usually utilized coercive or at times, reward power which contributed to a less affective learning environment. Richmond, et al. (1987) explored how the use of coercive or legitimate power BATs are negatively associated with students' cognitive learning and may also effect affective learning while positive or pro-social BATs improve it. Finally in the seventh study, Richmond et al. (1987) found that teachers who utilize pro-social BATs enhance students' cognitive learning and promote a positive affective learning environment.

In the power in the classroom series, the authors sought to determine how the instructor's communication and use of power affected students' perceptions of a teacher and impacted student learning (McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; Richmond & McCroskey, 1984; Kearney, et al., 1984; Kearney, et al., 1985; McCroskey & Richmond, 1983; McCroskey et, al., 1985; Plax et al., 1986). Researchers have determined that specifically, teacher BATs and BAMs influence how affective student learning is impacted through a teacher's classroom management and nonverbal behaviors may either enhance or hinder a students' affective learning, depending upon the BATs and BAMs an instructor employs. In the last study of the series, Richmond et al., (1987) examined the influence of teacher's use of BATs and BAMs on students' cognitive learning and determined that pro-social BATs enhance student cognitive learning positively.

Other scholars (Andrews, Carpenter, Shaw, & Boster, 2008; Boster, Levine, & Kazoleas, 1993; Boster, Mitchell, Lapinski, Cooper, Orrego, & Reinke, 1999; Fink et al., 2003; Fitch, 1994; Glass, 2013; Golish, 1999, 2000; Lamude & Lichtenstein, 1985; Min, Sellnow, & Vennette, 2006; Punyanunt, 2000; Remland & Jones, 1994; Richmond, 1990; Roach 1991a, 1991b, 1991c; Sylvia Xiaohua et al., 2006; Thompson & Gilchrist, 2011) have examined the use of power in the classroom, in higher education as education, administrative compliance-gaining, and the cross-cultural classroom. For now, I limit my discussion to the relevant literature on compliance-gaining and in higher education.

2.1.3 Compliance-gaining in the Classroom

Apart from the series on power use in the classroom Richmond (1990) examined student motivation and the use of BATs in the classroom. She found that the BATs chosen by the teacher does impact student motivation, whether intrinsic or extrinsic. Punyanunt (2000) discussed the function of humor and various compliance-gaining strategies in the college classroom. She found

that teachers who utilize humor in the classroom are perceived as using more pro-social BATs and are noted as more effective in gaining compliance with their students.

Paulsel (2004) reviewed BATs in new perspective teachers and found that they often use more legitimate and coercive forms of power. Sorenson, Plax, and Kearney (1989) further examined BAMs and BATs in both experienced as well as new teachers. The authors did not give the participants a list of BATs and BAM from which to choose her or his preferred method, rather the authors asked participants to generate their own lists in order to determine whether there might be a significant difference between new and experienced teachers. They found that there was not a significant variance, but new teachers did utilize more anti-social BATs than experienced ones. Claus, Chory, and Malachowski. (2012) discussed students' perceptions of an instructor's use of anti-social BATs as a result of argumentativeness and verbal aggression and how the students negotiated classroom justice and balance of power. They found that an instructor's use of verbal aggression is not correlated between an instructor's verbal aggressiveness, argumentativeness, and a student's use of anti-social BATs toward the instructor. Carter and Punyanunt-Carter (2006) examined the methods of compliance-gaining with students who were caught cheating. The authors found that students were, for the most part, willing to accept their punishment, but preferred an individual conversation to remedy the issue.

Roach (1991a) examined how graduate teaching assistants utilized in-class time. He noted that teaching assistants do implement BATs more often than professors do, and that TAs tend to rely more on the bases of legitimate power and higher authority. Pytlak and Houser (2014) validated that graduate teaching assistants use higher numbers of anti-social BATs in their time in the classroom and that TAs should focus primarily upon building positive relationships and rapport with their students rather than focusing on power; although, there will

be times when a power focus is needed. Golish and Olson (2000) examined the opposite side of the coin in that they sought to determine how students used compliance-gaining strategies toward their teachers. The authors noted that students utilized more face-saving strategies such as email as opposed to direct confrontation methods unless the teacher preferred or utilized more negative compliance-gaining techniques. Golish and Olson found that students who felt threatened may unite as a group or seek out someone in a higher position to get their desired effect.

2.2 Maintaining Power in the Classroom

Instructors have a number of ways in which they maintain power. Training teachers to maintain their power comes to a matter of classroom management and grading. Cooper and Simonds (2002) stipulated that "in order to have a lasting impact on student learning, teachers must facilitate academic growth while at the same time, that is conducive to learning" (p. 223). In facilitating such an environment, teachers should reflect on how they interact with their students. Roach (2002) argued that for training future teachers prior to their entering the classroom is vital as they venture to become leaders in the classroom with limited knowledge and skills. As leaders in the classroom, instructors must consider the available options that may influence their pedagogical philosophies, which may influence how instructors may approach power in the classroom. In the sections that follow, I discuss the modes in which instructors maintain power as well as the relevant philosophies on teaching.

2.2.1 Training Classroom Management

When training future teachers to approach the available means of maintaining power in the classroom, faculty trainers must examine course objectives and initiate reflexivity when discussing classroom management techniques with future instructors. Gorham (1990) argued that "students deserve to know a teacher's objectives, what they are expected to know or think or

feel, and how the attainment of those objectives will be approached and evaluated" as it applies to classroom management (p. 210). In making course objectives clear, students understand how they are to conduct themselves in the classroom, which will allow for an instructor to maintain her or his power simply by stating what is expected. Even if these expectations are made clear by the instructor, students may still resist in order to assert their student power.

McKeachie and Svinicki (2012) examined student misbehaviors such as a student not being prepared for class or students being disruptive in class in order to gain attention. The way in which instructors negotiate student misbehaviors is crucial. Plax and Kearney (1990) proposed different ways in which teachers can handle student misbehaviors. These strategies include training teachers to practice "with-it-ness" in that they must be aware of what is going on in the classroom at all times. In practicing with-it-ness, teachers must manage more than one task at a time while enforcing the pre-established rules. Another mode that a teacher could practice with-it-ness is to engage in pro-social nonverbal and verbal immediacy tactics such as consistent eye contact silence, acknowledging students by name when they have performed well. Hendrix (2010) suggested that an instructor who is reflective may manage incoherencies in the classroom and may be a way in which teachers could manage student misbehaviors in the sense that a teacher who is reflective can think back on a particular class and learn from the experience so that they can effectively manage the problem should it arise again. With these factors of classroom management considered, another way that instructors can manage power is by exploring available differing teaching philosophies as an approach to training future faculty. I now explore relevant pedagogical philosophies.

2.2.2 Pedagogical Framings

       With the available approaches to teaching, faculty trainers have a variety of sources to choose from in which to inform future educators are at their disposal. hooks (2010) argued that the case for critical thinking is at a despairing level. As children, students pose questions in order to uncover the mysteries of life. Children are disciplined that they should conform to the expectations of social action. Because of this discipline, students lose their love of learning by the time they enter the classroom. Per hooks, teachers must inspire critical thinking once again and make them fall in love with learning again. From this framing, a teacher must inspire her or his students not only to learn the concepts and skills, but a love of learning. One way in which an instructor could accomplish this feat is to implement the ways in which teachers talk about the nature of learning and the goal of teaching at large (Fassett &Warren, 2007). In restructuring learning as a passion, an instructor then negotiates power in the sense that the instructor and the student are in the classroom for the love of learning.

       Another philosophy available to faculty trainers is to consider Bain's (2004) student-centered approach. Bain examined the implementation of a student-centered approach, in that students become active participants in their learning as well as the perspective learning outcomes. Each student possesses his or her own unique worldview which informs perspectives on course topics before the teacher ever utters a word. Another crucial element to the student-centered approach concerns a natural critical learning environment. For Bain (2004), a natural-critical learning environment has two elements. The first element of the environment is that it is natural whereby students "encounter the skills, habits, attitudes, and information they are trying to learn embedded in questions and tasks they find interesting" for themselves (p. 99). The second element of the environment is 'critical' in the sense that students "learn to think critically,

to reason from evidence, to examine the quality of their reasoning, using a variety of intellectual standards to make improvements while thinking, and to ask probing and insightful questions about the thinking of other people" (p. 99). Bain explained that in order to initiate a natural-critical learning environment, instructors must first "pose an intriguing question" (Bain, 2004, p. 100). Second, the students engage the question under the guidance of the teacher who offers the significance of the question (Bain 2004, p. 100-03). Third, Bain mentioned that a natural-critical learning environment inspires critical thinking in which the students synthesize and apply the knowledge to their realties. Fourth, this environment helps students answer question in the fact that they are encouraged to pursue their explanations (Bain 2004, p. 103). Finally, the approach leaves students with a question that will broaden their scope of knowledge to depths not yet known. Critical thinking comes into play as students engage as to how to apply theoretical concepts to their personal lives. Instructors engaging in a student-centered approach fostering a natural-critical learning environment put students at the center of their approach to pedagogy. By focusing on students, instructors negotiate power in the sense that they place students and teachers on equal grounds for power in the classroom.

Finally, Freire (1970/2000) articulated an approach to pedagogical framing which concerns how power is treated in which teachers and students are co-collaborators to alleviate oppressive power and social injustice. When training future teachers Freire (1970/2000) interrogates a banking model of education in which students are empty depositories for the knowledge dispensed by the teacher who is the conveyer and holder of all knowledge. Freire posited that this model of education views students as static and having nothing to offer to the conversation (Freire, 2000, p. 73). In the banking model students are empty vessels to be filled, who do not have anything to offer to an interaction or climate of the conversation where he or

she has a unique voice to offer. Freire also examined a mode of teaching known as the co-intentional model of education or the notion that teachers as well as students co-create the critical realities and knowledge during the learning process. Teachers and students work together through dialogue "not only in the task of unveiling that reality, and thereby know it critically, but in task of recreating that knowledge" (Freire, 2000, p. 69). Essentially, both teachers and students are and become responsible to critically construct the educational environment. Freire posited that the nature of the marginal or the oppressed is ". . . that the oppressed are not 'marginal,' are not people living 'outside' society. They have always been inside- inside the structure which made them 'beings for others' (2000, p. 74). Freire noted that the structure of oppression is the sole cause for oppression.

