

The University of San Francisco
**USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library |
Geschke Center**

Doctoral Dissertations

Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects

2015

Writing Program Directors' Perceptions of Factors Promoting Writing Programs

Carole Kempler Meagher

University of San Francisco, ckmeagher@dons.usfca.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.usfca.edu/diss>

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Meagher, Carole Kempler, "Writing Program Directors' Perceptions of Factors Promoting Writing Programs" (2015). *Doctoral Dissertations*. 293.

<https://repository.usfca.edu/diss/293>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects at USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact repository@usfca.edu.

The University of San Francisco

WRITING PROGRAM DIRECTORS' PERCEPTIONS OF FACTORS
PROMOTING WRITING PROGRAMS

A Dissertation Presented
to
The Faculty of the School of Education
Department of Leadership Studies

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Carole K. Meagher
San Francisco
December, 2015

ABSTRACT

Writing Program Directors' Perceptions of Factors Promoting Writing Programs

Although California grows more socially and ethnically diverse, and its public universities serve this changing population, spending in higher education has been cut over the past few years. In this context, crucial departments such as writing programs, which offer all students the opportunity to build their communication skills while bringing their unique perspectives to traditional theories, have been under pressure for their higher cost than traditional lecture-style and new online courses. Further, writing programs are not always perceived as a source of institutional prestige.

This study starts with critical pedagogy: the idea that education is social change. The study then assumes writing programs enable critical pedagogy by engaging students' own experiences while teaching students the tools of communicating effectively to help drive social change for themselves and their communities. Leaders at California universities thus effectively promote or restrict critical pedagogy by cutting or growing writing programs. Using the lens of leadership theory, the decisions of these leaders ultimately demonstrates how they value student voices and engagement and the long-term social impact of their institution.

At five public California universities, writing program directors were interviewed and institutional reviews performed to evaluate local leadership practices. Key factors that supported writing programs were an emphasis on workforce development and a student-centered mission. Universities with an emphasis on research and on increasing their selectivity tended to put pressure on their writing programs. From the perspective of leadership theory, servant leaders aligned with a strong writing program whereas

transformational leaders yielded mixed results, depending on whether the mission of the institution prioritized the writing programs.

Writing programs provide two essential benefits to students. First, writing is an essential skill for participating in the workforce and obtaining access to economic and social capital. Second, writing programs, although not ensuring critical pedagogy will take place at the university, help enable access to empowerment for driving social change to serve communities through active engagement with academic theory. For California public universities to adapt to the increasing diversity and evolving educational needs of students, writing programs need to remain funded and active.

SIGNATURE PAGE

This dissertation, written under the direction of the candidate's dissertation committee and approved by the members of the dissertation committee, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Carole K. Meagher

Candidate

November 20, 2015

Date

Dissertation Committee

Dr. Patricia Mitchell, Chairperson

November 20, 2015

Dr. Betty Taylor, Second Reader

November 20, 2015

Dr. Brian Gerrard, Third Reader

November 20, 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As it is said, research involves standing on the shoulders of those who came before. This research would not have been possible if not for the generous time and thoughts shared by those who participated.

Dr. Patricia Mitchell, Dr. Betty Taylor, and Dr. Brian Gerrard, thank you for stepping into this process, for getting to know me and my work, and for your always savvy and thoughtful advice as this process evolved. Being new to education and to academic research as a whole, I relied on your willingness to answer basic questions and patiently guide me through the process.

To the Writing Program Directors at the universities known herein as Arcadia, Northern, State, Urban, and Valley, thank you for your generous time and insights. A special thank you goes to the Writing Program Director known as “GS,” who for the past few years has taken the time to teach me about writing and pedagogy and has always been helpful in recommending resources I would not have found on my own.

Finally, to my husband Neal, who always found me sitting in “that chair” and remembered to rotate our furniture so I wouldn’t wear out the upholstery or the carpet. Thank you for your charming company on the research trips, your technical support in the recording process, and for 23 years of believing in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	II
SIGNATURE PAGE	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
LIST OF TABLES	IX
CHAPTER I THE RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Background and Need for the Study	2
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Questions	5
Theoretical Framework	6
Critical Pedagogy	7
Leadership Theory	9
Servant Leadership.....	9
Transformational Leadership	10
Delimitations and Limitations of the Study	12
Significance of the Study	13
Definition of Terms.....	14
Summary	16
CHAPTER II REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	19
Introduction.....	19
Critical Pedagogy and Writing Programs	19
Critical Pedagogy and Writing in College Courses	25
Cost of Supporting Critical Pedagogy Through Writing Programs.....	30
Modern Leadership Theory.....	34
Servant Leadership.....	34
Empirical Definitions of Servant Leadership	35
Organizational Factors in Servant Leadership	36
Implications and Gaps.....	38
Transformational Leadership	40
Empirical Measurement of Transformational Leadership	40
Organizational Factors in Transformational Leadership	45
Implications and Gaps.....	46
Summary	47
CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY	50
Restatement of Purpose of the Study	50
Research Design.....	50
Research Settings	52
Population and Sample	54

Instrumentation	54
First Stage: Institutional Review.....	55
Second Stage: Interviews With Writing Program Directors.....	56
Reliability and Validity.....	59
Data Analysis.....	60
Protection of Human Subjects	60
Background of the Researcher.....	61
CHAPTER IV FINDINGS	64
Overview of Data.....	64
Profiles of Each Institution	65
Arcadia.....	65
Northern	66
State.....	67
Urban.....	68
Valley.....	69
Research Questions and Findings	70
Factors Promoting or Restricting Writing Programs	70
Research Mission.....	71
Workforce Development Mission.....	74
Increasing Selectivity Versus Writing Program	74
Conclusion	76
Value Student Voices and Engagement.....	76
Establishing a Student-Centered Vision and Mission.....	78
Investing for the Long-Term Future	80
Service To Most Vulnerable Students	80
Empowerment.....	81
Support for Critical Pedagogy	83
Education for Social Change	84
Message That Students Are Important.....	85
Empowerment Through Constructivism.....	86
Cross-Curricular Connections.....	86
Challenging and Engaging Discussions.....	86
Access To The Language of Power	87
Summary of Findings.....	89
CHAPTER V DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND FURTHER STUDY	91
Discussion Regarding Research Questions.....	91
Research Question 1: Factors.....	91
Research Question 2: Values	97
Research Question 3: Critical Pedagogy.....	100
Implications.....	103
Recommendations for the Profession	104
Recommendations for Future Study	105
Concluding Thoughts.....	108

REFERENCES	110
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR WAC PROGRAM COORDINATOR	122
APPENDIX B: SAMPLE INTRODUCTORY LETTER.....	125
APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT.....	126
APPENDIX D: IRB APPLICATION.....	129

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Summary of Participating Institutions: Approximate Student Demographics as of Most Recently Reported Semester	55
Table 2 Summary of Writing Programs Reviewed.....	65

CHAPTER I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

As increasing numbers of women, first-generation students, and people of color enter higher education, these individuals bring a newly rich set of voices and perspectives to academia (National Center for Education Statistics, 2014). To hear these voices, schools have created programs that build *critical pedagogy* (Freire, 1970) by empowering diverse student voices and engagement. These programs, such as *Writing Across the Curriculum* (WAC), which feature high levels of writing, critical thinking, and higher levels of engagement, cost more than large, lecture-oriented courses because successful delivery requires smaller class sizes and professional development for faculty (Russell, 2002). Although writing programs do not ensure that critical pedagogy is taking place in the classroom, these programs help students engage in academic discourse.

Nationwide, as well as in California, the effects of a 2008 economic recession meant reduced state support for higher education, pressuring leaders to control costs and manage budgets by increasing class sizes or using online education; exactly the opposite of a critical-pedagogy model (Freire, 1970; Legislative Analyst's Office, 2013; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association, 2014). Yet, researchers showed higher spending on students links positively to student engagement, retention, and persistence, so this focus on cost comes at a price, yielding a more negative impact on diverse populations in higher education than on traditional students (Kuh, Cruce, Shoup, Kinzie, & Gonyea, 2008; Pike, Kuh, McCormick, Ethington, & Smart, 2011). As higher education grows more diverse, then, the shift has been apparently to reduce student

engagement, making students passive recipients of a lecture rather than engaging in academic discourse, a return from critical pedagogy to *banking* (Freire, 1970).

