Transformational Leadership in the Ghanaian University Classroom

Rita Daniels & Alan K. Goodboy
West Virginia University, USA

Abstract: Effective teachers exhibit a variety of behaviors in the classroom that have positive impact on student learning. Teachers play different roles in the classroom, but the focus of this study is on their role as transformational leaders. Bolkan and Goodboy (2009) have revealed that transformational leadership (Bass, 1985) is an important predictor of student learning in the U.S. college classroom. This study extended the research on transformational leadership to the Ghanaian university classroom by assessing the relationship between teacher behaviors that reflect transformational leadership (i.e., teacher accessibility, immediacy, teacher confirmation, and student intellectual stimulation) and student learning outcomes (i.e., cognitive learning and affective learning). Results indicated that teachers' transformational leadership behaviors are related positively to students' perceived affective learning and cognitive learning, but differed in magnitude as predictors, explaining between 14-18% of the variance in Ghanaian students' learning outcomes .

Keywords: Ghana, university students, transformational leadership, learning outcomes

1. Introduction

Teachers play important roles in the classroom and a variety of their behaviors have been identified as effective teaching behaviors that promote student learning in the classroom (Frisby & Martin, 2010), especially from Eastern and Western cultural perspectives (e.g., Zhang & Zhang, 2005; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011). Ellis (2004) argued that the primary goal of a teacher is to foster learning; researchers should therefore identify behaviors that teachers enact in the classroom to achieve that primary goal. However, Southern cultures have received little to no attention with regard to teacher behaviors that foster learning at the higher education level.

One of the roles teachers play in the classroom is the role of a transformational leader (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009, 2010, 2011; Bolkan, Goodboy & Griffin, 2011; Pounder, 2006, 2008a, 2008b; Walumbwa, Wu & Ojode, 2004) which involves a variety of teacher behaviors (i.e., immediacy, teacher confirmation, individualized consideration, teacher accessibility, and student intellectual stimulation). This study furthers research on the effect of teachers' transformational leadership behaviors on students in the Ghanaian university classroom[1], to foster students' learning within a Southern cultural setting.

[1] The term *university* in Ghana is equivalent to *college* in U.S. but not vice versa

2. Literature Review

2.1. Transformational Leadership

Transformational leadership, first conceptualized by Burns (1978), is a major concept in the management literature. Parry (2000) showed that there is a positive association between this style of leadership and desirable leadership outcomes in organizations. Northouse (2010) described a transformational leader as one who motivates followers to do more than they originally expected to do. Bass (1985) identified three leadership qualities as the framework to describe transformational leadership. These qualities are charisma, individualized consideration and intellectual stimulation.

According to Bass, charisma refers to leaders' ability to use their insights on the needs and values of their followers to motivate and inspire their followers. Leaders who possess individualized consideration are supportive and considerate of their followers while those with intellectual stimulation encourage creative and new approaches to problem solving. Pounder (2008c) further linked the idea of transformational leadership as described in the organizational context to the instructional setting to assess students' perceptions of classroom dynamics in terms of perceived instructor effectiveness, motivation to expend efforts, and satisfaction.

Instructional communication scholars (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011; Bolkan, Goodboy & Griffin, 2011) opined that leadership models in the organizational setting can be applied to the instructional setting where the teacher plays the leadership role. As Bolkan et al. (2011) asserted, "teachers, much like organizational leaders, can transform the nature of the classroom" (p. 338). Therefore, by "viewing the teacher as the superior and students as subordinates… [the teacher] should operate in the classroom in much the same way as they do in the workplace" (Chory & McCroskey, 1999, p.2).

There is a plethora of research that has examined the applicability of the concept of transformational leadership in the instructional setting (Pounder, 2003) but from a Western cultural perspective. According to Gudykunst (2000), cross-cultural research has predominantly involved Eastern and Western cultures. Scholars have also provided an explanation and description of the behaviors that teachers rely on to communicate transformational leadership in the U.S. college classroom (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011). However, in order to extend the generalizability of study findings across cultures, McCroskey and McCroskey (2006) suggested that there is a need for three types of culture-centered research in instructional communication: (a) mainstream U.S. instructors teaching non mainstream students, (b) international instructors teaching predominantly mainstream U.S. students, and (c) monocultural studies conducted outside the U.S. in which both instructors and students represent a culture other than the mainstream U.S. culture.

The research and thinking on the third type of culture-centered research in instructional communication provides the rationale for extending the research on transformational leadership to the Ghanaian cultural setting. Communication style preferences and underlying psychological processes are very much influenced by cultural values and patterns (Gudykunst, Lee, Nishida & Ogawa, 2005). It is therefore possible that research findings will vary from culture to culture; thus, making it imperative on instructional communication scholars to also

examine instructional communication based on the assumptions of entirely different cultures other than the mainstream U.S. culture.

Given the fact that the U.S. college classrooms have internationalized with respect to students and instructors (Zhang & Zhang, 2005), the monocultural dominance in instructional communication has to be complemented with cultural global perspectives. With the advent of study-abroad programs, educational exchange programs, and the presence of international students and teachers in the university classrooms, cross-cultural experiences could be encountered anywhere and not necessarily in the U.S. college classroom. Cultural perspectives of instructional communication could therefore contribute to the understanding of a communication phenomenon and facilitate internationally joint endeavors for the desired student learning outcomes as suggested by Zhang and Zhang (2005).

3. Teachers as Transformational Leaders in the Ghanaian Cultural Context

The educational system in Ghana has undergone significant and ambitious reform processes (Osei, 2006). It is however important to note that the system of education in Ghana has since independence in 1957 been tailored towards the nationalist objective in creating a pan-Ghanaian identity, having inherited a British colonial model of education. In Ghana, the public school system is categorized into: (a) six years of compulsory primary education, (b) two levels of secondary education - three years each and, (c) one to four years of tertiary education (maximum of five years).