Freire (1970/2000) posited that the solution is not to 'integrate' students into the structure of oppression, but to transform that structure so that they can become 'beings for themselves'" (Freire, 2000, p. 74). Most classrooms have a power dynamic where the teacher is the head authority of information as well as the environment while the students are the subordinates which reinforces the nature of the oppressors (the teacher) and the oppressed (the students). Instructors can practice this power negotiation by relinquishing power at times. Along with the relinquishing of authority, solidarity allows teachers and students to be on the same level. In fostering true solidarity, Freire posited that "solidarity that one enter into a situation . . . fighting at their side to transform the objective reality which has made them 'beings for another'" (Freire, 2000, p. 49). In other words, true solidarity occurs when teachers and students join together as a unit, rather than separate entities to fight for one another as a mode of social justice. Freire also attributed true solidarity as being found in ". . . plentitude of the act of love," meaning that solidarity can happen when one is invested to the cause (Freire, 2000, p. 49-50). In training future educators,

one can take these available models and allow for an integrative model of classroom

management and approaches to power and teaching to demonstrate how a pedagogical case for

servant leadership can foster a manner of teaching that is centered on the students, engages them

critically, while also allowing them to fight against social injustice both within and outside the

classroom.

2.3 Servant Leadership: Toward a Model of Teaching

With all of the available models for teaching the negotiation of power and classroom

management, I call for a new paradigm for training future teachers. The proposed framework of

training incorporates a student-driven approach (Bain, 2004) that interrogates power by placing

the needs of students at the forefront while simultaneously engaging in critical thinking (Freire,

1970/2000; hooks, 2010) that may free them from old modes of thought. These new modes of

thought allows for instructors to construct a learning environment that examines power from the

stance of equality among the teacher and student as well as allow students to think for

themselves both within and outside the classroom. The integrated pedagogical framework

concerns Greenleaf's (1977/2002) model of servant leadership. Greenleaf's paradigm has the

potential to offer faculty trainers insight into how power functions in the college classroom while

also promoting a critical learning environment that engages both teachers and students to think

autonomously, which equips them to examine power and thus negotiate power in other areas of

their life. With this considered, I turn my attention to summarizing Greenleaf's seminal framing

of servant leadership.

2.4 Seminal Framework of Servant Leadership

In summarizing Greenleaf's (1977/2002) paradigm of servant leadership, I describe how

Greenleaf originally applied his paradigm in the contexts of businesses and non-profit

organizations, churches, and education. Greenleaf's paradigm consisted of a collection of essays each with a particular context whereby servant leadership has a potential impact and application for servant leadership. In the space below, I will provide and explicate Greenleaf's original framework. While there are many scholars who explore, apply and expand upon his original contexts of a servant leaders' potential in the realms of business, foundations, and religious institutions, I will focus on educational institutions. To begin, I provide the particular contexts that Greenleaf saw the potential for servant leadership within his original framing. Greenleaf discussed the ability for servant-leaders to arise as a part of the institutions of businesses, philanthropic organizations, religious institutions, and education. In these institutions, he discussed how each has the innate potential to serve as well as promote servant-leaders who promote more autonomous, fulfilled leaders to enact a better society. I will now go to review the concept of servant-leaders as Greenleaf conceptualized. Now, I will discuss Greenleaf's notion of servant as leader.

2.4.1 Servant as Leader

In the attempt to define precisely what constitutes a 'servant leader,' Greenleaf (1977/2002) provided a guiding premise of the defining qualities of an individual who seeks to serve prior to leading. In order to reframe leadership, Greenleaf interrogated power and authority. Greenleaf argued that typically power can manifest itself through the process of "persuasion" or "through overt compulsion or covert manipulation," (p. 115). He maintained that the servant leader will utilize persuasion with the purpose of enhancing the other individual's needs ahead of the needs of the leader. Greenleaf explored how servant leaders utilizes persuasive approach to power in a supportive and altruistic manner, thus forming a new power dynamic. Greenleaf noted that people in general are beginning to reject coercive forms of power

16

and are seeking to follow leaders who promote the creative supporting of others (1977/2002, p. 23-24). Following this claim, he stated that people will desire to align themselves with leaders who are "trusted and proven as servants . . ." (p. 24). Greenleaf's overall goal for servant-leaders to empower individuals who lead to have the capability to serve whether by acting as a trustee to offer advice as need be from the outside in, to administer and ensure day-to-day bureaucratic functionality, or the utilization of one's personal gifts to assist the institution. When an individual initiates this service, they are better able to serve the larger society.

In following this new negotiation of power, he stated that the servant-leader ensures that "other people's highest priority needs are being served" (p. 27). In this framework, the needs of the other are met prior to the advancement of the leader. In an effort to accomplish such a goal, Greenleaf posited various components or qualities that contribute to the construction of a servant-leader. First, servant leaders engage in listening. Listening is an important component to practicing servant leadership. Listening allows the leader to understand the followers' needs. Next, servant-leaders provide the optimal conditions to initiate language. Servant-leaders create open communication environments that allows followers to express their concerns and articulate their vision for the organization or context. The servant-leader says just enough to ignite the creativity of the served who then can contribute their own vocabulary in order to describe the situation which may also involve allowing those served to create their own language to describe the end goal. The servant-leader also possesses foresight in which the past, present, and future are simultaneously intersected within the here-and-now almost in an omnipresent fashion and intuitively make decisions that will foster the highest priority goal of the served. The servant-leader can absorb knowledge from the past and envision how present actions impact the future.

As Greenleaf explained "The servant-leader also empathizes with … and accepts them as they are, so to assist them in their rise toward their highest priority" (p. 33-34).

With these qualities in mind, Greenleaf (1977/2002) further explicated the nature of servant-leaders, he argued that servant leaders continually puts others' needs above their own while simultaneously promoting a better society. In this society, those without privilege or inherent power are empowered in order to enrich the quality of life for all who are involved. In his original work, Greenleaf discussed the role of institutions and the potential for those within organizations to work as servant-leaders. Greenleaf maintained that individuals entrusted within the system possess the capability to become and act as servant-leaders. As members of the system leaders can change the current state of leadership as they act as mentors and administrators to individuals and smaller groups of people who function within those parameters.

From this initial framing, Greenleaf (1977/2002) discussed the potential for application and utilization of servant leadership within the contexts of businesses, educational systems, and religious institutions. Crippen (2005) explored the essential qualities of a servant leader. These include: "a true humanitarian, puts others before self, caring and compassionate, balanced, one who empowers others, is transformational, and serves" (Crippen, 2005, p. 15-16). Other scholars have also posited traits or characteristics of servant leadership, Spears (2004) specifically extended Greenleaf's original framing with ten characteristics that define a servant-leader. These attributes include: listening; empathy; healing; awareness; persuasion; conceptualization; foresight; stewardship; commitment to the growth of people; and community building. From the articulation of these characteristics, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) developed and clarified a scale for measuring an individual's perceived servant leadership qualities. These characteristics

include "calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building" (p. 304).

Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) took a cue from Greenleaf to define calling as the "desire to serve and sacrifice self-interest for the benefit of others. Listening entails the leader's ability to hear and value the ideas of others. Empathy incorporates listening and extends to the leader's aptitude toward appreciating the circumstances that others face. Healing is operationalized as the ability of leader's to know "when and how to foster the healing process" (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006, p. 306). Awareness concerns how a leader ascertains and perceives cues from the environment. For Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) a leader utilizing persuasion will rely on less legitimate authority with their followers. Conceptualization is a leader's ability to utilize theoretical concepts to encourage literal thinking for followers. Foresight concerns an innate ability to anticipate the consequences of decision-making for the organization. Stewardship as a component is the belief that "an organization has a legacy to uphold and can contribute to the larger society" (2006, p. 308). Growth is the leader's ability to recognize opportunities for followers to succeed in an organization. Community building is operationalized as a leader's ability to promote and foster a community spirit among members of an organization. Greenleaf (1977/2002) and other scholars (Hays, 2008; Thompson, 2014) have incorporated servant leadership into a variety of contexts including business and foundations; churches; and education.

2.4.2 Businesses and Foundations

Greenleaf (1977/2002) argued that businesses function for the most part within and as an institution, and thus, the largest applicability and accessibility to act as servant leaders. In other words, businesses as an entity, possess the highest potential to emerge and promote servant-

leaders. Consequently, the vast majority of research on servant leadership has focused on businesses and organizations (Mittal & Dorfman, 2012; Van Winkle, Allen, DeVore, & Winston, 2014; Panaccio, Henderson, Liden, Wayne, & Cao, 2015).

To promote servant leadership in business and organizational contexts, Greenleaf (1977/2002) proposed what he referred to as a "new ethic." In this new ethic individuals are encouraged to engage in work which fulfills their personal and professional desires striving for deeper meaning in their work beyond the bottom line of profitability or product selling. Rather the individual works within her or his skillset or passion to reach optimal productivity within the business in order to provide service to consumers. Greenleaf explained, ". . . the business exists as much to provide meaningful work to the person as it exists to provide a product or service . . ." (p. 155). The importance in this claim essentially reaffirms that those within businesses exist within and as a part of an institution to provide something that society needs or desires. The servant-leader in the realm of business is one who can promote an environment in which the individuals who work within these organizations can thrive personally, thus wanting to serve the society at large while serving the organization.

Greenleaf (1977/2002) argued that foundations are unique organizational contexts in that trustees or staff members "distribute funds for a wide range of socially beneficial purposes" (p. 217). People entrusted to guide foundations have the ability to act as servant-leaders in that trustees who run them exist for a specific purpose, whether that be working to distribute funds to other people or institutional causes. Greenleaf posited that servant leadership within foundations is natural fit in that the organizational purpose of foundations is inherently altruistic. The resources provided by foundations are targeted to enact a contribution to society, trustees must

remain prudent and vigilant in the allocation of these resources whether that be money or other resources to ensure the foundations' sustained continuation.