Educational leaders are critical to recruit student engagement and success because leaders establish the policies that build engagement by supporting students' voices and rights, as well as creating an environment in which students are cocreators of knowledge rather than passive recipients (Trowler, 2013). Leaders must face their own values when asked to balance funding one program versus another (Burns, 1978; Greenleaf, 1977). The value a particular leader places on critical pedagogy—the idea that education must empower citizens to analyze their world and make it a better place for all—is essential to the institution's role in encouraging students to be active in shaping their worlds and communities in a positive way (Freire, 1970). When evaluating writing programs as to their academic or other value, then, the importance of creating spaces for student voices, as these voices become increasingly diverse and complex, is, for a particular educational leader, essential to how they prioritize their funding decisions. Leaders who follow models such as *servant leadership* (Greenleaf, 1977) and *transformational leadership* (Burns, 1978) would be expected to value student voice because these models encourage respect for constituents as active agents in the organization.

Background and Need for the Study

Students are resources for the classroom, bringing rich social and cultural value to the educational institution (Freire, 1970). Universities established departments that were specific to building writing skills for students with curricula that included elements such as remedial composition, first-year composition, WAC, and writing in the disciplines (WID; Russell, 2002). During the 1970s, a growing openness in attitudes toward diverse

cultures and historical interpretations, combined with increasingly diverse populations enrolling in higher education and an understanding of writing as an essential learning tool, led to the creation of programs such as WAC, which required students to write in all their classes, not merely in traditional English composition courses (Russell, 2002).

Writing assignments given in conjunction with WAC programs were more likely to deeply engage students by bringing their experiences and ideas into the academic discourse, rather than asking them to simply summarize a chapter (Melzer, 2014).

Writing programs, then, are a critical way for college students to not only learn in the disciplines, but to know their ideas and experiences matter, and to build their skills in communicating these ideas to a broader audience.

Writing programs require training for faculty, smaller class sizes, a comprehensive writing center for extra tutoring, and administrative effort; thus, such programs do come at a higher cost for colleges in comparison to lecture classes with limited student engagement (Russell, 2002). Resources such as money, time, and personnel in higher education, as in any other environment, are always limited. An organization's decision to prioritize one set of activities, outcomes, or students versus another requires a complex interplay of personal ambition, policy, and regulatory factors. However, the choice in how to ultimately weigh these priorities is often a function of the values of the organization's leader (Burns, 1978). Values such as ensuring equitable outcomes and protecting the most vulnerable members of the community—struggling students—may conflict with values such as increasing the organization's prestige if the leader is asked to excise a tutoring center in order to offer more online classes, or to reduce social and ethnic diversity in order to offer more merit scholarships (Greenleaf,

1977). An educational leader must skillfully navigate conflicting value systems that exist in their institution among other leaders and constituent groups including the general public, legislators, donors, faculty, and students. Leaders, ideally, will work toward a higher ideal of justice and equity than where the collective institutional conscience sits, without disappointing the more idealistic or alienating those with more immediate and pragmatic goals (Burns, 1978).

A fairly high rate of writing programs exist in 4-year colleges (Thaiss & Porter, 2010). Although courses associated with writing, and in particular, WAC programs, are more likely to engage students in critical pedagogy than those without this association (Melzer, 2014), researchers have not yet studied the extent to which the values held by a college's leadership influence the presence and stability of these programs. For example, which political and educational forces press to continue writing programs? Which forces point to writing programs as wasteful, attempting to redirect those resources to alternative programs? Finally, when and how do the personal values of the trustees, administrators, and donors impact the idea of critical pedagogy as these are enacted through writing programs?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to identify the impact of administrative leaders on critical pedagogy in higher education settings, as enacted through writing programs. The focus of the research was examining the perspectives of writing-program directors (WPDs) to identify factors from leadership theory that would be reflected in actions supporting or restricting writing programs. The support for writing programs depends, in part, on the value an institution's leaders place on hearing diverse student voices as an

essential part of academic discourse. These leaders' values are represented at the most tangible level by funding writing programs. By connecting institutions' stated values, actual funding patterns, and strength of writing programs, stakeholders have gained a greater understanding of how to best empower diverse populations by protecting academic programs that invite students to bring new perspectives that will continuously advance academic theory and public policy.

Budgets in higher education are scrutinized at the same time student populations have become more diverse. By analyzing institutional budgets as connected to organizational priorities, and ultimately, the core values of administrative leadership, stakeholders value diverse student populations as a resource for institutional learning. The support for the college's writing program, which often serves as a resource for critical pedagogy in higher education, is one crucial measure of the value the administration holds for diverse populations. Writing programs signal how an institution's leadership genuinely values students' voices and the leaders' willingness to protect these students when other demands accrue for resources.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

- What do WPDs perceive to be the factors promoting or restricting writing programs?
- What factors in educational administrative leadership cause leaders to value student voices and engagement?

- To what extent are critical-pedagogy values, supportive of writing programs, present in higher education leaders, institutional literature, and institutional funding patterns?

Theoretical Framework

As the United States becomes more diverse, more voices are challenging dominant ideologies in academic disciplines such as sociology and economics. Access to higher education is the means by which students who came from marginalized communities can take leadership roles in their own communities to help relieve oppression by applying their knowledge to influence social and public policy, increase democracy, and engage citizens. However, this vision will be quite difficult to achieve if educational leaders lack the sense of moral purpose that comes with education as a force for democracy by ensuring diverse student voices and experiences are heard.

This study examined the intersection of two seminal theories that have served as the basis for modern educational and leadership theory. *Critical pedagogy*, first described by Freire (1970), demands that education should be a tool to empower citizens by asking them to challenge and critique dominant ideologies rather than meekly accepting these ideas as facts. Students must be invited into the academic community as active participants in the creation of ideas and as resources for new knowledge, rather than as blank slates to receive information until they have somehow earned the right to disagree with the academic ruling class. Freire's work served as the basis for the use of education as an empowering force by supporting the establishment of diversity studies in academia, thereby creating spaces and voices for once-marginalized groups. In universities, writing programs help create a foundation for critical pedagogy because students build their

writing and research skills, providing tools to engage in the academic discourse in their courses (Melzer, 2014).

The field of leadership evolved from so-called “great-man” models that gave all credit for progress to specific leaders to recognition that leaders’ constituencies also have a powerful role in social and political processes. The theories that most clearly exemplify the interplay between leaders and constituents are *servant leadership* and *transformational leadership*. Servant leadership, developed by Greenleaf (1977), defines the role of educational leaders as ensuring the personal growth and development of the students at their institutions. Educational leaders who practice servant leadership think of themselves as public servants of these students, helping them achieve their own personal potential and agency as the students grow to take their own place in society. The idea of transformational leadership proposed by Burns (1978) is essential, because this model of leadership connects constituents to broader organizational goals. Students as participants in a system based on transformational leadership are, in turn, brought to higher levels of conscience and action because these are expected by, and inherent to the organization as a whole, not just as isolated individuals. More recent theorists regularly cited Greenleaf, whose field was business, and Burns, a political scientist, as the basis for their work in examining organizational dynamics.

Critical Pedagogy

In 1970, Freire’s book, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, articulated the idea that education was more than just sharing information, but a way of transforming the world. Education systems that rely on forcing one-way information on students become tools of oppression and cause citizens to disengage. Large one-way lectures followed by multiple-

choice quizzes to ensure students memorized the information are a classic example of this form of education. Students, in this scenario, are force fed theories that contradict their own experiences or personal history, or justify oppression against their own social and ethnic communities. Students could be required to dutifully follow the instructions presented by the instructor, and write papers that explain the so-called truths of these ideas. These students will either disengage from school and withdraw, reinforcing the idea that a particular group is fundamentally unfit for college, or internalize the oppression to complete their college education. Students may return to their communities and continue reinforcing oppression, rather than becoming a force for empowerment.

Critical pedagogy is essential for creating equitable access to power in society by creating true access to higher education. Education programs must value student voices and experiences; treat students as resources with a right to their own ideas, experiences, and perspectives; and encourage them to immediately create new knowledge by engaging with the institution as resources for knowledge, not as empty vessels to be filled.

“Women and men (are) beings who cannot be truly human apart from communication, for they are essentially communicative creatures” (Freire, 1970, p. 128). Writing, such as in WAC programs, helps students create this engagement by requiring them to produce papers that demonstrate critical thinking in their disciplines, giving them the opportunity to challenge assumptions based on their own experiences as well as from studies in their other classes (LeCourt, 1996). Carefully crafted writing projects allow students to develop critical-thinking skills while practicing the forms of communication they will be expected to use after graduation, better understand multiple points of view, and pay particular attention to the conflicting and competing interests of different groups in a

situation (Pennock, 2011). Writing programs provide an opportunity to ensure critical pedagogy can be enacted on college campuses.