The work of teachers in Ghana is centrally controlled by the national core curriculum in all ten regions of the country. Therefore, the quality of teachers and their enthusiasm in the classroom is very vital in creating that pan-Ghanaian identity for students. According to Osei (2006), Ghanaian teachers are beginning to adopt an approach to education that is generally individualist and child-centered with emphasis on enquiry–learning and discovery–methods. Additionally, teachers "operate as agents of change, providing informed intellectual input not only to pupils, but to their families and communities." (p. 41). Teachers are therefore proactive educational leaders.

According to Hofstede's (2001) dimensions of cultural variability, Ghana represents a collectivistic, high power distance African culture which could be typical of the South. As a result, Ghanaians are more likely to be implicit, indirect and face-saving in communication to maintain group harmony. According to Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey (1988), members of collectivist cultures tend to use high-context messages. In a high power distance culture, the people accept the hierarchical order in society which is inherent of inequality. Viewing Ghana from the lens of Hofstede's dimensions of cultural variability, teachers would be perceived as the authority and sole transmitter of knowledge and this is likely to translate into students and teachers communicating relatively little in-class and perhaps out of class interaction, and respect towards the teacher will be interpreted as students' reticence. According to Nadler and Nadler (2001), out-of-class communication refers to interactions such as advising, discussions about non-class related issues and discussions about class content, that take place between students and teachers, outside the formal classroom. These interactions may be initiated by the teacher or the student.

4. Behavioral Indicators of Transformational Leadership in the Classroom

Bolkan and Goodboy (2011) conducted a study to identify the teacher communication behaviors that students believe most accurately reflect the dimensions of transformational leadership (i.e., charisma, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation) in the U.S. classroom. Results of their study indicated that charismatic teachers are confirming, enthusiastic, humorous, caring, available, and treat students as equals. Charismatic teachers also show attitudinal similarity to students, relate content to students' lives, tell personal stories that are content relevant, and they are verbally immediate.

Students reported eight behaviors to show that a teacher has individualized consideration. These behaviors are: showing verbal immediacy, giving individual feedback, being available, personalizing content, conveying interest, remembering student history, giving special considerations, and promoting participation (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011).

According to Bolkan and Goodboy (2011), students identified teachers with the quality of intellectual stimulation as those who approach teaching with an interactive style, encourage students to think independently, challenge students, promote participation in classroom, use humor, and make content relevant to students' lives.

Previous research on effective teaching has identified many of the behavioral indicators of transformational leadership as effective teacher behaviors. For example, Waldeck (2007) and Ellis (2000) discussed the relevance of teacher accessibility and confirmation respectively, to effective teaching. However, Bolkan and Goodboy (2011) argued that there are some behaviors of transformational leadership such as remembering student history and providing individual feedback that have received less attention from instructional communication scholars. Additionally, though many of the behaviors reported on each of the dimensions of transformational leadership overlap, as Bolkan and Goodboy asserted, "what each of the behaviors have in common is their ability to foster a positive and trusting relationship between instructors and students" (p. 16).

Bolkan and Goodboy (2009), and Pounder (2008a) reported that transformational leadership behaviors have a positive impact on students' perceived learning. However, considering that majority of the research have been conducted in the mainstream U.S. culture, it is important to assess the contribution of each dimension of transformational leadership to student learning outcomes, in a different culture. Therefore, as suggested by Bolkan and Goodboy (2010), the parsimonious cluster of behaviors that demonstrate transformational leadership in the classroom: immediacy and teacher confirmation (charisma), student intellectual stimulation (intellectual stimulation), and teacher accessibility (individualized consideration) were examined in this study.

4.1. Immediacy and Teacher Confirmation (Charisma)

Immediacy and confirmation behaviors translate into the charismatic leadership quality where leaders motivate their followers through inspirational leadership (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011). As reported by Bolkan and Goodboy students perceived charismatic teachers as confirming, and immediate.

According to Mehrabian (1969), immediacy refers to the use of communication behaviors

to reduce psychological and/or physical distance and foster closeness between communicators. People are drawn towards persons they like and evaluate highly; and they avoid those they dislike and do not evaluate highly. Behaviors such as eye contact, smiling, vocal expressiveness, and gesturing communicate nonverbal immediacy (Gorham, 1988) while verbal immediacy is communicated via the use of words and language (Andersen). Witt, Wheeless and Allen (2004) noted that nonverbal immediacy has proven to be more important to student learning. Titsworth, McKenna, Mazer, and Quinlan (2013) also noted that teachers' enactment of nonverbal immediacy contribute to students' positive emotional experiences. It is important to however note that a weaker correlation has been reported between teacher immediacy and student learning in Asian cultures than in the U.S. (Myers, Zhong, & Guan, 1998). This finding suggests that immediacy is not pan-cultural effective teaching behavior.

Teacher confirmation is the process through which teachers recognize and acknowledge students as valuable and significant individuals (Ellis, 2000). According to Buber (1957), the human identity is discovered and established through confirmation. Additionally, confirmation is an interactional phenomenon which could serve as an acknowledgement of the relationship or affiliation between people and an endorsement of an individual's self-experience (Cissna & Sieburg, 2006). However, confirmation varies in intensity and extensity, quality and quantity (Laing, 1961).

Also, confirmation messages can be categorized into three groups: recognition, acknowledgement and endorsement (Sieburg, 1985). Individuals are recognized through the communication of immediacy behaviors such as smiling, touching, eye contact, and conversational opportunities to respond. By communicating in a relevant and direct manner, individuals are acknowledged. Any response that communicates a true and accurate acceptance of the individual's feelings serves as an endorsement of the individual.

4.2. Student Intellectual Stimulation (Intellectual Stimulation)

The ability to stimulate an individual's thought and imagination, problem solving, and problem awareness is referred to as intellectual stimulation (Bass, 1985). Considering the fact that teachers' primary role in the classroom is to facilitate problem solving and promote learning, a teacher's ability to intellectually stimulate a student is as a result of the teacher's technical expertise and intellectual power. Teachers, like organizational leaders, stimulate students to expend more effort in solving problems and taking new approaches.

According to Bolkan and Goodboy (2011), students reported that teachers use interactive teaching style (e.g., using unique activities to get the class involved with the course material), challenge students (e.g., making students work hard to ensure that they really know the material well), and encourage independent thought (e.g., helping students to think deeply about concepts taught in class) as a way of communicating the quality of student intellectual stimulation.