The question and implementation of power is also a formable one here for Greenleaf. Within businesses and foundations, Greenleaf discussed that power must be monitored to ensure that those entrusted with power are responsible in their use of power. Along the same lines, other scholars such as Page (2003) noted that trustees, particularly in the realm of higher education have a duty to organize an environment in which its staff and those who are involved are equipped to serve the larger community as they empower others to serve the lager society. Mittal and Dorfman (2012) argued that "Servant leadership is anchored in the human drive to bond with others and contribute to the betterment of the society. An emphasis on service motivation, as demonstrated by empowering and developing people with empathy and humility" are attributes that servant-leaders utilize in the context of businesses (p. 555). The application of servant leadership in businesses is such that individuals in powerful positions have the duty to better the members of the organization so that they can promote a sustainable legacy for the larger society. Greenleaf also examined servant leadership accessibility in religious contexts.

2.4.3 Churches

In examining his original context, Greenleaf (1977/2002) discussed the role of churches as serving institutions; he posited that the purpose behind religion is to rebind people to a larger context beyond their own so that they may escape their isolation and seek healing and thus be whole as they are served and serving others. The importance here is that pastors and other church officials, much like business owners and employees and trustees of philanthropic foundations have an over-arching goal to provide services, products, or resources to individuals so that they may serve others. Greenleaf's (1977/2002) argument in this context is that churches as

institutions have the potential to capitalize on individual gifts that will enable one to lead as her

or his individual gifts call for the specific situations. Individuals who work within churches rely

on reciprocity from the congregants as they must empower the particular leader by utilizing their

skillset in order to aid the leader in a given situation. Servant-leaders in churches work to form

an alliance of individuals whose personal abilities can complement one another in order promote

healing for the served, and by reciprocation, they too may be served. I now summarize

Greenleaf's thoughts on servant leadership potential in educational contexts.

2.4.4 Education

In addressing the prospect and application of servant leadership in education, Greenleaf

(1977/2002) first discussed the disparity that looms over many educational institutions by noting

two critiques. His first critique concerned the failure of higher educational institutions to allow

student adequate service leadership opportunity as was the state of education during Greenleaf's

writing. He also critiques the notion of credentializing. His initial critique concerns power and

authority figures who require students to stay in school until the ages of between sixteen to

eighteen which stifles an individual's leadership potential Greenleaf further critiques higher

education for credentializing, or the fact that there is the expectation of students to continue her

or his education merely for the end goal of obtaining a degree which suppresses learning or at

least one's desire to learn for the sake of knowledge. The implications for Greenleaf's audience

is that this academic structure hinders young leaders who may be ready to lead, but are unable to

fulfill the call to serve or lead due to the fact that they must complete a certain number of years

of school prior to even being considered fit to serve. The restrictions of this system on future

servant-leaders places a greater responsibility on academic institutions to account for these two

critiques, which may hinder individuals who work within academic institutions from acting as servant-leaders.

In order to address his critiques of the educational system, Greenleaf (1977/2002) posited that universities and other academic institutions must be open and equipped to change in order to serve both their students and the broader society. Greenleaf maintained that an equipped educational institution prepares future servant-leaders to address ambiguity in multiple contexts and use their knowledge and skills to provide certainty to unanswered questions. Greenleaf argued that educational institutions ought to prepare students to serve the larger society. Those who teach, administer, act as staff members, or work in any capacity within education have the potential to encourage creativity and knowledge. Greenleaf explained that individuals who occupy these positions possess the opportunity if not obligation to assist students in their preparation to serve whether that be through the implementation of a liberal arts education or other programs that aim to promote engagement of community and service. With Greenleaf's original framing of servant leadership contexts in mind, I am going to shift focus toward the further explanation and application of servant-leaders in education specifically.

2.5 Application and Expansion of Servant Leadership in Education

Numerous scholars (Black, 2010; Bogue, 2006; Bowman, 2005; Fitzgerald, 2015; Grothaus, 2004; Hine, 2014; Letizia, 2014; Page, 2003; Sergiovanni, 1996; Shaw & Newton, 2014; Sims, 2002; Stueber, 2000; Tate, 2003; Waite, 2011) have incorporated servant leadership in education to expand and or apply the prospects of becoming or enacting servant-leaders. Greenleaf's (1977/2002) principles or qualities of servant-leaders are utilized in facets and functions of educational environments, both within and outside of the actual classroom by

teachers and administrators that run or oversee academic institutions. In the sections that follow,

I plan to explore these various applications within the realm of education.

2.5.1 Servant-Leaders in the Classroom

Bowman (2005), Shaw and Newton (2014), and Waite (2011) have discussed the

qualities of servant leadership within the classroom. Bowman explained that the classroom is a

place where teachers embody the aspects of the skills they teach, while Shaw and Newton

explored servant leadership from the positionality of the principal. In both of these instances, the

authors illustrated that both the teacher and student are interdependent upon one another in that

the student and teacher interact in a classroom environment where mutual service exists.

Bowman (2005) noted that teachers with a servant leadership approach will challenge their

students to apply and personalize their learning rather than just focusing on rote memorization

and basic skill development. Bowman noted that teachers as servants "still have a ways to go" (p.

258) to ensure that all of the pragmatic principles of servant leadership are fulfilled. Bowman's

assertion supports Greenleaf's (1977/2002) critique that noted that individuals who work within

educational systems must adapt to the changing environments if they are to promote and inspire

servant-leaders for the future.

Herman and Marlowe (2005) expanded the concept of servant leadership in the

classroom by explaining that a classroom environment in which the teacher strives to enact a

servant-leader mentality should foster one that is built upon the "universals such as caring,

empathy, and understanding" (p. 176). In a similar vein, Fitzgerald (2015) discussed the various

qualities of teacher servant-leaders exemplifying and culminating in "love for each student" (p.

84) as the teacher and student relationship is built throughout the duration of the course or school

term. Letizia (2014) further expanded the conceptualization of servant leadership into the notion

of "radical servant leadership" in that teachers not only seek to serve those within the context of education, but also teach them to serve the larger society. This form of service goes beyond simply serving the present needs of the students toward fighting against the social injustices of the present structure of traditional educational institutions. In another application focused specifically in higher education, Johnson and Vishwanath (2011) explored the notion of "servant professorship." In this framing, the authors stipulated that as educators, we have a duty, if not desire to serve students for the betterment of their future. The authors noted that some students and faculty may resist the servant-leadership approach because students may desire to simply be told information and instructors may not be willing to adapt their teaching approaches. The authors argued that in order to achieve servant-professorship faculty must be diligent in their efforts to change and challenge their students to change. Now that I have examined the role of servant-leaders in the classroom, I will examine how Greenleaf's framework has been applied to school administrators.

2.5.2 School Administrators as Servant-Leaders

School administrators must also be servants to the teachers and students; Shaw and Newton (2014) argued that education is a reciprocal process of community and service to all parties involved. Administrators who wish to implement such an environment may create more work for themselves in that they must ensure that teachers and students engaged in an education process that will promote the development of servant-leaders (Stueber, 2000). Burch, Swails, and Mills (2015) discussed the present nature and implementation of the paradigm of servant leadership in the administration at Christian universities. The authors noted that the utilization of servant leadership is not as prevalent as would be expected in a religious education environment. The authors suggested that dialogue must ensue in order to inspire an open environment that

25

brings forth the core elements of servant leadership whereby the leaders listen and serve others prior to speaking and enacting policy or dictating what should be done. In this way, the administration must communicate as well as listen as they strive to instill an expectation of service first. Research has also occurred within private, religious institutions both at the primary and secondary educational level as noted below. Other scholars (Kohle, Smetho, & Dochney, 2012l; McClellan, 2007) examined how various roles within educational institutions possess potential implementation and embodiment of a servant-leader.

McClellan (2007) and Kohle et al. (2012) examined the student-advisors relationship in higher education. McClellan specifically explored the influence of the hierarchical organization of the university in the development of servant-leader advisors, while Kohle et al. (2012) discussed the potential for advisors to act as servant-leaders. Kohle et al. (2012) found that academic advisors actually do portray many of the qualities of servant leadership in that most are prior faculty members or administrators who are familiar with the inner-workings of the university. Advisors have the capability to act as servant-leaders because they have the insight into the bureaucratic structures of the University and into students' plan of study and future goals. Kohle et al. (2012) explained that servant-leader advisors will serve and advise students in a manner that allow students to achieve their goals and ensure students develop the skillsets needed to serve the world beyond the classroom.

2.5.3 Educational Servant Leadership in Religious Schools

Scholars (Bogue, 2006; Hine, 2014; McKinney, 2004; Page, 2003; Satyaputra, 2013; Striepe & O'Donoghue, 2014) have noted that servant leadership has also been applied to educational institutions including Catholic and Lutheran schools as well as other private religious universities. Each of these authors discussed the need for a revitalization of the religiously-

centered educational institutions who desire to implement a student-driven environment which thrive in the bounds of community and service. To validate this claim, scholars (Bogue, 2006; Hine, 2014; McKinney, 2004; Page, 2003; Satyaputra, 2013; Striepe & O'Donoghue, 2014) also sought to determine if religious institutions who stated this desire to promote a servant leadership environment were enacting this approach in their institutions. Sims (2002) expanded on this perspective in asserting that the practical implications of servant-leader should depict that just as Jesus Christ embodied a service-first mentality. She also claimed that those within the Lutheran tradition do not view themselves as leaders, rather as perpetual servants who strive to place others before their own needs.

In a similar light, Black (2010) discussed the notion of servant leadership within a Catholic school. Black noted that there would be many challenges when attempting to implement a climate where a student's needs and gifts will be at the forefront of the goal. Black highlighted the challenges of implementing a servant leadership approach noting the higher demands upon students to engage in serving others. However Black (2010) noted that teachers will be empowered by engaging in a servant leadership approach by serving their students and benefitting from their students service. Black's conclusion highlights the reciprocal nature of servant leadership. As Greenleaf (1977/2002) noted those that serve others receive benefits from engaging in that service. Scholars (Bogue, 2006; Hine, 2014; McKinney, 2004; Page, 2003; Satyaputra, 2013; Striepe & O'Donoghue, 2014) have argued that fostering and implementing servant leadership within educational institutions is problematic in that all parties must be committed to serve others.