Leadership Theory

Modern leadership theory looks in two directions. First, it looks inside the organization through Greenleaf's (1977) theory of servant leadership in creating a mutually constructive relationship between a leader and constituents. Next, it looks to the relationship the leader has outside the organization through Burns's (1978) theory of transformational leadership by evaluating that leader's ability to respond to establish organizational goals in the context of changing external forces. These goals are reflected back into the organization, empowering that leader's constituents and engaging members of the community, sharing the vision and values of the leader. The following sections describe these two theories in greater detail.

Servant Leadership

In *Servant Leadership*, Greenleaf (1977) mentioned Freire in the context of underrepresented and marginalized people who are empowered to speak up for their own needs rather than waiting for a leader from outside their community to hear their concerns and respond. Servant leadership, then, is the idea that leaders empower constituents to be heard, because leaders exist to serve constituents. For first-generation students, attending college is a way of making what Greenleaf called the "awesome decision for autonomy and independence from tradition" (p. 24). Young adults choose to advance socially and economically beyond their inherited status, and with various ambitions. Motivations may be altruistic in wanting to return to serve their communities in ways that require an education, such as a doctor or lawyer. Perhaps these young adults simply hope to enjoy a

higher level of economic stability in a job that is less physically demanding than that of their parents and grandparents. Accessing higher education is their first step to empowerment in meeting their needs. Further, these students naturally display a higher potential for leadership than their peers who chose to accept a continued state of oppression, as well as their more privileged peers who attend college because they were expected to do so and enjoy far more financial and cultural support. These potential leaders need an education to serve their communities, and need an education that empowers them to do so rather than accepting a curriculum in history, political science, or economics that may fail to respect their community's perspective.

Administrators in higher education express servant leadership by serving all students, nurturing healthy intellectual and emotional growth while ensuring vulnerable students reach just outcomes (Greenleaf, 1977). Greenleaf (1977) also noted that institutions, including those in higher education, often exist to benefit administrators and bureaucrats, rather than their served populations. Educational leaders might lose their sense of servant leadership to their constituents if they become embroiled in their own internal political issues, focusing resources on the most powerful groups and increasing the marginalization of already underrepresented students. Supporting writing programs that support diverse student voices, particularly when leaders must resist pressure to divert those resources away from these students, is one sign that administrators are practicing servant leadership.

Transformational Leadership

Although servant leadership (Greenleaf, 1977) emphasizes the moral obligation leaders have to their constituents, in *Transformational Leadership* (Burns, 1978)

described the actual process by which leaders and constituents engage with one another, with leaders engaging the “full person” (p. 4) to bring constituents into the leadership structure to achieve that organization’s goals. Transformational leaders must connect constituents to the institution by connecting to their own personal identities and values; then encourage these constituents to work for the benefit of the organization and broader community (Burns, 1978). The role of the classroom in political mobilization reinforces broader social themes and the experiences of children in marginalized populations who have experienced political activism when their communities sought equity and justice. Young people, in turn, learn this information, then balance it with other influences to shape entirely new attitudes in their own value development, when they grow into leadership roles.

In higher education, for transformational leadership to take place, the values of the institution must match those of the students and faculty (Burns, 1978). As students’ primary interaction with the institution is in the classroom (Elmore, 2004), the values expressed through teaching theories in history, economics, or other subjects need to support those of the students. Because students come from a variety of backgrounds, their diverse experiences may drive quite different perspectives and interpretations of the facts and circumstances that led to these theories, and could cause a deep clash in values between certain students and the institution. In a large lecture hall or online forum, students are cheaply and efficiently presented course materials and expected to regurgitate potentially troubling information back to the professor in a series of “right/wrong” answers through formulaic papers and multiple-choice quizzes. The emphasis is on competency-based subject-matter memorization rather than deep critical

thinking and analysis. A group of students may receive the message that their experiences and values are wrong or flawed, or worse, that higher education is not for them.

An institution that practices transformational leadership (Burns, 1978) must value student voices by investing in creating spaces for students to speak up, to question, to engage in critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970) to ensure students can use their new learning to constructively lead their communities. In addition, students can expand higher education as an institution that includes all voices and perspectives in the future. Although the writing program itself does not ensure faculty in all disciplines will engage in critical pedagogy, students build skills in writing and research, supported by the writing program that provides powerful tools to help students challenge the institution. The alternative, warned Freire (1970), is an education that draws members of the oppressed into the elite, sending them back to their communities to further their oppression. WAC programs, when tied to broader institutional goals, can ensure that colleges protect student voices and critical pedagogy because these are woven into the organization's functions, connecting a student's daily activities to their college's educational and civic goals.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

The emphasis of this study was on the support for writing programs at California public universities. Although critical pedagogy is an ideal outcome of a strong writing program, it is a distil outcome in that writing programs do not control how disciplinary courses are taught or managed. However, the idea that writing creates a powerful platform to enable critical pedagogy remained a core assumption of this study.

A key limitation to this study was that interview participants were WPDs, and the topic was their perceptions of their own leaders. Because these observations are subjective, WPDs' perceptions may have been flawed or biased, especially considering the status of each particular director's program. I worked to put comments in context, wherever possible. Finally, due to the highly sensitive and political nature of the topic, WPDs might have been reluctant to share too much meaningful information. It was essential to build a personal connection and mutual trust to ensure answers were as honest and thoughtful as possible.

Significance of the Study

This research added to the body of knowledge by applying leadership theory to concrete decision making in the academic world in an area that is challenging higher education today: engaging underrepresented populations, and increasing success rates for these students. Traditionally, researchers have applied leadership theory to the business world, working to maximize the use of resources and accomplish measurable targets such as short-term profits or payoffs for longer term investments. However, education decision making is fundamentally about values and balancing goals with deep social impact. For example, does a college provide small scholarships for many students, knowing some might still not be able to afford college, or does it provide fewer but larger scholarships for those who need it most? Should a college protect access for large groups of students knowing higher dropout rates will likely result, or should it focus resources on students it knows are most likely to succeed? In this study, I query if a college should invest resources in small, face-to-face classes because they are most vulnerable for students who need this education most to develop their social and cultural capital, or should they invest

in research, which builds prestige in the academic community? Should remedial writing and first-year composition be addressed by the local community college to save money, or does this further disadvantage struggling students by taking them out of the mainstream of the college community? The highest levels of administrators make these decisions, which are fundamentally value judgments about the role of diverse student voices in higher education.

This research has practical implications for WPDs, providing diversity and equity frames to generate support and visibility for their programs with their college's leadership. Broader institutional connections should ideally mean additional resources and influence for the writing program. The future of democracy relies on educating students in classrooms today. Students' individual experiences will help shape understanding of an increasingly diverse and empowered world, as well as advance the social theories that drive public policy. However, students' educational experiences are highly dependent on the value leaders place on hearing students' voices, and leaders' values are reflected in funding decisions. Shining a light on the role of student voices and the priorities of academic leaders will help ensure higher education remains a foundation of democracy, equity, and citizenship.

Definition of Terms

The following definitions clarify the purposes of this research.

Administration/administrator. Educational leaders at a college who hold primary responsibility for leading the organization, developing institutional goals, and performing essential managerial functions such as fundraising, public relations, and human resources (Phillips, Sweet, & Blythe, 2011).

Critical pedagogy. In this model, students “are increasingly posed with problems relating to themselves in the world and with the world and ... feel increasingly challenged and obliged to respond to that challenge” (Freire, 1970, p. 81).

English as a second language. A course or series of courses designed to prepare nonnative English speakers for college reading and writing courses.

Faculty. Those in a college or university who actively teach, as well as often performing research and developing curriculum (Phillips et al., 2011).

First-year composition. A class, or series of classes that teach general writing skills to prepare students for any type of writing they will face in their future coursework (Russell, 2002).

Remedial composition. A class or series of classes designed to teach students whose writing does not conform to entry-level college standards the fundamentals of grammar and spelling (Russell, 2002).

Servant leadership. A leadership theory stating that the leader’s role is to ensure their constituents’ needs for personal growth and autonomy are met, protecting the interests of the least powerful (Greenleaf, 1977).

Transformational leadership. The theory of leadership stating that leaders must work at a very high level of ethical and moral values, then translate these values into organizational goals and bring their constituents to these high levels to achieve the organization’s goals (Burns, 1978).

Writing across the curriculum (WAC). A program in which students are expected to write in courses other than English or composition (Russell, 2002).

Writing in the disciplines (WID). A program in which composition instructors teach students the conventions of writing in a particular field, such as science or social science (Russell, 2002).