4.3. Teacher Accessibility (Individualized Consideration)

Transformational leaders work with their followers on individual basis to meet the developmental needs of their followers (Bass, 1985). In the same vein, teachers communicate individualized

consideration by providing students with idiosyncratic feedback, and being available to students (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011).

Waldeck (2007) used the concept of teacher accessibility as a factor structure underlining personalized education. Keefe and Jenkins (2000) suggested that some of the elements of personalized education are (a) an interactive teaching environment, (b) flexible scheduling and assignments, (c) evolving, deepening relationship between student and teacher, and (d) diagnosis of student learning characteristics. Students described teacher accessibility as a condition for which the teacher is available to provide extra help for students, and advise students about their future plans, goals, non-professional issues, and personal issues bothering them.

5. Student Learning Outcomes in the Transformed Instructional Setting

Instructional communication scholars have examined a wide variety of teacher variables such as immediacy (Andersen, 1979) and teacher clarity (Zhang & Zhang, 2005) as important components of student learning. In the current study, Bass's (1985) conceptualization of transformational leadership (i.e., charisma, individualized consideration, and intellectual stimulation) was used in creating a cluster of behaviors that demonstrate transformational leadership in the classroom.

Over the last two decades, an important outcome variable for instructional communication research has been affective learning (Richmond & Gorham, 1996). According to Krathwohl, Bloom, and Masia (1964), affective learning refers to the "objectives which emphasize a feeling or tone, an emotion or degree of acceptance or rejection" (p.7). McCroskey (1992) added that affective learning refers to students' attitudes, values, and beliefs as a result of the students' acquisition of knowledge and psychomotor skills from the instructional setting. However, it is suggested that teachers use affective learning and cognitive learning goals interchangeably because cognitive learning has affective learning component (Krathwohl et al, 1964).

Christophel (1990) and Frymier (1994) provided evidence to show that students' positive affect toward the subject matter and/or school serves as a motivation for students' self-directed learning as well as their higher levels of cognitive learning. Kearney and Beatty (1994) also argued that "no completely valid measure of measuring cognitive learning exists" (p. 8). Cognitive learning includes the ability to retain information and to synthesize complex material (Bloom, Hastings & Madaus, 1971). Affective and cognitive learning are both desired learning outcomes of any student's educational experience and they are variables that are directly influenced by instructor communication. From a review of previous research (e.g., Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009) on the relationship between affective and cognitive learning, both variables were used as an assessment of student learning outcomes and were found to be positively related to transformational leadership. Hence the following hypotheses were offered:

H1: Student perceptions of their teachers' transformational leadership behaviors in Ghana (charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) will be related positively with affective learning.

H2: Student perceptions of their teachers' transformational leadership behaviors in

Ghana (charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration) will be related positively with cognitive learning.

6. Method

6.1. Participants

Participants of the study were 190 undergraduate students (60 females, 122 males, and 8 participants did not report on their sex) sampled from one faculty of a public university in Ghana. The ages of the participants ranged from 18 to 45 years ($M = 29.04$, $SD = 5.30$). The class size students reported on were mostly of 31-100 students (51.3%), followed by a class of 101-200 students (23.6%), a class of more than 200 students, and 30 students or less, accounting for 13.1% and 7.9% respectively. The remaining 0.5% were unreported. A majority of participants (60.7%) reported on a teacher they had never had previously in a semester-long course while 35.6% reported otherwise, and 2.6% of the participants did not indicate their familiarity with the teacher in a semester-long course. A majority of the teachers that participants reported on were males (52.9%) and 40.8% were females. The sex of only one instructor was unaccounted for. No other demographic data were gathered.

6.2. Procedures

Participants were asked to complete series of instruments in addition to providing demographic data. Plax, Kearney, McCroskey, and Richmond's (1986) methodology was employed in asking participants to evaluate the instructor of the class they attended immediately prior to the class in which they were completing the survey instruments. This anchoring technique maximized the number of teachers evaluated and included teachers who otherwise may not have agreed to participate in such a study. Students who did not have a class on the day of data collection to refer to, referenced the last class they had prior to the class in which they were completing the survey. Having received Institutional Review Board approval from the researchers' university, data were collected during the thirteenth week of the semester of the public university in Ghana.

6.3. Measurement

As suggested by Bolkan and Goodboy (2010), a parsimonious set of measures including Immediacy and Teacher Confirmation (charisma), Student Intellectual Stimulation (intellectual stimulation), and Teacher Accessibility (individualized consideration) were used in measuring teachers' transformational leadership behaviors in the classroom.

Charisma. The Behavioral Indicants of Immediacy (BII) scale (Andersen, 1979) was used to measure teachers' immediacy behaviors. The scale examines perceptions of specific behaviors (e.g., gestures, smiles, and eye contact) operationally defined as immediacy. The scale is 15-item (e.g., my teacher (a) "engages in eye contact with me when teaching more than most other instructors," and (b) "gestures more while teaching than most other teachers"), five-step, Likert-type summative scale generated directly from the behavioral manifestations of

the immediacy construct. It is a widely-used measure on immediacy (Witt, Wheeless & Allen, 2004). Responses on the BII scale ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). With results of high correlations between the reports of students in classes and reports of trained observers, Andersen (1979) confirmed the use of students to report teachers' immediacy behavior as a valid means of data collection. In the current study, the alpha reliability of this scale was $\alpha = .79$ ($M = 58.68$, $SD = 14.26$).