As noted in the above review, applications and extensions of servant leadership in education have been applied to religious contexts in higher and secondary education, but limited

studies (Johnson & Vishwanath, 2011; Kohle et al. 2012; Letizia; 2014) have explored the development of servant leadership in public higher education. Furthermore, none of the existing studies on servant leadership in higher education have focused specifically on the importance of negotiation of power in the teacher-student relationship. As Greenleaf (1977/2002) noted the ways in which a servant-leader approach power is an essential to achieving the goals of the servant-leadership approach. A servant-leader must at times relinquish her or his power in order to allow and embrace other opportunities for growth and to serve others. In the space that follows, I will briefly describe the connection between power and servant leadership.

2.6 Power and Servant Leadership

Greenleaf (1997/2002) argued that power and authority are central in framing and implementing servant leadership. Greenleaf discussed power in two manifestations, persuasion and coercion. The power in persuasion lies in leaders' abilities to create opportunities in which people have choices to make their own decisions and thus foster autonomy. Coercion, on the other hand, places individuals into a predetermined path which hinders and may even stop them from growing. Leaders' use of coercive power fosters only resistance from followers whereas leaders' persuasion implements an environment that is open and organic, which allows for all people to be served and thus serve others. In implementing and using power and authority, Greenleaf argued that servant-leaders will gain legitimate power because they have fostered an environment of trust and balance among all who are involved. Greenleaf noted that individuals guided by servant-leaders become leaders. In essence, Greenleaf argued that servant-leaders should utilize persuasion or a one-person-at-a-time mentality to serve their followers and allow them a voice to realize their potential and legitimate power as servant-leaders.

Other scholars (Wheeler, 2012; Wong & Page, 2003) have explored the relationship between servant leadership and power. Wong and Page (2003) addressed power and servant-leaders by exploring whether or not individuals who wished to enact and embody servant leadership relinquished their power. They found that servant-leaders who choose to utilize other forms of power, such as social power or referent power, moved beyond coercion and fostered growth in the followers. Wheeler (2012) discussed the nature of power and servant leadership specifically within higher education. He claimed that servant leadership is not a set of practices to implement; rather, a "way of being" (p. 13). Servant-leaders are self-aware and authentic both inwardly and outwardly so that they are able to serve others' needs. In regard to how power is utilized by servant-leaders, Wheeler (2012) noted that servant-leaders generally frame and use power "with, and not over" (p. 41). Servant-leaders rely more on referent and expert power over coercive and legitimate even though they are in positions in which they can use both legitimate and coercive compliance-gaining methods (Wheeler, 2012).

Greenleaf (1997/2002) argued that servant-leaders management of power is a defining characteristic needed to achieve the benefits of servant leadership. Within the context of education power manifests both within and outside of the classroom (Bain, 2004; Thompson & Gilchrist, 2011). Teachers' interaction with students becomes the site in which power is negotiated. Greenleaf's paradigm of servant leadership and approach to power provides a framework to explore students' perceptions of their teachers' use of power and specific compliance-gaining communication behaviors.

CHAPTER 3

RATIONALE AND RESEARCH QUESTION

Scholars (Hofmeyer, Sheingold, Klopper, & Warland, 2015; Quinlan, 2014) have demonstrated that teachers function as leaders in the classroom. In the role of leader teachers provide direction and guidance to students and thus inherently engage in the use of power (Bain, 2004). McCroskey and Richmond (1983) argued that teachers utilize compliance-gaining communication behaviors in order to maintain power in the classroom. Hence, all teachers must learn how to manage and negotiate power with their students.

Faculty trainers have a number of tactics and theoretical philosophies to choose from (Bain, 2004; hooks, 2010; Freire (1970/2000) in training future teachers to initiate and maintain their power through communication. I argue that a framework of training teachers to negotiate power should incorporate a student-driven approach (Bain, 2004). This student-driven approach to training teachers to negotiate power should place the needs of students at the forefront while simultaneously providing students the opportunity to engage in critical thinking (Freire, 1970/2000; hooks, 2010) processes that are empowering. This approach allows for instructors to construct a learning environment that examines power from the stance of equality among the teacher and student as well as allow students to think for themselves. Greenleaf's (1977/2002) model of servant leadership provides an integrated pedagogical framework to explore this approach. Greenleaf's paradigm has the potential to offer faculty trainers insight into how power functions in the college classroom while also promoting a critical learning environment that engages both teachers and students to think autonomously, which equips them to examine power and thus negotiate power in other areas of their life.

In fostering their power through communication, teachers have the opportunity to choose how they communicatively construct and demonstrate their power. A different theoretical framing of communicating their power comes through initiating Greenleaf's paradigm servant leadership in the classroom. As noted in the literature review, servant leadership in education has applied to primarily religious contexts in higher and secondary education. I argue that the limited studies (Johnson & Vishwanath, 2011; Kohle et al. 2012; Letizia; 2014) that have explored the development of servant leadership in public higher education fail to address the importance of negotiation of power in the teacher-student relationship. Thus, this project also serves to extend the theoretical development of servant leadership. Given the lack of research on the servant-leadership framework within public education, research question one seeks to clarify the connection between servant-leadership as a theoretical framework and the compliance-gaining communication behaviors that teachers use to maintain power in the higher education classroom.

RQ 1: Does servant leadership predict the use of BATs in the classroom?

In asking this question, I seek to interrogate the power negotiation involved between teachers and students. Servant-leaders utilize more forms of referent power (Greenleaf, 1977/2002) in order to maintain compliance. I speculate that this begins with classroom management and a positive student-teacher relationship in which the instructor utilizes less coercive or legitimate forms of power with students. The elements that contribute to a positive learning environment are consistent with the traits of a servant-leader. Based on Greenleaf's (1977/2002) theoretical model, teachers should use more positive bases of power such as persuasion and referent power to gain compliance within the classroom, thus, I predict that teachers with a servant leadership framework will use more pro-social BATs to maintain to control:

H1: Instructors adopting a servant leadership framework are more likely to engage in pro-

social BATs.

CHAPTER 4

METHOD

In this section, I clarify the participants, measurements, and procedures for data analysis.

4.1 Participants

The sample consisted of 676 undergraduate students who were enrolled in Introduction to Communication and upper division communication studies courses at a large southwestern university. Students were offered extra credit for participating in the survey. One hundred forty-two surveys were removed from the data set and not analyzed, because participants did not complete a portion of the survey. Of the 534 participants included in the analysis, 320 (60%) were female and 214 (40%) were male. Of the analyzed participants 155 (29%) were first-year college students, 253 (47%) were sophomores, 0 (0%) were juniors, and 126 (24%) were seniors. The average age of the participants was 20 (SD = 3.17). Participants were asked to indicate the number of students present within the class. The average number of students in the class was 61 (SD = 62.93) with a minimum number of 11 students reported and a maximum of 500.

Of the participants analyzed, 356 (67%) noted that they attended a strictly face-to-face class format, 178 (33%) noted that the course was a blended course (consisted of both online and face-to-face instruction), and 0 (0%) of participants noted that the course was a strictly online course. Of the analyzed participants 298 (56%) were majors in the College of Arts and Sciences; 166 (31%) were majors in the College of Business36 (6.7%) in the College of Public Affairs and Community Service; 12 (2.2%) in the College of Education; 7 (1.3%) in School of Journalism; 5 (.93%) in the College of Engineering; 4 (.74%) in the College of Information; 2 (.37%) in the College of Music; 1 (.18%) in the College of Visual Arts and Design, 1 (.18%) in the College of Merchandising, Hospitality, and Tourism; and 3 (.56%) identified themselves as "undecided."

Of the participants analyzed, 256 (48%) identified the rank of their instructor as full-time

Faculty (Lecturer/Assistant Professor/Associate Professor/Professor); 42 (7.9%) identified their

instructor as Part-time Faculty (Adjunct); 113 (21%) were identified as Teaching Assistant (TA)/

Teaching Fellow (TF); and 122 (23%) indicated that they did not know the rank of their

instructor. Of the analyzed participants, 492 (92%) indicated that the evaluated faculty member

was from the College of Arts and Sciences; 20 (3.7%) were from the College of Business; 11

(2%) was from the College of Public Affairs and Community Services; 4 (.7%) were from the

School of Journalism; 2 (.37%) were from the College of Education; 2 (.37%) College of Music;

1 (.2%) was from the College of Engineering; 1 (.2%) was from the College of Visual Arts and

Design; and 1 (.2%) did not report the department.

4.2 Data Collection and Measurements

The survey was constructed in Qualtrix to allow for students to access the survey at their

convenience. In order to access the survey, students received a link through Blackboard. The

survey included basic demographic information including age of participant, gender of

participant, participant's rank in school, and participant's major.   In order to explore the

connection between servant leadership and behavior alteration techniques (BATs), Burberto and

Wheeler's (2006) adapted servant leadership questionnaire and McCroskey et al. (1985) measure

of BATs in the classroom were utilized. Participants were asked to answer all questions with the

instructor from the last class they attend prior to completing the survey. This technique allows

for data to come from a variety of instructors rather than only the instructors from the same

department.

4.2.1 Servant Leadership Questionnaire

In an effort to develop and validate a scale to measure and operationalize the qualities of servant leaders, Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) developed operational definitions to the eleven qualities of servant leaders. The original eleven characteristics included: "calling, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualist foresight, stewardship, growth, and community building" (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006, p. 304). The original 56-item questionnaire was reduced to 28 items based on the author's data analysis. Barbuto and Wheeler group servant leadership into five concrete dimensions based upon their convergent and divergent analysis. The authors argued that some original characteristics of servant leadership, such as listening and empathy are general leadership skills and not unique to servant leadership. Additionally, both of these skills contribute to dimensions of emotional healing and wisdom and thus do not load uniquely in the analysis (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). The authors determined the predictive validity by sampling an organization and the multivariate leadership questionnaire and results were positively correlated with each of the five subscales of the scale.