Writing program. The organizational entity at a college that manages all or a subset of the courses, faculty development, and other activities related to college writing, such as English as a second language (ESL), remedial composition, first-year composition, WAC, WID, and the tutoring center (Russell, 2002).

Writing-program director (WPD). The person at a college, most often a faculty member, who is responsible for managing activities related to the writing program such as curriculum development and faculty training.

Summary

Academic communities are actively studying critical pedagogy leadership theory but these had not been analyzed together to see how they impact one another. Decision making is a human process, performed by leaders seeking to balance their own self-identity with competing interests and limited resources. Finding a connection between student voices—particularly those from underrepresented populations—and leaders willing to prioritize these voices by committing financial resources to writing programs helped frame future questions about funding higher education in an increasingly diverse world.

In Chapter 2, the two spheres of the theoretical framework come together. I demonstrate critical pedagogy in the context of writing programs through research on writing. Further, because writing programs require additional financial resources such as small class sizes and professional development, I discuss the ways program directors,

typically faculty, successfully obtain these resources. Researchers had not yet identified individual administrative leaders' values and connected these to support for WAC-program success in California's changing public university environment.

Servant leadership and transformational leadership, since their first descriptions in the mid-1970s, have emerged into fully formed management practices. Empirical research demonstrating the measurable existence of servant leadership and transformational leadership, and the differing organizational impacts of these practices, has been performed in a variety of for-profit and nonprofit settings. Yet, higher education has its own set of organizational challenges that limit the impact of an administrative servant leader or transformational leader because faculty, not administrators, controls curriculum decisions. Administrators do, however, control budget decisions, which has implications on higher cost programs such as writing. Not studied in the extant literature, this research study aimed to tie administrator values to funding decisions.

Chapter 3 describes the intersection of critical pedagogy and modern leadership theory, examined in the context of academic leadership and writing programs. First, I reviewed colleges using a critical-discourse analysis of the institution's overall and key program purpose statements. An institutional ethnography using documents such as budgets, policies, and procedures was another window into the values held by administrators. Finally, I interviewed WPDs to discuss their overall program status and interactions with administrative leaders to see how the program connects to the overall institution.

Chapter 4 presents the data found in the institution reviews and interviews. Writing programs are well-supported when the university prioritizes workforce

development and ties to the local business community, but experience internal competition when the focus is on research and less so on undergraduate education. Further, those seeking to increase their selectivity, meaning the rate at which higher prepared students apply to the university, tended to put pressure on their writing programs. These programs are seen as cost centers or service programs rather than sources of student success or institutional prestige. Although the arguments for writing programs and for critical pedagogy are strikingly similar in their aims of student acculturation and developing student voices, the presence of a writing program only assists in creating a platform for critical pedagogy. Each separate academic program must establish themes, if any, around social justice and social change.

Chapter 5 is about conclusions and future recommendations. Writing programs need to focus externally as well as internally, emphasizing the importance of writing in communicating research results. Writing programs make the university a source for on-campus recruiting for the business community and create the foundations for future leaders with substantial communication skills.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In this study, I considered the intersection of *critical pedagogy*, as enacted in writing programs, and *leadership* theory. Critical pedagogy, first described by Freire (1970), demands that education become a tool to empower citizens through challenging and critiquing dominant ideologies rather than meekly accepting these ideas as facts. Critical pedagogy is enacted in college curricula in various ways. For this literature review, I reviewed recent writing programs that emphasized critical thinking to discern the impact of critical pedagogy as well as the factors that would increase the cost of delivering these programs.

I examined modern leadership literature, based on *servant leadership* and *transformational leadership* literature, to find empirical measures to define and differentiate these, to examine the impact on an organization, and to consider the impact of these leadership practices on higher education. Servant leadership emphasizes the personal development of individual constituents. The emphasis in transformational leadership is on organizational goals, and transforming the constituents' personal goals to align with those of the organization.

Critical Pedagogy and Writing Programs

Critical pedagogy is, at its core, education for social change (Freire, 1998b). Critical pedagogy means that those who become educated do not learn merely facts and figures or names and dates, but become fundamentally changed. Students become empowered to solve problems in their own communities because they learn about power

and structure and how to question and challenge the names, dates, facts and figures to see reality as it is, not merely how it is presented (Freire, 1998b).

When looking at discussion on writing programs, many of the same arguments emerge as in critical pedagogy. Writing expectations in a class, rather than large lecture halls with multiple-choice examinations, gave students the message that the course content was important and that they were expected to take an active role in their learning process rather than being passive learners (Pobywajlo, 2001). In a model of critical pedagogy, each student, with their own experiences, culture, history, and knowledge, is a resource in the learning environment (Macedo, 1994). By sharing these factors, all students create knowledge in that they expect and highlight contradictions and challenge sources rather than accepting facts. Students construct knowledge among one another, rather than blindly receiving hollow facts and figures (Freire, 1998a). In this way, education is empowering because students see themselves as knowledgeable and agents of change from the inception of their education, rather than objects of a system of education that situates them as deficient and powerless (Shor, 1992).

Writing, like critical pedagogy, empowers students, pressing them to construct knowledge for themselves rather than accept presented facts. The dynamic interaction between literacy and language emerges, in that writing builds engagement and reflection with material, itself a process of self-construction (Freire, 1998b). WAC programs are more likely to deeply engage students by bringing their experiences and ideas into the academic discourse, rather than asking them to simply summarize a chapter (Melzer, 2014). Through writing, students have the opportunity to challenge the social order because activities now ask students to express themselves (Freire, 1985). Social change

starts from the self: a student's own knowledge, history, and experience. Educators can provide students with access to the disciplinary knowledge and tools to argue in a particular field effectively; then writing programs can create a platform for all student voices through the structures of the program.

Critical pedagogy does not merely allow students to bring themselves into the academic discourse using conventional academic forms, such as writing research papers, and will not automatically create space for the questioning and advocacy needed to bring marginalized voices into the academy (LeCourt, 1996; Villanueva, 2001). Students perceive their coursework as a step toward the broader pragmatic goal of graduation and a job, and the faculty have power over the ability of students to achieve that goal (Thomson-Bunn, 2014). Students are likely to choose a safe strategy, pretending to agree with the instructor's perspective rather than challenging their point of view if it means passing the class and graduating. Further, students may resist the faculty's social and political ideology, however well-meaning that instructor's intentions may be. Writing programs remain an important starting position by encouraging writing in the disciplines, as well as teaching students the fundamentals of academic writing and argument as powerful tools to be used while in school or after graduation.

Education's current emphasis on preparing workers to participate in the economy instead of creating knowledge for its own sake risks the creation a "cult of expertise" (Harris, as cited in Rutz, 2012, p. 89) in which outsiders criticizing the ideas and values of an academic discipline might be discouraged for expediency's sake, rather than encouraged to continue developing ideas in a particular field from diverse and alternative perspectives. Given the more recent emphasis on career-oriented education in practical

majors such as engineering and business, general-education courses such as history or political science might be a student's only opportunity to learn and critique social and civic issues. Higher education has become departmentalized and specialized (Macedo, 1994). Each specialization may focus on its own body of knowledge, refusing to acknowledge the contributions and the conflicts across disciplines. The result can be an education that creates a series of simplified views, such that one learns specific vocabulary and theoretical models but is not able to question this information or put this learning to use by combining it with information from other disciplines. Students must create connections across the disciplines, linking across disciplines so diverse contributions and conflicts are visible because a student's full knowledge is engaged (Macedo, 1994; Russell, 2002).

Students develop writing skills through sustained inquiry, tying the students' own experiences and prior learning to abstract concepts and developing metacognitive processes so the student can better understand their own assumptions and values (Beaufort, 2012). Students explore their personal relationships to nature, cities, and their own home lives through readings from diverse fields such as psychology, social science, city planning, and others (Beaufort, 2012). Students, by learning the influences of race, class, and gender on literature, would draw from outside the traditional confines of a literature class to more richly understand what they were reading (hooks, 1994). Thus, learning becomes a process by which students develop a broader, more critical view of the world around them, and how to influence it for the better. The learning environment, then, becomes a dialogue among teacher and students in which participants present, untangle, and better understand (albeit not necessary resolve) problems (Freire, 1985).

Education and curriculum can never be entirely neutral or objective; they are fundamentally biased due to the perspective of the institution and its own power structure, what it chooses to omit and include, and how it frames problems and solutions (Freire, 1985). Students might be rebuffed if they ask questions in one class when there are conflicts across disciplines (Russell, 2002). Faculty like it when students simply admire what the faculty have to say, and sweetly repeat (Melzer, 2014), as Freire (1985) said, yes, it is “pretty to be a rhinoceros” (p. 117). However, when educators ask students to write critically, a dialogue between the teacher and student emerges, and educators treat students as resources who are expected to bring their own experience as well as learn across disciplines into the classroom. Faculty are not usually trained to handle challenging discussions in class (hooks, 1994); however, writing programs often provide training to faculty so they can help students develop their ideas and make arguments skillfully and persuasively.