Ellis's (2002) Teacher Confirmation Scale (TCS) was used to measure the extent to which students perceived their teachers exhibit confirming and disconfirming behaviors during the semester. TCS was originally a 27-item Likert scale which measured four dimensions: (a) how teachers respond to questions, (b) teachers' interest in students and their learning, (c) teaching style, and (d) absence of disconfirmation. The fourth dimension was eliminated, leaving 16 items on the scale to improve the overall reliability of the scale, $\alpha = .93$ (Ellis, 2002). The current study therefore utilized the 16-item scale which measures (a) how teachers respond to questions (e.g., "my teacher takes time to answer students' questions fully"), (b) teachers' demonstration of interest in student learning (e.g., "my teacher makes an effort to get to know students"), and (c) teaching style (e.g., "my teacher gives oral and written feedback on students' work"). Responses ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The alpha reliabilities for the total and subscales are as follows: summed scale, $\alpha = .87$ ($M = 60.62$, $SD = 9.94$); how teachers respond to questions, $\alpha = .59$ ($M = 19.20$, $SD = 3.08$); teacher's demonstration of interest in student learning $\alpha = .74$ ($M = 22.83$, $SD = 4.14$); teaching style $\alpha = .78$ ($M = 18.64$, $SD = 4.00$). Previous reliability coefficients reported for the three subscales have ranged from .81 to .87 (Ellis, 2004; Turman & Schodt, 2006). For the summed scale, Campbell, Eichhorn, Basch, and Wolf (2009) recorded .93 for the alpha reliability.

Intellectual Stimulation. Bolkan and Goodboy's (2010) 10-item scale was used in measuring how teachers communicate intellectual stimulation. The scale consists of three constructs which describe three core teacher behaviors: (a) using an interactive teaching style (four items: e.g., "uses unique activities to get the class involved with the course material"), (b) challenging students (three items: e.g., "helps me realize that my hard work is worth it"), and (c) encouraging independent thought (three items: e.g., "wants me to think critically about what we are learning"). Participants were asked to indicate how frequently their teacher performed each of the behaviors using a 5-point scale anchored with 1 (*never*) and 5 (*very often*). The alpha reliabilities for the total and subscales are as follows: summed scale, $\alpha = .79$ ($M = 29.14$, $SD = 5.89$); interactive teaching style, $\alpha = .71$ ($M = 11.54$, $SD = 3.03$); challenging students, $\alpha = .59$ *(*$M = 8.52$, $SD = 2.27$); encouraging independent thought, $\alpha = .64$ *(*$M = 9.08$, $SD = 2.14$). Previous reliabilities for this scale have been .95, .91, .92, and .88, respectively (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2011).

Individualized Consideration. Waldeck's (2007) measure of Teacher Accessibility (TA) is a construct on the Personalized Education Scale. TA consists of 9 items with factor loadings ranging from .63 to .93, and an estimated alpha reliability of .91 ($M = 44$, $SD = 11.7$). Items on the scale measured instructors' efforts to be socially and physically accessible to students in a variety of locations, using varied communication channels, and during office hours as well as the instructors' "private time" to discuss students' professional and personal issues. However, three items on the scale with alpha reliabilities below .70 were dropped for the measure of

teacher accessibility (e.g., this instructor (a) "takes time to give me advice about my future plans and goals," and (b) "has an adequate number of office hours to provide extra help for students"). An abridged version of the scale containing six items was used. The alpha reliability of the abridged version of the scale was .83 (M = 10.62, SD = 5.73).

Learning Outcomes. Participants reported on their perceived learning using two different scales. One was the six subscales from Mottet and Richmond's (1998) Revised Affective Learning Scale, with four items measuring affect for the course and two items measuring affect for the teacher. Each of the subscales used four, 7-point bi-polar adjectives (e.g., bad - good, worthless - valuable, unlikely - likely, positive - negative) to assess learning (e.g., (a) my attitude about the content of the course, (b) my likelihood of actually enrolling in another course of related content if I had the choice and my schedule permits, and (c) my attitude towards the teacher of the course). Previous reliabilities for the teacher affective learning scale and course affective learning scale were .95 and .96 respectively (Wanzer, Frymier, & Irwin, 2010). In the current study, the alpha reliability for teacher affect was .82 (M = 43.87, SD = 9.34) and for course affect α = .77 (M = 39.71, SD = 9.38). The alpha reliability of the summed scale was .85 (M = 83.50, SD = 16.26).

Another scale that was used to measure students' perceived learning is the Cognitive Learning Loss Scale (Richmond, McCroskey, Kearney & Plax, 1987) which contains two items that measure how much students believe they learned in a class, and how much they would have learned with an "ideal" teacher. The scale ranges from 0-9 (0 meaning *nothing* and 9 meaning *more than in any other class*). In the current study, cognitive learning was assessed by relying on the score obtained from the first item, which is deemed a direct indicator of students' perceived cognitive learning (Richmond et al, 1987). The reliability coefficient of the cognitive learning measure could not be computed because the measure is a single item. However, a mean score of 7.09 (SD = 1.73) was obtained for the measure.

6.4. Data Analysis

Data analysis entailed three steps. Prior to tests of the hypotheses, Pearson correlations were computed among all variables. The means, standard deviations, and correlations are reported in Table 1. Affective learning and cognitive learning were computed as dependent variables and the measures of charisma, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration were computed as independent variables in a multiple regression analysis. Pearson product-moment correlation was computed among variables of transformational leadership and affective learning to test H1, and among variables of transformational leadership and cognitive learning to test H2. Multiple regression analyses were performed to examine overall effects of the behavioral indicators of transformational leadership.

Table 1. Correlations Between Variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Transformational leadership												
Charisma												
1. Immediacy	58.68	14.26										
Teacher confirmation												
2. Response to questions	19.20	3.07	.29**									
3. Interest in student learning	22.83	4.14	.25**	.66**								
4. Teaching style	18.64	4.00	.17*	.62**	.74**							
Intellectual stimulation												
5. Interactive teaching style	11.54	3.03	.14	.38**	.50**	.52**						
6. Challenging students	8.52	2.27	.09	.33**	.40**	.42**	.39**					
7. Encouraging independent thought	9.08	2.14	.12	.46**	.46**	.52**	.42**	.51**				
Individualized consideration												
8. Teacher accessibility	10.62	5.73	.29**	.30**	.28**	.31**	.35**	.29**	.19*			
Learning outcomes												
9. Cognitive learning	7.10	1.73	.13	.24**	.32**	.29**	.29**	13	.18*	.29**		
Affective learning												
10. Course affect	39.71	9.38	.08	.32**	.26**	.22**	.13	.10	.16*	.09	.24**	
11. Instructor affect	43.87	9.34	.02	.37**	.38**	.32**	.28**	.12	.27**	.21**	31**	.51**