The five subscales include "altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship" (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006, p. 311). Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) defined each of the subscales. Altruistic calling is characterized as a leader putting others' needs ahead of her or his own so to positively influence others' lives. Emotional healing depicts the leader as highly empathetic, a great listener, as well as having the ability to create and foster safe environments in which followers may voice their concerns. Wisdom is exemplified in the leader's awareness of her or his surroundings and the foresight to understand the consequences. Persuasive mapping concerns the servant-leaders form and articulate visions

for the future of the group or organization. Lastly, organizational stewardship points to the servant-leader's ability to contribute to the larger society in a positive and memorable manner.

Subsequent testing and confirmation of the instrument was conducted by Liden, Wayne, Zhao, and Henderson (2008). The SLQ randomized measure (see Appendix A for the scale) consists of 28 items on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). In order to test the hypothesis, I first ensured the reliability and validity of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire (SLQ). In order to test the reliability and validity, I ran a principle component Factor analysis with varimax rotation to validate a five-factor solution. Three of the five factors loaded as expected (Emotional Healing, Wisdom, and Organizational Stewardship). However, Persuasive Mapping and Altruism had two items present that did not load clearly, F (5,527) = 19.16, p = .000 (see Table 1). Due to the theoretical support of the scale as a whole (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Linden et al., 2008), I chose to continue with the analysis using the full SLQ.

Table 1

Summary of Validity and Reliability of the Servant Leadership Questionnaire

Variable	Emotional Healing	Organizational Stewardship	Persuasive Mapping	Altruistic Calling	Wisdom
SLQ 1	.188	.253	.209	.803*	.293
SLQ 2	.218	.284	.130	.776*	.349
SLQ 3	.826*	.159	.121	.182	.244
SLQ 4	.236	.223	.162	.252	.792*
SLQ 5	.216	.290	.292	.362	.594*
SLQ 6	.415	.531*	.216	.297	.340
SLQ 7	.230	.371	.228	.191	.654*
SLQ 8	.862*	.208	.172	.120	.222
SLQ 9	.232	.290	.219	.267	.762*
SLQ 10	.268	.296	.603*	.255	.430
SLQ 11	.282	.762*	.078	.161	.323
SLQ 12	.864*	.212	.196	.101	.176
SLQ 13	.225	.375	.278	.149	.706*
SLQ 14	.262	.310	.700*	.168	.403
SLQ 15	.212	.765*	.279	.205	.317
SLQ 16	.486	.352	.409	.379	.212
SLQ 17	.822*	.223	.284	.139	.189
SLQ 18	.419	.285	.687*	.127	.296
SLQ 19	.199	.761*	.293	.219	.277
SLQ 20	.313	.543*	.500	.198	.262
SLQ 21	.508	.285	.456	.385	.292
SLQ 22	.302	.259	.427	.160	.615*
SLQ 23	.229	.663*	.348	.275	.361

4.2.2 Compliance-Gaining BATs

Behavioral Alteration Techniques (BATs) are the way in which power is initiated and sustained through the communication in the classroom. Kearney, et al. (1984) generated a list of BATs and BAMs and in their fifth study McCroskey, et al. (1985) hypothesized that a teacher's use of pro-social BATs are positively correlated with effective and cognitive learning. The 18 BATs, as noted above, were divided into categories of pro-social and anti-social. The pro-social BATs include reward from behavior (1), reward from others (2), reward from source (7), personal responsibility (9), expert (10), self-esteem (12), altruism (15), and duty (17).The anti-social BATs include punishment from source (3), referent-model (4), legitimate higher authority (5), guilt (6), normative rules (8), punishment from others (11), debt (13), personal relationship: negative (14), personal relationship: positive (16), and legitimate personal authority (18). The initial list of BATs and BAMs were compiled using both students and instructors in a two-phase process. First participants were asked to distinguish and group similar messages. In the second phase, participants were asked to take the grouped messages and report how often they utilized these messages in their classrooms on a scale of 1- never to 5- very often. Other authors (Sorenson, Plax, & Kearney, 1989) utilized the original scale to measure classroom compliance-gaining tactics. Thus, the entire compliance-gaining scale will consist of 57 items (specific BAMs) that correspond to the 18 BATs (see Appendix B for scale).

Participants evaluated the likelihood of the instructor of the designated course engaged in the specific BAM using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (extremely unlikely) to 7 (extremely likely). The BATs list was not be provided to participants in the survey. When preparing the data for analysis I ran a factor analysis to confirm BAMs loaded to pro-social and anti-social BATs

categories; reliability analysis of pro-social and anti-social BATs; and computed an overall score

for pro-social and anti-social BATs.

Table 2

Summary of Validity and Reliability of the Behavioral Alteration Techniques and Messages (BATs/BAMs)

Variable	Anti-Social BATs	Pro-Social BATs
Reward from Behavior	-.097	.771*
Reward from Others	.179	.681*
Punishment from Source	.835*	.016
Reference Model	.693*	.294
Legitimate Higher Authority	.744*	.133
Guilt	.789*	.238
Reward from Source	-.323	.649*
Normative Rules	.747*	.262
Personal Responsibility	.361	.547*
Expert	.054	.727*
Punishment from Behavior	.854*	.129
Self-Esteem	.045	.833*
Debt	.858*	.175
Personal Relationship- Negative	.890*	.065
Altruism	.233	.753*
Personal Relationship- Positive	.675	.421
Duty	.363	.586*
Legitimate Personal Authority	.816	.098

4.3 Data Analysis

To test the research question and hypothesis, a series of multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine how the independent variables (SLQ subscales: altruistic calling, emotional healing, wisdom, persuasive mapping, and organizational stewardship) predicted an instructor's use of pro-social BATs and anti-social BATs in the college classroom. First, I conducted a regression analysis to determine if the data met the assumptions of regression. The collinearity diagnostics indicated a possible problem with multicollinearity, but did not meet the threshold of a VIF of greater than 10 (Altruistic, Tolerance =.269, VIF = 3.712; Emotional Healing, Tolerance = .467, VIF = 2.143; Wisdom, Tolerance = .262, VIF = 3.818; Persuasive Mapping, Tolerance = .191, VIF = 5.225; Organizational Stewardship, Tolerance = .260, VIF =3.843). Thus, the series of regression analysis procedures were conducted as planned.

The first regression analysis sought to determine if the five sub-scores of Servant Leadership (Altruistic Calling, Emotional Healing, Wisdom, Persuasive Mapping, and Organizational Stewardship) had specific predicative association with the pro-social BATs. The second regression analysis sought to determine in the 5 SLQ sub-scales significantly predicted anti-social BATs. In the second step of the regression procedure the five SLQ sub-scales were added as predictor variables. The analysis controlled for age of participant, gender of participant, classification of participant, rank of instructor, class size, and class format. The nominal variables (gender, classification, rank, and format) were dummy coded in order to create dichotomous variables that could be examined using regression analysis. Variables with more than two categories were grouped in order to conduct the regression analysis. Classification of participants were grouped into two categories: first year/sophomore and junior/seniors. The rank of instructor for part-time, other, and teaching assistants were grouped into one category, while

41

full-time faculty were grouped into a second category. The other nominal variables only had two categories and thus were not combined.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

5.1.1 Pro-Social BATs

A two-step multiple regression procedure was conducted to examine if the five SLQ sub-scales were significant predictors of pro-social BATs. In the first step of the regression analysis the control variables were entered as predictor variables, while pro-social BATs was the criterion variable. In step 1 of the regression analysis, the age of participant, the rank of instructor, the format of the class, the gender of the participant, and the classification of the participant did not significantly predict the use of pro-social BATs, $R^2 = .009$, $p = .417$ (See Table 3).

H1 specifically proposed that instructors who utilized a servant leadership framework in the classroom were more likely to implement more pro-social compliance-gaining BATs. In the second step of the regression analysis, the five SLQ sub scales significantly supported the use of pro-social BATs, $R^2 = .168$, $p = .000$. Examination of the standardized coefficients in the second step of the regression analysis indicated that persuasive mapping significantly predicted the use of pro-social BATs in the classroom, $\beta = .251$, $t = 2.734$, $p = .000$. Faculty who were perceived to have higher levels of persuasive mapping were more like to be perceived to engage in pro-social BATs. Although significant, persuasive mapping was the only servant leadership factor to predict the use of pro-social BATs. Thus, my hypothesis is partially supported. Additionally, the gender of participant was a significant predictor of pro-social BATs, $\beta = -.216$, $t = -2.159$, p <.05. Male participants ($M = 4.14$, $SD = 1.11$) perceived significantly higher levels of pro-social BATs than female participants ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.25$), $F(1, 532) = 4.21$, $p = .04$.

5.1.2 Anti-Social BATs

A two-step multiple regression procedure was also conducted to examine if the five SLQ sub-scales were significant predictors of anti-social BATs. In the first step of the regression analysis the control variables were entered as predictor variables, while anti-social BATs was the criterion variable. In the second step of the regression procedure the five SLQ sub-scales were added as predictor variables.

In step 1 of the regression analysis, the age of participant, the rank of instructor, the format of the class, the gender of the participant, and the classification of the participant did not significantly predict the use of anti-social BATs, $R^2 = .050$, $p = .000$ (See Table 4).

H1 specifically proposed that instructors who utilized a servant leadership framework in the classroom were more likely to employ fewer anti-social compliance-gaining BATs. In the second step of the regression analysis, the five SLQ sub scales significantly predicted the use of anti-social BATs, $R^2 = .096$, $p = .000$. Examination of the standardized coefficients in the second step of the regression analysis indicated that emotional healing ($\beta = .266$, $t = 4.325$, $p = .000$) and altruistic calling ($\beta = -.211$, $t = -2.591$, $p = .010$) significantly predicted the use of anti-social BATs in the classroom. Faculty who were perceived to have higher levels of emotional healing were more like to be perceived to engage in anti-social BATs. In contrast, faculty who were perceived to have higher levels of altruistic calling were less likely to be perceived to engage in anti-social BATs.

Additionally, the gender of participant was a significant predictor of anti-social BATs, $\beta = -.198$, $t = -4.605$, $p < .05$. Male participants ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 1.37$) perceived significantly higher levels of anti-social BATs than female participants ($M = 2.31$, $SD = 1.28$), $F (1, 531) = 20.44$, $p = .000$. Also, the rank of instructor was a significant predictor of anti-social BATs, $\beta = -.101$, $t = -2.139$, $p < .05$. Full-time faculty are significantly less likely ($M = 2.38$, $SD = 1.24$) to

engage in anti-social BATs than part-time, teaching assistant, or other ($M =2.69$, $SD = 1.41$), F (1,53) = 6.096, $p = .014$.