Students whose parents did not attend college or who come from communities outside the traditional academic (White, affluent) subculture, who lack access to these privileged discourses, often lack the cultural and social capital needed to write in standard English and make arguments in ways that are considered appropriate to an academic environment (Shor, 2009). Students must learn how to use dominant dialects and writing standards so they can be more effective when communicating with those with power and can engage them effectively and work for change (Macedo, 1994; Shor, 1992). At the college level, a common model in the United States is to establish a class called “first-year composition” in which students learn standard grammar and how to compose academic papers as general skills (Russell, 2002). As a result, these students are expected

to be able to apply these capabilities to their disciplinary studies, upon having achieved some level of writing proficiency. Writing programs, then, are a critical way for college students to not only learn in the disciplines, but to know their ideas and experiences matter, and to build their skills in communicating these ideas to a broader audience.

However, 36% of U.S. students come to college needing some form of academic remediation in writing or mathematics, and these students are more likely to come from underrepresented backgrounds (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012). In practice, students who did not come from the dominant culture fail writing tests due to inexperience in their use of the language of power. These students may be segregated into remedial-skills classes and often not allowed to access academic disciplines despite being cognitively quite bright. Thus, underrepresented people experience yet another barrier to higher education in the name of academic excellence (Russell, 2002; Shor, 1992).

Although unequal education systems force students into these remedial programs, they should be integrated into the academic discourse community by encouraging them to participate through writing projects about issues that affect them and their communities (Shor, 2001). For example, as students were welcomed into the academic environment, their writing naturally began to align with more traditional forms of academic communication and students were able to participate fully in the discourse communities (Singer, 2001). Writing programs can have a profound impact on underrepresented students by having them practice their writing, exposing them to the canonic literature in a particular discipline, and creating assignments that encourage them to engage fully with the institution, so they can bring diverse voices to the academy.

In summary, critical pedagogy is education for empowerment because students are fully engaged and respected as whole participants in a course, rather than as empty vessels to be filled. Further, through writing programs, educators provide students with tools, building their writing skills, so they can participate fully in society. Students can then demand a more just world for themselves and their communities.

Critical Pedagogy and Writing in College Courses

A writing program such as WAC is one way to create space for critical pedagogy; however, its presence does not guarantee student voices, particularly those from underrepresented groups, will be heard. The educational outcomes of the writing program must build to an overall institutional mission of critical pedagogy. This mission must be supported on a personal level by those who make decisions regarding institutional priorities and funding.

To select literature for this section, I searched databases to identify articles that discussed courses that emphasized writing as a learning tool for critical thinking. A solid cross-section of content areas and types of instructors emerged. Article authors identified where courses supported critical pedagogy by focusing on writing and on critical thinking, were open to diverse perspectives, demonstrated willingness to critique the dominant theory, and researched elements that might drive incremental cost in delivering the program. The following describes a series of examples, ranging in subject areas from communications to sociology, that helped shed light on how writing programs work in practice.

Authors have developed the pedagogical connection between critical thinking and analysis in writing classes well. Cavdar and Doe (2012) used writing in a political science

class to help develop critical-thinking skills by having students recognize assumptions, evaluate arguments, and use evidence to support or refute these assumptions and arguments. Later, these students will use the ability to discern hidden assumptions to dissect arguments that may be oppressing their own communities and respond effectively. Franz and Green's (2013) review of a science course used writing to help students develop a sense of skepticism and the importance of evidence-based reasoning necessary for science, as well as engaging in advocacy later in school and beyond. Recognizing multiple perspectives and skillfully weaving these into a paper benefitted student grades (Lancaster, 2014), which bodes well for developing a student's ability to manage conflicts and controversies later in life.

A student complaint about a class activity led to Shafer's 2012 article about the role of critical pedagogy in an English-composition classroom. Shafer noted that students might be willing to step up and disagree, in general terms, about a class concept or activity they find personally troubling on some level. However, to achieve what Shafer referenced as Freirean writing for true liberation, a student needs the space to link their deepest values to the issue at hand. By articulating exactly what they truly feel and believe and their reasons for doing so, students make themselves vulnerable to instructors and their peers. These deeply personal specific aspects bring students to an understanding of themselves as well as the issues at hand. With this new understanding, students are truly empowered for action. Instructors must create space in writing classes for students to seek these deep truths for themselves and one another. Shor (2007) explained this process for a composition class in which students selected topics about which they were all concerned, in this case, the Iraq War and Gay Marriage. The instructor taught students

to research the topics, evaluate sources, and write a report on their findings, providing the skills to uncover truths, aiming to stoke a desire for activism combined with skilled action when the need to take leadership during a controversy arises in their futures.

This deep connection to the self and the broader world was articulated in 2002 by Rose and Theilheimer in their analysis of two writing-intensive classes: developmental psychology and American government. Students demonstrated a growing understanding of their own psychological and cultural processes through writing assignments in the developmental-psychology class. In the American government class, students researched and wrote about a community issue about which they cared deeply. The instructor pressed students to synthesize ideas and construct solid arguments for various audiences: allies, opponents, and politicians. Fiore and Elsasser's (2001) English class for Bahamian women used the theme of marriage to explore students' attitudes and experiences, then used writing to impact their marriages. The culmination of this effort was an open letter to Bahamian men, printed in the local newspaper, recounting their negative behaviors such as domestic violence, extramarital affairs, and neglect of their household financial and child-rearing responsibilities. The use of writing for expression is empowering for students, making them stronger advocates for their own ideas. For Rusche and Jason (2011), having students apply class theory in sociology to their actual lives helped students use these as tools to solve their own personal and intellectual problems. Further, the writing process helped students work out confusion or frustrations away from class; the instructor observed they were prepared to articulate these more effectively when in class discussion.

Shor (2005) as both critical pedagogue and writing instructor provided a direct example of how these fields can come together, describing how the analysis of social class can build students' awareness of social inequities while building their writing skills. DiGrazia and Stassinis (2011), in a case study in a criminal-justice class, averred that involving writing helped students build awareness of diversity and appreciation for the complexity and multilayered nature of issues by forcing them to become deeply involved in their subject areas. In the same way A. Heaney (2006) reviewed a program for at-risk students that used writing as a tool to build academic skills while helping students learn how to engage with and understand their own communities. Bean, Carrithers, and Earenfight (2005) studied an outcomes-assessment process for a WAC program and noted that history is a product of the writer's own creation of meaning through their roles in society and in the power structure. Students in the class were expected to critique these interpretations by situating the writer in a historical context (Bean et al., 2005).

The most profound example came from Kapp and Bangeni's 2009 2-year study of 20 South African students, all of whom came from marginalized populations. At first, students would merely mimic the official instructor's viewpoint because they needed to access the material. Soon, that access evolved into challenging the material, with students grappling with clashing discourses, using writing to help them integrate their disparate academic and personal identities to develop their own effective voices. As South Africa continues to adapt to becoming a more inclusive and diverse culture, these students will have crucial roles in helping bridge the gaps between the elite and broader populations. This pattern matches the evolution in U.S. higher education since the 1970s and the role of WAC programs in helping students from underrepresented populations question, and

ultimately change dominant discourses to be more inclusive of diverse perspectives. Evolving academic theories and newly institutionalized disciplinary fields reflect these changes in discourse in public policy that assumes diversity rather than expecting all to fit in a single model. The changing public conversation naturally respects rather than marginalizes alternative points of view. In the same vein, Sidler (2005) wrote about a composition class that used the study of biotechnology—specifically, genetic research—as a guiding theme. Sidler pointed out that this generation of college students will be the ones grappling with the emerging social and policy challenges this powerful science will bring; students need critical pedagogy to ensure citizens and politicians make decisions in an ethically and morally informed way.

These examples demonstrate how the interrelationship of critical pedagogy and writing is enacted in students' coursework. Students are not merely presented facts in a banking (Freire, 1970) way, but are asked to research, analyze, weigh alternative perspectives, and present ideas in a variety of fields using the skills developed in their writing courses. Without support for writing programs, whether in traditional first-year composition courses, a WAC model, or simply WID, students may struggle with the communication skills needed to participate in the academic discourse. In particular, students from underrepresented backgrounds may not have learned academic tone and style in their home culture and will need to learn these communication codes to be heard. Because today's college student is tomorrow's community leader, business person, scientist, policymaker, or politician, ensuring diverse voices can be heard means empowering students through writing programs.