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

7. Results

The first hypothesis predicted that student perceptions of their teachers' transformational leadership behaviors (*charisma*, operationalized by immediacy and teacher confirmation; *intellectual stimulation*, operationalized by interactive teaching, challenging students, and encouraging independent thought; *individualized consideration*, operationalized as teacher accessibility) will be related positively with affective learning. Results of a Pearson correlation partially support this relationship. Intellectual stimulation (*interactive teaching style* (r = .24, p = .002); *challenging students* (r = .18, p = .024); and *encouraging independent thought* (r = .24, p = .002)) and teacher confirmation (*responding to questions* (r = .40, p < .001); *interest in student learning* (r = .36, p < .001); and *teaching style* (r = .30, p < .001)) were significantly related to affective learning. However, teacher accessibility (r = .12, p = .131) and immediacy (r = .06, p =.424) were not significantly related with affective learning.

A multiple regression analysis was computed using immediacy, teacher confirmation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration as independent variables of transformational leadership, and affective learning as the dependent variable. The equation containing the measures of transformational leadership moderately accounted for 19.4% of the variance in affective learning (F(4,156) = 9.39, p < .001). However, a closer examination of the beta weights revealed that only teacher confirmation (*responding to questions* (β = .30, p = .003); *interest in student learning* (β = .18, p = .117); and *teaching style* (β = -.04, p = .740)) accounted for any unique variance in affective learning (See Table 2).

Table 2. Results of Multiple Regression Analyses for the Dimensions of Transformational Leadership as Predictors of Affective Learning and Cognitive Learning

	Affective Learning					Cognitive Learning				
	B	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*	*B*	*SE*	β	*t*	*p*
Transformational leadership										
Charisma										
Immediacy	-.05	.09	-.05	-.58	.561	.00	.01	.01	16	.874
Teacher confirmation										
Responding to questions	1.59	.54	.30	2.97	.003	.02	.06	.04	.39	.659
Interest in student learning	.71	.45	.18	1.57	.117	.06	.05	.15	1.26	.208
Teaching style	-.15	.46	-.04	-.33	.740	.02	.05	.04	.38	.702
Intellectual stimulation										
Interactive teaching style	.44	.46	.08	.96	.339	.08	.05	.14	1.58	.115
Challenging students	.14	.61	.02	.24	.813	-.05	.07	.06	-.67	.501
Encouraging independent thought	.55	.68	.07	.81	.419	.01	.08	.01	.10	.919
Individualized consideration										
Teacher accessibility	-.15	.23	-.06	-.68	.495	.05	.03	.18	2.19	.030

Hypothesis two predicted that student perceptions of their teachers' transformational leadership behaviors will be related positively with cognitive learning. Results of a Pearson correlation partially support this relationship. Intellectual stimulation (*interactive teaching style* ($r = .29$, $p < .001$); *challenging students* ($r = .13$, $p = .074$); and *encouraging independent thought* ($r = .18$, $p = .025$)), teacher accessibility ($r = .29$, $p < .001$), and teacher confirmation (*responding to questions* ($r = .25$, $p = .001$); *interest in student learning* ($r = .32$, $p < .001$); and *teaching style* ($r = .29$, $p < .001$)) were significantly related to cognitive learning. However, immediacy ($r = .13$, $p = .089$) was not significantly related with cognitive learning. A multiple regression analysis was computed using immediacy, teacher confirmation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration as independent variables for transformational leadership, and cognitive learning as the dependent variable. The equation containing the four independent variables moderately accounted for 14.2% of the variance in affective learning ($F(4,167) = 6.92$, $p < .001$). However, a closer examination of the beta weights revealed that only teacher accessibility ($\beta = .18$, $p = .030$) and teacher confirmation (*responding to questions* ($\beta = .04$, $p = .659$); *interest in student learning* ($\beta = .15$, $p = .208$); and *teaching style* ($\beta = .04$, $p = .702$)) were significant predictors of students' perceived cognitive learning (See Table 2).

8. Discussion

This study is the first step in learning about transformational leadership in the Ghanaian university classroom, from a Southern cultural perspective. Significant findings were obtained for both hypotheses, and in the direction predicted but the results did not support the primacy of all the dimensions of transformational leadership. Additionally, unpredicted findings emerged from the study.

First, under charismatic leadership, teachers' immediacy was neither a significant predictor of cognitive learning nor affective learning. Teachers' accessibility, a measure of individualized consideration, was not significantly related with affective learning but was a significant predictor of cognitive learning. Therefore it can be implied that teacher accessibility only contributes to students' cognitive learning and not students' affect for the course or the teacher. Roach and Bryne (2001), and Zhang (2006) have shown that cultural values play a significant role in the interpretation and evaluation of teacher-student relationships, and teaching and learning styles.

The power relationship recognized in the Ghanaian classroom contradicts the tenets of immediacy. Results of the study indicate that the teacher's use of behaviors enacted to decrease the physical and psychological distance between a student and a teacher, either has no impact on the perceived cognitive learning and affective learning of the students in Ghana or that students' measurement of immediacy is different in Ghana and so the effect of immediacy will not reflect in the results of the study, considering the fact that Western-based scales were used. The unpredicted findings suggest the likelihood of this power distance to translate into a school climate in which students and teachers have relatively little in-class and perhaps out of class interaction. Thus, the teacher's nonverbal immediacy, if appreciated at all, is not likely to result in the reduction of the physical and psychological distance between teachers and students but rather students will experience cognitive dissonance because the power distance is greatly respected.

Andersen (1979) in her seminal work on immediacy in the classroom reported a significant correlation between students' affective learning and teachers' nonverbal immediacy behaviors but no significant relationship with cognitive learning (by the measurement of test scores). Even though the learning loss measure of cognitive learning has been argued as a measure of perceived learning and not actual learning, the use of the learning loss measure did not yield results of correlation between cognitive learning and nonverbal immediacy as found in other studies conducted in the US culture (e.g., Chesebro & McCroskey, 2001).