Table 3

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Servant Leadership and an Instructor's use of Pro-Social BATs in the classroom ($N= 534$)

Variable	B	SE B	β	Semi-partial²
Step 1				
Age	.004	.018	.011	.010
Rank of Instructor	-.026	.116	-.011	-.010
Class Format	-.055	.129	-.022	-.019
Gender of Participant	-.218	.108	-.089	-.088
Classification of Participant	-.102	.139	-.036	-.032
Step 2				
Age	.002	.017	.005	.005
Rank of Instructor	-.091	.107	-.038	-.037
Class Format	.036	.119	.014	.013
Gender of Participant	-216	.100	-.088*	-.094
Classification of Participant	-.066	.129	-.023	-.022
Altruistic Calling	-.036	.074	-.038	-.021
Emotional Healing	.076	.042	.107	.079
Wisdom	-.041	.077	-.041	-.023
Persuasive Mapping	.227	.083	.251*	.119
Organizational Stewardship	.141	.075	.150	.083

Note: $R^2 = .009$ (p $= .417$) for step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .158$ ($p = .000$) for step 2. * $p < .05$

Table 4

Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Servant Leadership and an Instructor's use of Anti-Social BATs in the classroom ($N= 534$)

Variable	B	$SE\ B$	β	Semi-partial^2
Step 1				
Age	-.015	.020	-.036	-.034
Rank of Instructor	-.271*	.127	-.101	-.093
Class Format	-.056	.141	-.020	-.017
Gender of Participant	-.543*	.118	-.198	-.197
Classification of Participant	-.188	.152	-.059	-.054
Step 2				
Age	-.006	.019	-.015	-.014
Rank of Instructor	-.234	.125	-.087	-.078
Class Format	-.082	.139	-.029	-.025
Gender of Participant	-.500	.116	-.182*	-.179
Classification of Participant	-.115	.151	.036	-.033
Altruistic Calling	-.226	.087	-.211*	-.113
Emotional Healing	.210	.048	.266*	.186
Wisdom	-.081	.090	-.074	-.039
Persuasive Mapping	.061	.097	.060	.028
Organizational Stewardship	-.065	.087	-.061	-.032

Note: $R^2 = .050$ (p = .000) for step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .096$ ($p = .000$) for step 2. * $p < .05$

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

In the examination of power and servant leadership as tools and strategies used in the college classroom, various factors merit further consideration. An instructor who exhibits or is perceived to exhibit servant leadership qualities may achieve compliance from students through the use of both pro-social and anti-social strategies. Specifically, several factors regarding the outcomes of the SLQ emerged that are both noteworthy and unexpected, including some unanticipated results contrary to my initial hypothesis. A few of the most surprising results that surfaced include the factors of altruistic calling, persuasive mapping, emotional healing, and the significance based on the participants' gender. In order to identify the roles and functionality of these elements in compliance-gaining strategies, I will briefly discuss these four findings in further detail, and will conclude by addressing the study's limitations followed by suggestions for possible directions for future scholarship.

Overall, participants indicated instructors whom they perceive as having higher levels of persuasive mapping implement more pro-social BATs. On the contrary, instructors who were seen to exhibit higher emotional healing were perceived to implement more anti-social BATs. Also, instructors who were perceived to have higher levels of altruistic calling were less likely to engage in anti-social BATs. Additionally, male participants were significantly more likely to perceive instructors pro-social and anti-social BATS. Furthermore, participants perceived part-time faculty, teaching assistants, and other to engage in higher levels of anti-social BATs than full-time faculty. In exploring the possibilities of interpretation, I move to a discussion on the SLQ-factor of persuasive mapping.

6.1.1 Persuasive Mapping

Wheeler (2002) characterized persuasive mapping as a leader's ability to see and direct individuals toward the overall goal of the organization. An individual who is utilizing persuasive mapping possesses an ability to foresee potential consequences and benefits of courses of action and the impact for the organization. Scholars (Searle & Barbuto, 2001) stipulated that servant-leaders who engage in persuasive mapping "persuasively presented models to be more productive than authority on positive outcomes" (p. 281) meaning that a servant-leaders who communicate an overall vision as opposed to implementing consequences are a positive approach to power and compliance-gaining. When engaging in persuasive mapping, a servant-leader will use more positive messages to push followers toward the organizational goals and priorities while also granting them the articulation to achieve those goals. Instructors fostering persuasive mapping may implement pro-social compliance-gaining messages that may consist of statements such as "You will enjoy it," " Others will respect you if you do," and others. The messages that instructors utilize to maintain power in the classroom while exhibiting a factor of persuasive mapping may attempt to place their reasoning or justification in a larger context in order to achieve a classroom objective or request. In structuring their compliance-gaining strategies in a lager contexts, the instructor is engaging in persuasive mapping in the sense that they have the foresight needed to direct their students to a common goal for their own good. The second significant finding concerns emotional healing.

6.1.2 Emotional Healing

The relationship between the SLQ-items concerning emotional healing and anti-social BATs was the most contrary to my hypothesis. I found that instructors who are perceived as emotional healers utilize more anti-social BATs. Wheeler (2012) characterized emotional

healing as a leader's ability to assess the present situation while simultaneously addressing the differences between individuals and the organization. Emotional healing can apply directly to instructors' power in the classroom in the sense that instructors serve students by listening empathetically and expressing sensitivity toward their students. Similarly, Beck (2014) argued that servant-leaders who score high on emotional healing place a high priority on the concerns and the holistic development of others. Instructors who are perceived as emotional healers possess the ability to assess the needs of an individual and help to guide students to reach their highest potential. In regard to power, instructors who exhibit high emotional healing utilize higher anti-social BATs as they may construct their compliance-gaining messages as "it is for your own good," "you will be unhappy if you don't," "You will be hurt if you don't," and others (Kearney et al, 1985). Emotional healing as a construct concerns how instructors might see the needs of their students and make the appropriate decisions to lead them in the right direction. I speculate that instructors with high levels of emotional healing may engage in anti-social BATs in an effort to assist students in accomplishing their primary goals. The next significant finding that warrants consideration is altruistic calling.

6.1.3 Altruistic Calling

Altruistic calling consists of a fundamental conscious choice to serve others (Greenleaf, 1977/2002). Wheeler (2012) explained that individuals engaged in altruistic calling function under a mindset of placing others needs above their own. Individuals with altruistic calling are likely to structure their compliance-gaining strategies for the good of students in the sense that instructors seek to place the students' needs as the first priority. I argue that instructors who are perceived as more altruistic are likely to relinquish power to their students. Bain (2004) explained that a student-centered approach will challenge faculty to place the students' needs at

50

the forefront. Furthermore, Freire (1970/2000), hooks (2010), and Fassett and Warren (2007) all maintain that empowerment of students requires instructors to engage in genuine dialogue with their students. In order to truly place the needs of our students above our own and engage in this dialogue, instructors may at times need to relinquish control of the classroom environment and thus are less likely to engage in compliance-gaining strategies that may be harmful to students.

Van Dierendonck (2011) suggested that a servant-leader who fosters a sense of altruism allows members of an organization to feel as though they are a part of something bigger, and might instill a sense of identification with the overall community. In the classroom, instructors who function under altruistic calling may structure their compliance-gaining messages in such a way so to promote a greater sense of community with those who in the classroom. Instructors who are perceived to be more altruistic are less likely to be perceived to engage in anti-social BATs. Instructors with altruistic calling are likely to avoid anti-social BATs to maintain a supportive student-centered environment (Bain, 2004). They are unlikely to use anti-social BATs such as those identified by Kearney et al. (1985) as "If you don't others will be hurt," "Others will be harmed," "You will be punished if you don't," and others. In an effort to maintain power in the classroom, instructors who embody altruistic calling may avoid message constructions which would be perceived to hurt the community environment they have worked to foster.

While my hypothesis was only partially supported, this study serves as a starting point to understand how faculty use servant leadership in public higher education. The findings that persuasive mapping and altruistic calling work, albeit differently than expected, to foster a servant leadership approach to power in the classroom provide a foundation to build further research on how power is negotiated in the classroom and the servant leadership theoretical framework. Future research should specifically interrogate the individual SLQ factors to

51

highlight how instructors utilize them in their approach to power and development of a student-driven classroom environment. Future research should also field test a training module for instructors, which incorporates a servant leadership approach to power negotiation. The development and implementation of such as robust training could provide a template for teacher training beyond our discipline.

6.1.4 Gender

Gender of the participant was a significant predictor of the instructors' perceived use of both pro-social and anti-social BATs. Male participants perceived higher levels of compliance-gaining strategies overall than female participants. None of the previous studies from the power in the classroom series or subsequent literature on BATs attempted to account for the gender of the participant and thus, our findings point to several areas of future development in compliance-gaining research in the classroom. Chory and Goodboy (2010) maintained that "moderating and mediating variables should be investigated" (p. 195). Our findings demonstrate the further need to account for variables such as gender of participant to ensure that moderating variables are accounted for. Future research should clarify why male participants perceive power use overall in higher levels than female participants. Given that my study is limited to self-report data, the conclusion I can draw are limited. Experimental research which accounts for the gender of participant and gender of instructor in the design would be able to further clarify the predictive relationship between compliance-gaining strategies, servant leadership, and gender differences.

6.1.5 Rank of Instructor

Instructors who were part-time, teaching assistants, or other were more likely to engage in anti-social BATs than full-time faculty. Roach (1991a) reported that graduate teaching assistants utilize compliance-gaining BATs more often than full-time faculty. Additionally, he

found that graduate teaching assistants used more anti-social BATs than pro-social BATs. Roach (1991a) argued the graduate teaching assistants lack the legitimate positionality of full-time faculty and thus students may be less likely to comply with instructor requests. In turn, graduate teaching assistants utilize anti-social BATs to address students' lack of compliance. Roach also reported that full-time faculty used BATs differently than graduate teaching assistants. He found that full-time faculty were better able to use BATs to influence students' affective learning than graduate teaching assistants. He called for training graduate teaching assistants to manage BATs to enhance students' affective learning. Thus, a combination of legitimate power from position and experience both play a role in how participants perceived the influence of the rank of the instructor on instructor's compliance-gaining strategies. Future research should explore ways in which faculty trainers can incorporate more pro-social (and less anti-social) compliance-gaining strategies into graduate teaching assistants' professional development and training.