Cost of Supporting Critical Pedagogy Through Writing Programs

The model of the low-cost, large lecture/online class, efficient for passing large groups of students for a class and, of course, ideal for one-sided, low-engagement “banking,” was simply not represented in these classes (Freire, 1970; Legislative Analyst’s Office, 2013). Class sizes under 25 along with faculty training were common themes when researchers described structure. Pobywajlo’s (2001) survey of writing instructors found half of the classes were capped at 20, and most were under 40 students. Although Boyd’s (2010) case study used a large lecture format for part of a 100-student communications class, teaching assistants handled small sections of 25 students each, and the assistants were trained to ensure consistent grading. Jackson and Morton’s (2007) example of a writing program gone awry noted the near impossibility of teaching writing to a class of 75 students that met for only 1 hour per week. Classes need to be taught by faculty, not teaching assistants, noted Townsend (2001) in a study of successful writing-intensive disciplinary courses. Leveraging assistants for grading might be appropriate at times; however, students need to engage with faculty who bring deeper disciplinary knowledge and thus a more solid discourse.

Because content-area faculty often lack the experience in teaching and coaching writing skills, Townsend (2001) also mentioned the importance of a full-service writing center that can support all students who need help, not just those from English composition and ESL classes. The idea of linked courses, in which a content-area class is paired with a writing class, also emerged, but the coordination effort among the faculty was treated in DiGrazia and Stassinis’ (2011) criminal-justice class as an extra course section, for time purposes. Faculty in A. Heaney’s (2006) program for at-risk students

took a full week during the summer to engage in the extra planning needed to deliver the courses. At Bean et al.'s (2005) university, faculty worked with a consultant to help develop a consistent assessment process across multiple courses and met regularly to share teaching practices and ensure rubrics were applied appropriately. Professional-development costs for the consultant, along with faculty meeting time and the implication of smaller classes to provide this deep level of grading and feedback for students, contribute to higher costs for a WAC program than larger classes run by faculty working independently.

A. Heaney (2006) and Rusche and Jason (2011) mentioned the use of online bulletin boards, not as a replacement for writing or class time but as a way of allowing students to directly engage with one another. However, Rusche and Jason (2011) also mentioned the importance of verbal and nonverbal cues when engaging students, which is obviously impossible in a completely online class. To attain the high levels of student learning and engagement shown in the previous examples that created critical pedagogy, higher spending on teaching to allow for smaller classes and professional development would be expected to be positively correlated with these results. This relationship was demonstrated when Pike et al. (2011) performed a regression analysis correlating National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) results with information on college spending and student characteristics from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System and the College Board. Even after controlling for student characteristics and engagement, teaching expenditure positively correlated with student learning and engagement, especially for first-generation students ($p = .01$). Pike et al. (2011) also found a statistically significant positive correlation ($p = .05$) between spending and

student engagement for first-year students, defined as those having participated in activities such as faculty interactions outside the classroom, or discussing course material outside of class with fellow students. Earlier, Kuh et al. (2008) used NSSE and College Board data to demonstrate a positive relationship between high student engagement and student persistence and graduation rates. The Kuh et al. findings noted this relationship was of particular significance to students from nontraditional backgrounds. Thus, spending cuts have a disproportionate impact on these students.

To control spending in higher education, recommendations go against important elements for student engagement and thus critical pedagogy. Interviews conducted by Kilgore and Cook (2007) with faculty at a large public research university found that the cost of instruction is squeezed to maintain research programs and other institutional priorities. Classes grow larger and professional-development opportunities for faculty diminish, making active student–faculty engagement difficult. To save money, colleges are hiring more and more adjunct faculty who do not participate in culturally sensitive training, lack institutional connections for curriculum development that would broaden the ideologies covered in a subject area, and lack time to spend with students for informal mentoring, advising, and relationship-building (Kezar, 2012). Rusch (2004) described the difficulty in academia of having discussions about race and gender and relying on untrained adjunct faculty, only exacerbating this problem with the most vulnerable students.

As diversity grows in education, hooks (1994) clearly saw a “backlash” (p. 33) against progressive and engaging environments; perhaps this concern about cost is merely a pretext to repress diverse student voices. Shor (2005) argued this point

vehemently, contrasting the relative egalitarianism and public investment in education during the 1960s and 1970s with the later erosion in the tax base, thereby cutting funding for public education. Simultaneously, private institutions that serve the elite dramatically increased their endowments during the same period. Although analyzing the political and social trends leading to this change in the funding environment for higher education is outside the scope of this paper, the values of leaders in higher education and their willingness to advocate for resources for previously underrepresented students, such as writing programs, are discussed in this study.

In terms of the trend of online classes, Faculty who participated in a survey expressed concerns that online education, although a likely cost-saver, was not as effective as in-person classes in student interactions and, more important, in reaching at-risk students (Jaschik & Lederman, 2014). Cost-saving measures have a marked negative impact on underrepresented and struggling students by effectively suppressing their opportunities to engage with the institution, when these students need it most.

When higher education leaders must make spending decisions, student voice, engagement, and critical pedagogy are not always a priority. Cost-effective class delivery such as online education, increasing numbers of adjunct faculty, larger classes, and less training for faculty effectively push student voices to the background, most notably for those who were already marginalized by the institution. Leaders, especially those for whom these issues are not personally salient, must be proactive about ensuring student voices, even when these are different or inconvenient, are protected in academic programs.

To better understand the dynamics of finance decisions, the community must identify the core values of the institution's leadership to highlight the impact of these decisions. The community must challenge the value structure that privileges other activities over critical pedagogy such as eliminating WAC programs that support diverse student voices. In the following section on modern leadership theory, I identify factors in the individuals who make these decisions in an effort to evaluate their adherence to the models.

Modern Leadership Theory

In the 1970s, two seminal theories of leadership emerged that formed the basis for the study of organizational behavior today. The first is Greenleaf's (1977) theory of servant leadership, which examines the importance of the role of the leader in how they positively impact their constituents, as well as that leader's responsibility to those who are weakest and most vulnerable. The second is Burns's (1978) theory of transformational leadership, which explains the role of the leader in defining the organization's goals and objectives; then connects these to the personal goals and objectives of constituents to build deeper commitment and ultimately, higher organizational performance. In the following sections, I describe these two theories in greater detail, perusing studies that sought to find tangible evidence of these theories in action, and discuss how college leaders might reflect these leadership models to support critical pedagogy.

Servant Leadership

From the business world came Greenleaf's (1977) theory of servant leadership: the idea that leaders empower constituents to be heard because leaders exist to serve

constituents' needs, helping them grow into their full potential. In this way, organizations achieve their goals most effectively because all members are fully engaged in a constructive way. In higher education, servant leaders would prioritize critical pedagogy and support programs such as WAC because these help their served public—the students—to engage with academia so students and the college could continue to grow and evolve as social needs changed.

Empirical Definitions of Servant Leadership

Greenleaf's (1977) writings originally defined servant leadership very broadly; later researchers found ways to measure servant leadership empirically. Barbuto and Wheeler (2006) surveyed 80 community leaders along with 388 of their followers to create a Servant Leadership Questionnaire that used factor analysis to quantifiably measure, among other characteristics, altruistic calling and organizational stewardship as essential qualities of servant leaders. Altruistic calling means the leader desires to make a positive difference in constituents' lives. A leader who demonstrates organizational stewardship works toward the long-term best interests of the organization and community rather than their own personal ambitions or short-term goals. Van Dierendonck and Nuijten (2011) later expanded Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) work with a survey of more than 1,500 leaders and followers over eight samples drawn from various sources. Using factor analysis as well, they found servant leaders also valued empowerment: the desire to have constituents make their own decisions and take direction for themselves. They also valued courage: the willingness to take risks and question authority to achieve what is best for the long-term interest of the served community.

Supervisors who demonstrated servant leadership in a study of 187 undergraduate business students also demonstrated procedural justice: they used fair processes and procedures that led to equitable and thoughtful treatment of their constituents (Mayer, Bardes, & Piccolo, 2008). Walumbwa, Hartnell, and Oke (2010) studied 815 employees working at seven multinational corporations and found that the belief that their leaders were fundamentally fair, combined with employees' own sense of self-efficacy, led to positive voluntary behavior such as helping others with their work as well as a work environment that was pleasant and cooperative.