The finding of this study on immediacy and learning outcomes could be an explanation to Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey's (1988) assertion that "immediacy cues are highly inferential and vary by culture and context" (p. 203). This study also highlights a rather latent concern of whether immediacy and its effectiveness in the classroom is pan-culturally applicable. Though studies have suggested that immediacy behaviors might have a cultural variation (e.g., Myers, Zhong & Guan, 1998), instructional communication scholars should further investigate behaviors of teacher immediacy across cultures, particularly Southern cultures, and its effectiveness in the classroom. Considering the fact that immediacy was not found in this study to be significant in predicting students' cognitive learning and affective learning, perhaps, the finding is rather as a result of variation in immediacy cues.

A second interesting finding from the study is that teacher confirmation was the only significant predictor of affective learning. However, of the three dimensions of teacher confirmation (i.e., response to questions, interest in student learning, and teaching style), the only significant predictor of affective learning was teacher's response to questions. Goodboy and Myers (2008) suggested that teacher confirmation increases student perceived understanding, reflects caring to students, and creates a positive classroom climate that "fosters affect and learning in a linear progression" (p. 172). The finding of the study makes sense considering a close examination of the beta weights of teacher confirmation and how charisma is the greatest predictor of affective learning. In other words, teacher confirmation accounts for the greatest variance in the model.

Therefore, for teachers in the Ghanaian university classroom, teacher confirmation should be of much concern in developing positive interpersonal relationships with students to foster desired learning outcomes. The teachers must learn to avoid disconfirming behaviors such as indifference, imperviousness, and disqualification of a person or message (Cissna & Sieburg, 1981) because such behaviors demonstrate the neglect of students' self-worth and experiences. According to Ellis (2000, 2004), teachers can demonstrate confirming behaviors by (a) showing a general interest in students' learning and education, (b) responding to students' questions in ways that communicate interest in students' concerns and comments, and (c) varying teaching techniques to help students learn in the classroom. Considering the acknowledged power relation between the teacher and the student in the Ghanaian context, it is likely that teacher confirmation will promote students' in-class and perhaps out of class communication for enhanced learning outcomes. Future research should further explore the importance of teacher confirmation in the Ghanaian university classroom.

Finding similar results with teacher confirmation (e.g., Goodboy & Myers, 2008) in another culture (Ghana) provides evidence of the pervasiveness of the role of transformational leadership in the classroom, specifically teacher confirmation (charisma). This underscores the

importance of this line of research. Though charisma showed to have the most significance on students' learning outcomes (affective and cognitive learning), Bass (1985) noted "charisma is a necessary ingredient of transformational leadership, but by itself is not sufficient to account for the transformational process" (p. 31). As Goodboy and Myers (2008) noted, teacher confirmation promotes student classroom involvement. This study contributes to effective teaching in the Ghanaian university classroom by informing teachers on the utilization of confirming behaviors, particularly in their response to questions, to enhance teacher-student classroom communication for desired student learning outcomes.

The third unpredicted finding is that intellectual stimulation was not a significant predictor of both cognitive learning and affective learning. However, according to Bass (1985), intellectual stimulation enhances thoughtful problem-solving abilities. Bass and Riggio (2006) noted that intellectual stimulation is a quality of transformational leadership which promotes intrinsic motivation. Based on the connection made between intellectual stimulation and intrinsic motivation, Bolkan, Goodboy, and Griffin (2011) found that "when teachers influence students' intrinsic motivation through the use of intellectually stimulating behaviors, students approach their learning in deep and strategic ways, and are less likely to adopt a surface-level approach to their studies" (pp. 343-344).

One of the limitations with the present study is the use of self-report data. Participants provided self-report data of the assessment of their chosen instructor's transformational leadership behaviors in the university classroom. Self-reports may not necessarily be indicative of teachers' actual behaviors in the classroom. Students may over or under report the use of instructor behaviors perceived as behaviors of transformational leadership. Also, the number of teachers evaluated by students is unknown though several teachers may have been involved because participants of the study reported on the teacher of the class they had immediately prior to the class in which they completed the questionnaire.

Another limitation of the study is the use of Western instructional communication literature (theory and measurement) to understand the teacher's role of transformational leadership in a Ghanaian classroom. The "culture of learning" differs among cultures (Cortazzi & Jin, 1999). Therefore, to offset this limitation, data should be triangulated (e.g., interviews) in future research. Also, one of the dimensions of intellectual stimulation (challenging students) was not reliable even though the summed scale was reliable and so no item was dropped from the subscale to achieve acceptable reliability. Thus, we recommend the development of local and original measurements that would cater for the cultural differences and the demands of the education system in interpreting the behaviors that teachers enact in the classroom. For instance, teacher-student communication within the classroom is more limited than out-of-class communication. This discrepancy is due to the recognized power distance between the teacher and the student within the classroom. However, teachers do not necessarily keep office hours to engage students in out-of-class communication and so in examining teacher accessibility, teachers' commitment to keeping office hours is not likely to be of relevance.

Unlike the organizational setting which has benefitted from Bass's programmatic research on transformational leadership, the instructional context requires more research, paying attention to other cultures as well, other than the U.S. mainstream culture, given that college classrooms are increasingly becoming internationalized. One implication for this study is that teachers can

better understand their role as transformational leaders in the classroom, irrespective of their cultural background or that of their students (given the possibility of culture-based findings as obtained from this study) to maximize student learning outcomes. Finally, the necessity for teachers to enact effective instructional communication behaviors has been well proven by research and the findings of this study support teacher confirmation as one of the effective teacher behaviors that have significant impact on student learning outcomes.

9. Conclusion

Research has shown a significant positive relationship between instructors' transformational leadership behaviors and students' cognitive learning, affective learning, and intrinsic motivation (e.g. Bolkan & Goodboy, 2009, 2010, 2011; Bolkan & Goodboy & Griggin, 2011; Pounder, 2006, 2008a, 2008b, 2008c) from a Western cultural perspective. Considering the progress made, transformational leadership and effective teaching behavior is a line of research worth pursuing in instructional communication, paying particular attention to culture-centered research.