CHAPTER 7

LIMITATIONS

There were limitations to the study. Although I did control for the gender of the participant, I did not control for the gender of the instructor. Knowing the gender of both the participant and the instructor evaluated may have assisted in determining the role gender in perceptions of power use. While Elias and Loomis (2004) noted that an instructor's gender did not significantly predict effective compliance-gaining, my findings that demonstrate a difference in perceptions of compliance- gaining based on the gender of the participant warrants further examination.

Additionally, the particular discipline of instructors might influence their approaches to maintaining power within the classroom. Due to the limitations of regression analysis, I was unable to control for the discipline of the instructor. More advanced multi-variate statistical modeling may be able to address this limitation in further research.

Furthermore, the compliance-gaining scale used in this study was not the most updated version of the scale as offered by Kearney (2004/2009), which could provide a more nuanced depiction of the various updated behavioral alteration techniques. The updated scale includes 22 BATs instead of 18 and reframes some of the labels describing the BAMs to fit updates to compliance-gaining literature. The BAMs I included in this study are found in the most recent measure.

Finally, while the assumptions of multicollinearity were met in order to conduct the regression procedures, the VIF scores are higher than expected and warrant caution in interpretation of the results. In particular persuasive mapping as a sub-scale is problematic in that two of the items in the factor analysis did not load on and the VIF score exceeded 5.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

Power is central to instructors maintaining their role in the classroom as leaders, and a

teachers' power is initiated and sustained through communication. The goal of this project is to

interrogate power in public higher education and examine potential models for training future

faculty to manage their power in the classroom. I argue that faculty trainers have a number of

techniques and pedagogical philosophies from which to structure their approach to situating

power in the classroom including Bain (2004), hooks (2010), and Freire (1970/2000), but

Greenleaf's (1977/2002) paradigm of servant leadership offers a dynamic approach whereby

students and teachers interrogate and negotiate power balances during class time.

In examining Greenleaf's (1977/2002) paradigm of servant leadership and the negotiation

of power between students and teachers in the higher education classroom, I hypothesized that

instructors who foster a mindset of servant leadership in regard to power would utilize more pro-

social compliance-gaining techniques in order to maintain their power. After examining the

results, I found that my hypothesis is partially supported, in that instructors who seem to foster a

servant leadership approach maintain power through both pro and anti-social behavior alteration

techniques. The significant factor that predicted pro-social BATs was persuasive mapping;

however, participants perceived instructors fostering emotional healing to utilize more anti-social

BATs and perceived instructors with altruistic calling to utilize less anti-social BATs. Thus,

faculty trainers should be aware of the potential for anti-social message construction when

attempting to foster emotional healing.

In applying Greenleaf's (1977/2002) paradigm of servant leadership as a theoretical

framework for training future faculty members, pedagogical scholars can further examine how

power is a communicative construct in which instructors and students approach and interrogate power from the standpoint of service first. Greenleaf's paradigm can serve as a framing for faculty trainers in that the framework allows instructors to seek out their students' needs and tailor the compliance-gaining messages to best fit the needs of the learning environment, while still remaining as an authority figure.

APPENDIX A

SERVANT LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE

1. This person puts my best interests ahead of his/her own.

2. The person does everything he/she can do to serve me.

3. This person is one I would turn to if I had a bad personal trauma.

4. This person seems alert to what's happening.

5. This person offers compelling reasons to get me to do things.

6. This person encourages me to dream "big dreams" about the organization.

7. This person is good at anticipating the consequences of decisions.

8. This person is good at helping me with my emotional issues.

9. This person has a great awareness of what is going on.

10. This person is very persuasive.

11. This person believes that the organization needs to play a moral role in society.

12. This person is talented at helping me to heal emotionally.

13. This person is in touch with what's happening.

14. This person is good at convincing me to do things.

15. This person believes that our organization needs to function as a community.

16. This person sacrifices his/her own needs to meet my needs.

17. This person is one that could help me mend my hard feelings.

18. This person is gifted when it comes to persuading me.

19. This person sees the organization for its potential to contribute to society.

20. This person encourages me to have a community spirit in the workplace.

21. This person goes beyond the call of duty to meet my needs.

22. This person seems to know what is going to happen.

23. This person is preparing the organization to make a positive difference in the future.

APPENDIX B

BEHAVIORAL ALTERATION TECHNIQUES

1. You will enjoy it. You will get a reward if you do. It will make you happy. It will help you. You will benefit if you do.

2. Others will think highly of you if you do. Others will like you if you do. Others will respect you if you do.

3. I will punish you if you don't. I will make it miserable for you if you don't. I will continue doing bad things to you if you don't.

4. This is the way I always do it. People who are like me do it. People you respect do it.

5. Do it. I'm just telling you what I was told. It is a rule, I have to do it and so do you. I don't know why, you just have to do it.

6. If you don't, others will be hurt. If you don't others will be unhappy. Others will be harmed if you don't.

7. I will give you a reward if you do. I will make it beneficial to you if you do. I will continue to reward you if you do.

8. Everyone else does it. We voted, and the majority rules. Society expects you to do it. All of your friends are doing.

9. It is your responsibility. It is your obligation. It is your turn. There is no one else that can do it.

10. From my experience, it is a good idea. From what I have learned, it is what you should do. This has worked for me, it should work for you too.

11. You will lose if you don't. You will be punished if you don't. You will be unhappy if you don't. You will be hurt if you don't.

12. You will feel good about yourself if you do. You are the best person to do it. You are good at it.

13. You owe me one. It's your turn. You promised to do it. I did it the last time.

14. I will dislike you if you don't. I will think less of you if you don't.

15. If you do this, it will help others. Others will benefit if you do. It will make others happy if you do.

16. I will like you better if you do. I will respect you if you do. I will think more highly of you if you do. I will appreciate you more if you do.

17. Your group needs it done. Your group depends on you. Your group will be hurt if you don't.

18. Because I told you to. Just do it. You have to do it, it's required. You don't have a choice.

REFERENCES

Andrews, K. R., Carpenter, C. J., Shaw, A. S., & Boster, F. J. (2008). The legitimization of

    paltry favors effect: A review and meta-analysis. *Communication Reports*, *21*(2), 59-69.

    doi:10.1080/08934210802305028

Bain, K. (2004). *What the best college teachers do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.

Barbuto, J. E., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of

    servant leadership. *Group and Organizational Management*, 31(3), 300-326.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1059601106287091

Black, G. L. (2010). Correlational analysis of servant leadership and school climate. *Catholic

    Education: A Journal of Inquiry and Practice*, *13*(4), 437-466.

Boster, F. J. (1995/1998). Commentary on compliance-gaining message behavior research. In C.

    R. Berger & M. Burgoon (Eds.), *Communication and social processes*. (pp. 91-113). East

    Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press.

Boster, F. J., Levine, T., & Kazoleas, D. (1993). The impact of argumentativeness and verbal

    aggressiveness on strategic diversity and persistence in compliance-gaining behavior.

    Communication Quarterly, *41*(4), 405-414. doi:10.1080/01463379309369901

Bouge, G. E. (2006). A breakpoint moment: Leadership visions and values for trustees of

    collegiate mission. *Innovative Higher Education*, *30*(5), 309-326.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10755-005-9002-4

Bowman, R. F. (2005). Teacher as servant leader. *Clearing House*, *78*(6), 257-259.

    http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/TCHS.78.6.257-260

Burch, M. J., Swails, P., & Mills, R. (2015). Perceptions of administrators' servant leadership

    qualities at a Christian university: A descriptive study. *Education*, *135*(4), 399-404.

Carter, S. L., & Punyanunt-Carter, N. M. (2006). Acceptability of treatments for cheating in the
college classroom. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, *33*(3), 212-216.

Chory, R. M. & Goodboy, A. K. (2010). Power, compliance, and resistance in the classroom. In
D. L. Fassett & J. T. Warren (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Communication and
Instruction*. (pp. 181-199). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Claus, C. J., Chory, R. M., & Malachowski, C. C. (2012). Student anti-social compliance-gaining
as a function of instructor aggressive communication and classroom
justice. *Communication Education*, *61*(1), 17-43. doi:10.1080/03634523.2011.619270

Cooper, P. J. & Simonds, C. J. (2002). *Communication for the classroom teacher* (7th ed.).
Boston, MA: Pearson.

Crippen, C. (2005). Servant-leadership as an effective model for educational leadership and
management: First to serve, then to lead. *Management in Education, 18*(5), 11-16.

Ekinci, A. A. (2015). Development of the school principals' servant leadership behaviors scale
and evaluation of servant leadership behaviors according to teachers' views. *Education &
Science / Egitim Ve Bilim*, *40*(179), 241-260. doi:10.15390/EB.2015.2152

Fassett, D. L., & Warren, J. T. (2007). Critical communication pedagogy. Thousand Oaks, CA:
Sage.

Fink, E. L., Cai, D. A., Kaplowitz, S. A., Sungeun, C., Van Dyke, M. A., & Jeong-Nam Kim, M.
A. (2003). The semantics of social influence: Threats vs. persuasion. *Communication
Monographs*, *70*(4), 295-316. doi:10.1080/0363775032000179115

Fitch, K. L. (1994). A cross-cultural study of directive sequences and some implications for
compliance-gaining research. *Communication Monographs*, *61*(3), 185-209.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637759409376333

Fitzgerald, R. J. (2015). Becoming leo: Servant leadership as a pedagogical philosophy. *Critical Questions in Education*, *6*(2), 75-85.

Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Anniversary Edition). New York: Continuum.