For writing programs to be supported, program managers' perceptions of their own leaders would support these values and would also emerge in the college's self-description. A college's leaders would describe themselves as having an important role in the broader society as well as making sure students were always heard and treated fairly and equitably by institution personnel to create an overall positive climate. However, Mumford and Fried's (2014) meta-analysis of the research on servant leadership identified the risk of a liking bias such that these program managers, if they found their leaders to be supportive, would like these leaders and associate positive, servant-leadership-like traits to these leaders. In contrast, they associated negative traits to their leaders if the leaders were unsupportive of their specific programs or had poor interpersonal skills, even if they were perceived as servant leaders on broader community issues.

Organizational Factors in Servant Leadership

A leader may have noble ethical and moral intentions; however, critical organizational factors will affect that leader's impact on their organization. Servant

leadership is associated with organizational factors that give leaders flexibility and power. Beck (2014) surveyed over 1,000 people in community organizations to identify servant leaders using Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) Servant Leadership Questionnaire and found that the longer a leader has been with an organization, the more strongly they demonstrate servant-leadership qualities. This time stability suggests the leader has developed enough power in the organization and long-term relationships to use for influence in obtaining resources. Further, the existence of longer serving leaders suggests an organization is relatively stable, thereby shielding leaders from the pressure of economic threats to survival and providing them time and space to nurture constituents and the community. For example, in a case study at North Carolina State University, integrating the WAC program into broader institutional goals, required a multiyear process of various organizations independently developing their own outcomes and assessments, then discovering these similar efforts and leveraging a more robust interdisciplinary program than could have happened with multiple microefforts (Anson, Carter, Dannels, & Rust, 2003). For these results, faculty leaders needed to have been in their jobs for several years to have built relationships and resources to advance this bureaucratic process. However, in a case study of two writing programs, colleges relied on untenured administrators and adjuncts, potentially weakening the long-term stability of programs due to the higher turnover of untenured compared to tenured faculty (Brady, 2013). These programs relied on the support of tenured faculty in other departments for their continued presence on campus.

Two literature reviews found a connection between the presence of servant leaders and an organization's strong financial position. Christensen, Mackey, and

Whetten's (2014) literature review sought to find a connection between servant leadership and Corporate Social Responsibility, and observed that corporate responsibility reduced the short-term profits of a firm; thus, altruism and stewardship associated with servant leaders came at a cost to the organization. Doh and Quigley's (2014) study of servant leadership and stakeholder theory attempted to reconcile the conflicting goals of institutional stakeholders and provided three case studies from the business world (Coca-Cola, Wal-Mart, and DuPont) as to how these were resolved. For example, shareholders need a return on their investment, customers will only pay competitive prices for products and services, employees require good wages, and neighboring communities expect environmental stewardship to protect their health and local natural resources. Again, a strong financial position makes it possible for a servant leader to negotiate the right balance of all goods to keep stakeholders satisfied.

Most writing programs have existed for a long time and cost more than a traditional lecture course. Solid servant leadership behind a program requires a stable organization and solid funding (Thaiss & Porter, 2010). Long-term administrators and faculty and consistent, generous funding from public and private sources would ensure the programs continue.

Implications and Gaps

The above servant-leadership studies were empirical studies performed at private businesses rather than educational institutions. However, all organizations need to recognize the agency and humanity of their constituents. Each must balance a budget and weigh short-term versus long-term goals.

The most important gap in the literature is that constituents in all cases were subordinates of the leader and these studies focused on subordinates' personal interactions with their leaders. Mumford and Fried (2014) have also noted this limitation. Higher education does not manage in a hierarchy such that faculty are subordinate to administrators; rather colleges have shared governance. Tenured faculty members make decisions in academic matters such as curriculum development and grading criteria, whereas administrators are responsible for the overall institutional direction, financial management, and other nonacademic issues. In a series of case studies on best practices in shared governance in higher education, faculty did not see themselves as followers of the administration, but as part of the leadership of the institution (T. Heaney, 2010). Writing programs are academic and thus are a faculty responsibility. If an administrator seeks to influence the function or existence of a writing program, whether to find cost savings or for another reason, the battle will not be hierarchical but about appropriate boundaries for organizational decision making.

Further, although WAC program directors are likely to have perceptions of their own administration, the actual served community is the student; in particular, those from backgrounds traditionally underrepresented in higher education. Administrators probably have limited interactions with students but will need to see their work of service in abstract, programmatic way, in the same way a business leader might see their work as making customers' lives better or giving back to the local community, even if they do not directly interact with customers or community members.

In summary, servant leaders focus on improving the lives and situations of constituents, however these are defined. These leaders are able to focus on these lofty

goals because they enjoy long tenures with their organizations that allow for deep relationships, permitting them to accomplish long-term goals. Their organizations tend to be funded well enough that conflicting constituent groups can be reasonably satisfied. However, these leaders typically work in organizations that do not change much. The stressors of constantly shifting directions, combined with the economic costs of such changes, means that a servant leader's effectiveness might be limited when an organization's environment changes.

Transformational Leadership

From political science comes Burns's (1978) theory of transformational leadership. Transformational leaders must connect constituents to the institution by connecting to their own personal identities and values; then encourage these constituents to work for the benefit of the organization and broader community (Burns, 1978). Transformational leaders use tools such as idealized goals and inspirational motivation to encourage constituents to go beyond their roles and responsibilities to help the organization achieve its aims (Bass & Riggio, 2006). For writing programs, the institutional values must include critical pedagogy as part of its mission and the administrative leadership must articulate the connection between the writing program and achieving the college's goals of social-justice education, increased graduation rates among underserved populations, among others.

Empirical Measurement of Transformational Leadership

As with servant leadership, researchers attempted to empirically measure the factors that define transformational leadership and differentiate it from servant leadership. In an effort to distinguish between transformational leadership and servant

leadership, Parolini, Patterson, and Winston's (2009) survey of 500 people on their preferred type of leader, respondents traditionally associated servant leadership with interpersonal relations among leaders and constituents and the morals of those leaders. In contrast, respondents associated transformational leadership with how leaders influence their organizations' goals and their constituents' roles in achieving those goals. Rafferty and Griffin's (2004) survey of nearly 1,400 public-sector workers used factor analysis to reveal that transformational leaders demonstrate vision, asserting clear goals for the organization, with employees who feel personally connected to these goals. Additionally, transformation leaders provided intellectual stimulation, encouraging employees to devise their own strategies to achieve organizational goals and thus become personally invested in that achievement. In a survey of 155 employees in a for-profit firm, constituents of a transformational leader believed their managers were highly effective in finding new opportunities for their organization and clearly articulated these outcomes for them to work toward (Choudhary, Akhtar, & Zaheer, 2013). Thus, respondents recognized transformational leaders for their ability to focus on overarching goals, and leaders' relationships with followers tended to center around the organization's needs rather than the follower's needs.

Followers of transformational leaders gain satisfaction from being a part of a successful team and helping a winning leader. A survey of over 200 people in a university setting contrasted constituent outcomes in servant versus transformational leadership environments. Researchers found that although servant leaders were effective because followers found working for them personally satisfying, transformational leaders' impact sprung from their constituents' perception that the leader was highly

capable; thus, followers were willing to join with that individual (van Dierendonck, Stam, Boersma, de Windt, & Alkema, 2014). In a higher education study of 39 academic research teams, in higher performing teams, measured by number of publications, constituents expressed greater trust in their supervisor's abilities when that supervisor was a transformational leader, and derived job satisfaction from trust in their supervisors and team members (Braun, Peus, Weisweiler, & Frey, 2013). Writing programs that had been established as separate academic programs, rather than remaining part of an English Department, also tended to have stronger visibility and support because of higher level reporting relationships, allowing them to develop and implement programs across various departments (Anson, 2006). Writing can be perceived as a curricular invasion from the English Department when the program's ownership is based on English, perhaps as an extension of the tutoring laboratory in which the purpose of writing papers is to improve grammar and spelling rather than build critical thinking and academic engagement (McMullen-Light, 2010). The experience of researchers suggests that the placement of the writing program has significance in the perception of that the program leader's effectiveness by other members of the campus community, creating a virtuous circle in which the effective leader is provided more resources and support, which leads to more successes and even more resources and support.

Although transformational leaders require goals and followers who believe in those goals, leaders must also be able to navigate an organization to get the resources to achieve these goals. In an effort to identify behavior that suggested a leader was transformational, Ewen et al. (2013) surveyed 400 headmasters and 1,400 teachers in German schools and observed transformational leaders also have strong political skills:

they are socially astute and had networks among stakeholders to achieve their own and organizational targets. Mullin and Schorn (2007) demonstrated these political skills at a large public university by finding touch points for the writing program across all levels of the organization and rewarding participation.