In the Ghanaian university classroom, unlike what research on U.S. College classrooms indicates, teacher immediacy is not a significant predictor of student learning. Giving that Myers, Zhong, and Guan (1998) also reported a weaker correlation between teacher immediacy and student learning in Asian cultures than in the U.S., immediacy is not pan-cultural effective teaching behavior. Also, teacher accessibility, a measure of individualized consideration was a significant predictor of cognitive learning but was not significantly related with affective learning. However, teacher confirmation (specifically, the responding to questions dimension") was the sole significant predictor of affective learning, and intellectual stimulation was not a significant predictor of both cognitive and affective learning. Hence, for the Ghanaian university student, unlike the U.S. college student, teachers' charisma is denoted by behaviors of teacher confirmation but is not influenced by immediacy. This difference can be attributed to cultural differences given that Ghana represents a collectivist, high power distance culture whereas the U.S. for instance, is identified as an individualistic culture with lower power distance.

Future research should use the recommended parsimonious measure of transformational leadership with other populations (in terms of level of class, culture, and area of study). As suggested by Nussbaum (1992), and McCroskey and McCroskey (2006), research in instructional communication is generally hooked around the college classroom and students of communication studies, and the mainstream US culture. The relationship between transformational leadership and other desired instructional outcomes such as satisfaction should also be examined to improve research on transformational leadership in the classroom.

References

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

Andersen, Janis F; Andersen, Peter A. & Jensen, Arthur D. (1979). The measurement of nonverbal immediacy. *Journal of Applied Communications Research, 7*, 153-180. doi:10.1080/00909887909365204

Bass, Bernard M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Bloom, Benjamin S.; Hastings, John T. & Madaus, George F. (1971). *Handbook on formative and summative evaluation of student learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bolkan, San & Goodboy, Allan K. (2009). Transformational leadership in the classroom: Fostering student learning, student participation, and teacher credibility. *Journal of Instructional Psychology, 36*, 296-306.

Bolkan, San & Goodboy, Allan K. (2010). Transformational leadership in the classroom: The development and validation of the student intellectual stimulation scale. *Communication Reports, 23*, 91-105. doi:10.1080/08934215.2010.511399

Bolkan, San & Goodboy, Allan K. (2011). Behavioral indicators of transformational leadership in the college classroom. *Qualitative Research Reports, 12*, 10-18. doi:10.1080/17459435.2011.601520

Bolkan, San; Goodboy, Allan K. & Griffin, Darrin J. (2011). Teacher leadership and intellectual stimulation: Improving students' approaches to studying through intrinsic motivation. *Communication Research Reports, 28*, 337-346. doi:10.1080/08824096.2011.615958

Buber, Martin. (1957). Distance and relation. *Psychiatry, 20*, 97-104.

Burns, James M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper Row.

Campbell, Laura C.; Eichhorn, Kristen C.; Basch, Charles & Wolf, Randi. (2009). Exploring the relationship between teacher confirmation, gender, and student effort in the college classroom. *Human Communication, 12*, 447-464.

Cortazzi, M. & Jin, L. (1999). Cultural mirrors: Materials and methods in the EFL classroom. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in second language teaching* (pp. 196-219). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chory, Rebecca M. & McCroskey, James C. (1999). The relationship between teacher management communication style and affective learning. *Communication Quarterly, 47*, 1-11. doi:10.1080/01463379909370120

Cissna, Kenneth N. & Sieburg, Evelyn. (2006). Patterns of interactional confirmation and disconfirmation. In J. Stewart (Ed.), *Bridges not walls: A book about interpersonal communication* (pp. 429-438). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Christophel, Diane M. (1990). The relationships among instructor immediacy behaviors, student motivation, and learning. *Communication Education, 39*, 323-340. doi:10.1080/03634529009378813

Deci, Edward L. & Ryan, Richard M. (2002). The "what and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 23*, 123-139.

Ellis, Kathleen. (2000). Perceived teacher confirmation: The development and validation of an instrument and two studies of the relationship to cognitive and affective learning. *Human Communication Research, 26*, 264-291. doi:10.1093/hcr/26.2.264

Ellis, Kathleen. (2002). Perceived parental confirmation: Development and validation of an instrument. *Southern Communication Journal, 67*, 319-334. doi:10.1080/10417940209373242

Ellis, Kathleen. (2004). The impact of perceived teacher confirmation on receiver apprehension, motivation, and learning. *Communication Education, 53*, 1-20. doi:10.1080/0363452032000135742

Frisby, Brandi N. & Martin, Matthew M. (2010). Instructor-student and student-student rapport in the classroom. *Communication Education, 59*, 146-164. doi:10.1080/03634520903564362

Frymier, Ann B. (1994). A model of immediacy in the classroom. *Communication Quarterly, 42*, 133-144. doi:10.1080/01463379409369922

Goodboy, Allan K. & Myers, Scott. (2008). The effect of teacher confirmation on student communication and learning outcomes. *Communication Education, 57*, 153-179. doi:10.1080/03634520701787777

Gorham, Joan. (1988). The relationship between verbal immediacy behaviors and student learning. *Communication Education, 37*, 40-53. doi:10.1080/03634528809378702

Gudykunst, William B. (2000). Methodological issues in conducting theory-based cross-cultural research. In H. Spenser Oatly (Ed.), *Culturally speaking: Managing rapport through talk across cultures* (pp. 293-315). London: Continuum International.

Gudykunst, William B.; Lee, Carmen M.; Nishida, Tsukasa & Ogawa, Naoto. (2005). Theorizing about intercultural communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 3-32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gudykunst, William B. & Ting-Toomey, Stella. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, Geert. (2001). *Culture's consequences* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kearney, Patricia & Beatty, Michael J. (1994). Measures of instructional communication. In R. B. Rubin, P. Palmgreen & H. E. Sypher (Eds.), *Communication research measures: A sourcebook* (pp. 7-20). New York: The Guilford Press.

Keefe, James W. & Jenkins, John M. (2000). *Personalized instruction: Changing classroom practice*. West Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.

Krathwohl, David R.; Bloom, Benjamin S. & Masia, Bertram B. (1964). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook II: Affective domain.* New York: McKay.