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

Garko, M. G. (1990). Perspectives on and conceptualizations of compliance and compliance-gaining. *Communication Quarterly*, *38*(2), 138-157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463379009369750

Glass, M. (2013). Teaching strategies to get the tone right: Making requests and gaining compliance. *TESL Canada Journal*, *30*(7), 125-134.

Golish, T. D., & Olson, L. N. (2000). Students' use of power in the classroom: An investigation of student power, teacher power, and teacher immediacy. *Communication Quarterly*, *48*(3), 293-310. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463370009385598

Gorham, J. (1990). Individual differences in classroom dynamics. In J. A. Daly, Gustav W. Friedrich, & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Teaching Communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 207-222). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977/2002). Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness (25 Anniversary ed.); Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.

Grothaus, T. (2004). Empowering adolescents as servant-leaders: Promoting resiliency, positive networking, and community stewardship. *Reclaiming Children and Youth: The Journal of Strength-Based Interventions*, *12*(4), 228-231.

Hays, J. M. (2008). Teacher as servant applications of Greenleaf's servant leadership in higher education. *Journal of Global Business Issues, 2*(1), 113.

Hendrix, K. G. (2010). Communication and the preparation of future faculty: Managing the incoherencies. In D. Fassett & J. Warren (Eds.). *Handbook of communication and instruction* (pp.81-106). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Herman, D. V., & Marlowe, M. (2005). Modeling meaning in life: The teacher as servant leader. *Reclaiming Child Youth*, *14*(3), 175-178

Hine, G. (2014). Student leadership development: A functional framework. *Journal of Catholic Education*, *18*(1), 79-110. doi:10.15365/joce.1801052014

Hofmeyer, A., Stiengold, B. H., Klopper, H. C. & Warland, J. (2015). Leadership in learning and teaching in higher education: Perspectives of academics in non-formal leadership roles. *Contemporary Issues in Education Research*, 8(3), 181-192.

hooks, b. (2010). *Teaching critical thinking: Practical wisdom.* New York: Taylor & Francis.

Johnson, A. C., & Vishwanath, K. R. (2011). Servant professorship and its implications. *International Journal of Education Research*, *6*(1), 135-146.

Kearney, P. (2004/2009). Behavior alteration techniques. In R. B. Rubin, P. Palmgreen, & H. E. Sypher (Eds.), *Communication research measure: A sourcebook* (pp. 103-108). New York, NY: Routledge.

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

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. *Communication Education*, *32*, 19-28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634528509378579

Kohle P. W. K., Smith, C. K., & Dochney, B. J. (2012). Advising as servant leadership: Investigating the relationship. *NACADA Journal*, *32*(1), 53-62. http://dx.doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-32.1.53

Lamude, K. G., & Lichtenstein, A. (1985). The effects of motivational needs and rights situational dimension on compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Research Reports*, *2*(1), 164-171.

Letizia, A. A. (2014). Radical servant leadership: A new practice of public education leadership in the post-industrial Age. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies* (JCEPS), *12*(2), 175-199.

Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*(2), 161-177. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006

McClellan, J. M. (2007). The advisor as servant: The theoretical and philosophical relevance of servant leadership to academic advising. *NACADA Journal*, *27*(2), 41-49. http://dx.doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-27.2.41

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1983). Power in the classroom I: Teacher and student perceptions. *Communication Education*, *32*, 175-184. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634528309378527

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P., Plax, T. G., & Kearney P. (1985). Power in the classroom V: Behavior alteration techniques, communication training and learning. *Communication Education*, *34*, 214-226. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634528509378609

McKeachie, W. J., & Svinicki, M. (2012). *McKeachie's teaching tips.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McKinney, L. J., (2004). Evangelical theological higher education: Past commitments, present realities, and future considerations. *Christian Higher Education*, *3*(2), 147-169. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15363750490429426

Min, L., Sellnow, D. D., & Venette, S. (2006). Integrating nonnatives as teachers: Patterns and perceptions of compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Education*, *55*(2), 208-217. doi:10.1080/03634520600566207

Mittal, R., & Dorfman, P. W. (2012). Servant leadership across cultures. *Journal of World Business*, 47(4), 555. doi:10.1016/j.jwb.2012.01.009

Page, O. S. (2003). Promoting diversity in academic leadership. *New Directions for Higher Education*, *124*, 79-86. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/he.132

Panaccio, A., Henderson, D. J., Liden, R. C., Wayne, S. J., & Cao, X. (2015). Toward an understanding of when and why servant leadership accounts for employee extra-role behaviors. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 30*(4), 657-675. doi:10.1007/s10869-014-9388-z

Paulsel, M. L. (2004). Using behavior alteration techniques to manage student behavior. *Communication Teacher*, *18*(2), 44-48. doi: 10.1080/17404620420000191900

Plax, T. G. & Kearney, P. (1990). Classroom management: Structuring the classroom for work. In J. A. Daly, Gustav W. Friedrich, & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Teaching Communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 207-222). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum

Plax, T. G., Kearney, P., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (1986). Power in the classroom
VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy, and affective learning.
Communication Education, *35*, 43-55. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634528609388318

Punyanunt, N. M. (2000). The effects of humor on perceptions of compliance-gaining in the
college classroom. *Communication Research Reports*, *17*(1), 30-38.
doi:10.1080/08824090009388748

Pytlak, M. A., & Houser, M. L. (2014). Because I'm the teacher and I said so: GTA use of
behavior alteration techniques to establish power and credibility in the college classroom.
Western Journal of Communication, *78*(3), 287-309. doi:10.1080/10570314.2014.893010

Quinlan, K. M. (2014). Leadership of teaching for student learning in higher education: What is
needed?. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 33(1), 32-45.
doi:10.1080/07294360.2013.86409

Remland, M. S., & Jones, T. S. (1994). The influence of vocal intensity and touch on compliance
gaining. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *134*(1), 89-97.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1994.9710887

Richmond, V. P. (1990). Communication in the classroom: Power and motivation.
Communication Education, *39*, 181-195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634529009378801

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). Power in the classroom II: Power and learning.
Communication Education, 33, 125-136. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634528409384729

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C., Kearney, P., & Plax, T. G. (1987). Power in the
classroom: Linking behavior alteration techniques to cognitive learning. *Communication
Education*, *36*, 1-12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03634528709378636

Roach, K. D. (1991a). Graduate Teaching Assistants' Use of Behavior Alteration Techniques in the University Classroom. *Communication Quarterly*, *39*(2), 178-188. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463379109369795

Roach, K. D. (1991b). Principals' use of power, behavior alteration strategies and affinity-seeking strategies: Effects on teacher job satisfaction. *World Communication*, *20*(1), 23-38.

Roach, K. D. (1991c). University department chairs' use of compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Quarterly*, *39*(1), 75-90. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463379109369784

Roach, K. D. (2002) Theory into practice: Training graduate teaching assistants to communicate more effectively in the classroom. In J. L. Chesebro & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), *Communication for teachers* (pp. 207-222). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Russell, E. (2013). Servant leadership through distance learning: A case study. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education (TOJDE)*, *14*(4), 26-45.

Salkind, N. J. (2008). Predicting who'll win the superbowl: Using linear regression. In *Statistics for people who think they hate statistics*. (3rd ed.). (pp. 245-261). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Satyaputra, A. G. (2013). Servant leadership for higher education. *Christian Education Journal*, *10*(2), 483-486.

Sergiovanni, T. (1996). *Leadership for the schoolhouse*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Shaw, J., & Newton, J. (2014). Teacher retention and satisfaction with servant leader as principal. *Education*, *135*(1), 101-106.

Sims, C. (2002). Sergiovanni, synodical schools, and servant leadership. *Lutheran Education*, *138*(2), 95-99.

Sorensen, G., Plax, T. G., & Kearney, P. (1989). The strategy selection construction controversy: A coding scheme for analyzing teacher compliance-gaining message constructions. *Communication Education*, *38*(2), 102. doi:10.1080/03634528909378744

Spears, L. C. (2004). The understanding and practice of servant-leadership. In L. C. Spears & M. Lawrence (Eds.), Practicing servant leadership: *Succeeding through trust, bravery, and forgiveness* (pp. 9–24). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Striepe, M. M., & O' Donoghue, T. (2014). Servant leadership in a catholic school: A study in the western Australian context. *Education Research & Perspectives*, *41*(1), 130-153.

Stueber, R. (2000). Leadership perspectives: making a difference with servant leadership. *Lutheran Education*, *136*(1), 49-55.

Sylvia Xiaohua, C., Hui, N. H., Bond, M. H., Sit, A. F., Sowan, W., Chow, V. Y., & ... Law, R. M. (2006). Reexamining personal, social, and cultural influences on compliance behavior in the United States, Poland, and Hong Kong. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *146*(2), 223-244. http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.146.2.223-244

Tate, T. F. (2003). Servant leadership for schools and youth programs. *Reclaiming Children and Youth: The Journal of Strength-Based Interventions*, *12*(1), 33-39.

Thompson, A. (2014). Fostering growth and development of recovering students in higher education through servant leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education, 89(2),* 244-257. doi:10.1080/0161956X.2014.897101

Thompson, J. J., & Gilchrist, E. E. (2011). The Academic Advisor's Playbook: Seeking Compliance from College Student-Athletes. *NACADA Journal*, *31*(1), 29-41. http://dx.doi.org/10.12930/0271-9517-31.1.29

Van Winkle, B., Allen, S., DeVore, D., & Winston, B. (2014). The relationship between the

    servant leadership behaviors of immediate supervisors and followers' perceptions of

    being empowered in the context of small business. *Journal of Leadership*

    Education, 13(3), 70-82. doi:10.12806/V13/I3/RF5

Waite, J. (2011). Research administrators as servant leaders. *Journal of Research Administration*,

    42(2), 64-77.

Wenig, R. E. (2004). Leadership knowledge and skill: An enabler for success as a technology

    education teacher-leader. *Journal of Technology Studies*, *30*(1), 59-64.

Wheeler, D. (2012). Servant leadership for higher education: Principles and practice. San

    Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wong, P. T. P., & Page, D. (2003, October). *Servant leadership: An opponent-process model*

    and the revised servant leadership profile. Paper presented at the Servant Leadership

    Roundtable at Regent University, Virginia Beach, VA.