Laing, Ronald D. (1961). *The self and others*. New York: Pantheon.

McCroskey, James C. (1992). *An introduction to communication in the classroom*. Edina, MN: Burgess International Group, Inc.

McCroskey, James C. & McCroskey, Linda L. (2006). Instructional Communication: The historical perspective. In T. P. Mottet, V. P. Richmond & J. C. McCroskey, *Handbook of instructional communication: Rhetorical and relational perspectives* (pp. 35-47). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Mehrabian, Albert. (1969). Attitudes inferred from non-immediacy of verbal communications. *Journal of Verbal Learning & Verbal Behavior, 6*, 294-295.

Mottet, Timothy P. & Richmond, Virginia P. (1998). Newer is not necessarily better: A reexamination of affective learning measurement. *Communication Research Reports, 15*, 370-378.doi:10.1080/08824099809362136

Myers, Scott A.; Zhong, Mei & Guan, Shijie. (1998). Instructor immediacy in the Chinese college classroom. *Communication Studies, 49*, 240 – 146. doi:10.1080/10510979809368534.

Nadler, Marjorie K. & Nadler, Lawrence B. (2001). The roles of sex, empathy, and credibility in out-of-class communication between faculty and students. *Women's Studies in Communication, 24*, 241-261. doi:10.1080/0363452032000085090

Nussbaum, Jon F. (1992). Effective teacher behaviors. *Communication Education, 41*, 165-180. doi:10.1080/03634529209378878

Northouse, Peter G. (2010). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Osei, George M. (2006). Teachers in Ghana: Issues in training, remuneration and effectiveness. *International Journal of Development, 26*, 38-51. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2005.07.015

Parry, Ken. (2000). Does leadership help the bottom line? *New Zealand Management, 47*, 38–41.

Pintrich, Paul R.; Smith, David A. F.; Garcia, Teresa & McKeachie, William J. (1991). *A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning questionnaire*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Plax, Timothy G.; Kearney, Patricia; McCroskey, James C. & Richmond, Virginia. (1986). Power in the classroom VI: Verbal control strategies, nonverbal immediacy and affective learning. *Communication Education, 35*, 43-55. doi:10.1080/03634528609388318

Pounder, James S. (2003). Employing transformational leadership to enhance the quality of management development instruction. *Journal of Management Development, 22*, 6-13.

Pounder, James S. (2006). Transformational classroom leadership: The fourth wave of teacher leadership? *Educational Management Administration & Leadership, 34*, 533-545.

Pounder, James S. (2008a). Full range classroom leadership: Implications for the cross-organizational and cross-cultural applicability of the transformational-transactional paradigm. *Leadership, 4*, 115-135.

Pounder, James S. (2008b). Transformational classroom leadership: A novel approach to evaluating classroom performance. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 33*, 233-243.

Pounder, James S. (2008c). Transformational leadership: Practicing what we teach in the management classroom. *Journal of Education for Business, 84*, 2-6. doi:10.3200/JOEB.84.1.2-6

Richmond, Virgina P. & Gorham, Joan. (1996). *Communication, learning, and affect in instruction* (2nd ed.). Edina, MN: Burgess International Group, Inc.

Richmond, Virgina P.; McCroskey, James C.; Kearney, Patricia & Plax, Timothy G. (1987). Power in the classroom VII: Linking behavior alteration techniques to cognitive learning. *Communication Education, 36*, 1-12. doi:10.1080/03634528709378636

Roach, K. David & Bryne, Paul R. (2001). A cross-cultural comparison of instructor communication in American and German classrooms. *Communication Education, 50*, 1-14. doi:10.1080/01463370500056127

Ting-Toomey, Stella. (2005). The matrix of face: An updated face-negotiation theory. In W. B.

Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 71-92). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Titsworth, S.; McKenna, T.; Mazer, J. P. & Quinlan, M. M. (2013). The bright side of emotion in the classroom: How teachers influence students' enjoyment, hope, and pride. *Communication Education*, *62*, 191–209. doi:10.1080/03634523.2013.763997

Turman, Paul D. & Schrodt, Paul. (2006). Student perceptions of teacher power as a function of perceived teacher confirmation. *Communication Education, 55*, 265-279. doi:10.1080/03634520600702570

Sieburg, Evelyn. (1985). *Family communication: An integrated systems approach*. New York: Gardner Press.

Waldeck, Jennifer H. (2007). Answering the question: Student perceptions of personalized education and the construct's relationship to learning outcomes. *Communication Education, 56*, 409-432. doi:10.1080/03634520701400090

Walumbwa, Fred O.; Wu, Cindy & Ojode, Lucy A. (2004). Gender and instructional outcomes: The mediating role of leadership style. *Journal of Management Development, 23*, 124-140.

Wanzer, Melissa B.; Frymier, Ann B. & Irwin, Jeffrey. (2010). An explanation of the relationship between instructor humor and student learning: Instructional humor processing theory. *Communication Education, 59*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/03634520903367238

Witt, Paul L.; Wheeless, Lawrence R. & Allen, Mike. (2004). A meta-analytical review of the relationship between teacher immediacy and student learning. *Communication Monographs, 71, 184-207*. doi:10.1080/036452042000228054

Zhang, Qin. (2006). Immediacy and out-of-class communication. A cross-cultural comparison. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 33-50. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.06.006

Zhang, Qin & Zhang, Jibiao. (2005). Teacher clarity: Effects on classroom communication apprehension, student motivation, and learning in Chinese college classrooms. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 34*, 255-266.

Author Note

Rita Daniels (M. A., Ohio University, 2013) is a PhD student in the Department of Communication Studies at West Virginia University. Her research interests lie in the processing and use of messages between and within organizations, the notions of gender that are encouraged, accepted and deeply woven into the social fabric, as well as how people from different cultures communicate and form intercultural relationships.

Alan K. Goodboy (Ph.D., West Virginia University, 2007) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at West Virginia University. His current research interests are bullying in different contexts (student bullying, workplace bullying, cyberbullying, homophobic bullying, and racist bullying), instructional and organizational dissent, intrinsic motivation and self-determination in the college classroom.