The development of writing-intensive courses is a peer-reviewed activity among faculty that creates personal relationships as well as a professional investment across the institution, not just within departments. Faculty are selected through a competitive process and compensated to attend a special writing training, and are recognized as mentors among their peers when they bring their learnings back to their home departments, which furthers their personal commitment to the program. Writing is included in an alumni survey, and any positive feedback about the importance of writing is immediately returned to the administration and departments, as well as any personally named faculty, which reminds the organization of the importance of writing to long-term student success. Finally, research and factual data are used to satisfy accreditors and the administration about the benefits of investing in writing to the university's overall goals. These efforts bring positive attention to the writing program at all levels of the university and ensure its success.

Jackson and Morton (2007) contrasted two university writing programs and found a similar result. In one program, writing was articulated as part of the academic college's strategic plan and faculty were highly engaged from the beginning, yielding a successful program. In the second, a specific discipline area was required to suddenly partner with the writing program, with little planning or discussion. The result was that discipline faculty did not understand or respect the activities of the writing faculty, and the writing

faculty were unable to connect to discipline faculty who each had their own ideas for writing-program needs, which confused students and frustrated all the faculty involved. The lack of a well-articulated vision for the program and support for faculty roles in this program doomed it to these early and, apparently unnecessary growing pains.

Brown and Moshavi's (2002) study of 400 faculty demonstrated the clear importance of transformational leadership in the organizational effectiveness of an academic environment characterized by highly autonomous tenured employees. Little opportunity arose to punish or reward faculty. As a result, the department chair's charisma was the most crucial element in faculty members' willingness to expend extra effort to achieve the organization's goals.

Transformational leaders are highly effective at aligning constituents' motivations and activities with organizational goals, then achieving these goals. A strong writing program associated with a transformational leader must clearly meet the college's objectives such as educational themes and graduation rates, and further, that leader will clearly articulate how the program supports these objectives and demonstrates commitment by using political capital to resource the program. For example, the WAC program at a small liberal arts college described by Pennington and Boyer (2003) is clearly tied to the institution's mission of a values-based education by using student writing as a way of engaging students in a disciplinary discourse to discuss alternative points of view and ethical issues. Although critical pedagogy and transformational leadership were not explicitly mentioned, the desire to engage with the material at a complex level and its tie to the overall mission of the organization demonstrated a solid connection.

Organizational Factors in Transformational Leadership

In an extensive literature review, researchers associated transformational leadership with dynamic, rapidly changing environments. In these environments, followers were encouraged to be leaders in their own parts of the organization and take initiative to drive change (Smith, Montagno, & Kuzmenko, 2004). In contrast, servant leaders are more likely to succeed in a static environment in which deep personal relationships and organizational stability are more important than responding to change.

For writing programs, then, if the environment is changing, a transformational leader in the administration who is supportive of the program will be invaluable in protecting it; however, if a leader is transformational and has goals that conflict with building the writing program, it could be at risk. For writing programs to remain stable, they must align with the overall mission of the institution, have strong connections to other academic units, and ideally report at a high level in the administrative structure so they can be visible and reasonably autonomous in establishing goals (Townsend, 2008). When the institutional mission changes, however, the writing program may lose its support. For example, Brady (2013) found a university that decided to increase emphasis on research. Teaching-intensive programs such as writing became less important to the overall mission and were perceived as competing with the new priority rather than supporting it or even neutral. In another example, Thaiss described the tension between emphasis on computerized standardized testing in higher education and the valuing of student creativity and critical thinking (Rutz, 2013). Educational leaders who rush to new technology to solve the problem of student writing ability through machine-graded essays risk eliminating student voices from the broader curriculum. Class sizes can now increase

because papers can be checked automatically, demonstrating proper grammar and vocabulary usage; yet the opportunity for students to deeply engage with the institution is lost.

Implications and Gaps

As mentioned before, higher education is not a classic hierarchical model in which leaders set an idealized vision, then motivate followers to achieve these goals; rather, but in a shared governance model, faculty are responsible for developing and executing academic programs such as writing whereas college executives are responsible for budgeting, human resources, and other administrative staff functions (T. Heaney, 2010). The traditional leadership influence on higher education from a hierarchical lens, then, is limited. Studies described here focused on followers as organizational subordinates rather than the served population; in this case, the students of that leader's institution.

Further complicating the discussion of transformational leadership is that although transformation leaders are traditionally associated with innovative environments, most writing and even WAC programs have been around for many years (Smith et al., 2004; Thaiss & Porter, 2010). Writing is no longer exciting or innovative. Transformational leaders, due to their strong personalities and broad ambitions, can also be accused of being narcissistic, overly ambitious, and even amoral in their quest to achieve organizational aims (Bass & Riggio, 2006). As a result, writing programs could be at risk of an energetic executive leadership who, in their quest for the latest exciting innovation in education, eliminates "old" programs that happened to protect student voice and engagement.

Transformational leadership is about transforming the entire organization as a sum of its parts, through a unified set of goals, and through the organization itself by impacting the values, motivations, and actions of the members of that organization. Transformational leaders are visionary by definition, and thereby able to articulate a clear strategy with which constituent members can engage. These leaders tend to emerge during times of change because they are needed to help refocus the organization toward a new set of goals. As a result, transformational leaders also focus on their constituents, knowing that unless they bring everyone to the new vision, that vision could fail. An organization's norms and values need to adapt to the new vision.

Summary

Critical pedagogy and writing instruction are deeply connected. Each seeks to develop the student's positive identity as a member of a community and an advocate for justice and change, defined in a particular discipline. The belief that knowledge is constructed by the learner rather than provided ready-made facts is common to both traditions. Educators encourage students to make connections across disciplines and challenge ideas using a level of skepticism and insistence on evidence. Finally, critical pedagogy and writing instruction use the power of language and seek to nurture the development of a students' communication skills, particularly in the modes and styles used by those who hold power, to ensure students can engage effectively in the future. Examples showed how writing courses used critical pedagogy values in a variety of disciplines.

However, this education does not come cheaply, as classes are small so students can engage with the instructor and one another, and writing assignments can be carefully

assessed. Support services such as tutoring are also needed to ensure students succeed in these classes. Studies show this extra investment in teaching is most critical for students from underrepresented backgrounds, so scaling back on teaching has a disproportionate and negative impact on equity for the next generation of young adults accessing higher education.

Modern leadership theory brings together servant leadership and transformational leadership. Servant leadership is most connected to individual leaders' relationship with their constituents and a sense of altruism and long-term benefit for the organization. The presence of servant leadership highly correlates with stable organizations whose members have a long history with the organization as well as sufficient financial resources to support diverse and occasionally conflicting priorities, such as having a reasonable profit margin while paying competitive wages to workers. In writing programs, faculty have been able to nurture long-term relationships to encourage cooperation across disciplines. However, the increased use of lower-cost, untenured faculty in writing programs puts some of these programs at risk, due to the potential loss of institutional longevity.

Transformational leadership links the goals of an organization to the personal ambitions and values of the members of that organization. Transformational leaders have a clear vision of the future of the organization and their constituents have a solid understanding of their roles in that organization. Leaders are known to be effective and results-oriented, and use political savvy to advance their agendas. Environments with transformational leaders tend to be changing rapidly and skilled leaders are able to quickly change their followers' goals and priorities to realign to the new reality. For writing programs with transformational leaders at the helm of their universities, these

rapid changes have been experienced by writing programs as a risky proposition. When an organization's goal includes writing as a critical student outcome, the writing program enjoys solid support from administrative leaders, and faculty are proud to be a part of the program. However, writing is considered a stalwart program and lacks the shiny newness of other initiatives, such as online learning assessments or the prestige of cutting-edge research. In these cases writing programs risk becoming less important to the institution, and thus can be undermined by an aggressive leader with different priorities.

Writing is an essential resource for critical pedagogy. However, the idea that support for writing programs is based on the value the institution's administrative leaders place on these student voices had not been researched. Of utmost importance is the impact of the values of the institution and its administrative leaders through their desire to empower students, establish critical pedagogy as an organizational priority, and align resources to support this aim. This research connected the program to the administrative leadership of an institution through the alignment of resources to show how diverse student voices remain a priority, discerning what forces push these voices to the sidelines of an institution.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Restatement of Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to find the connection between support for diverse voices and administrative leaders' values, reflected in their actions and decisions in higher education. To liberate the voices of diverse students on college campuses, writing programs that empower them must be fully funded and protected against competing institutional priorities. Political and financial support for these programs ultimately depends on the values of institutional leaders. By studying the institution's official statements and budgets, then looking at the strength of its writing programs, and finding the connection between individual leaders' personal values and commitment to student voice, a model can emerge to successfully sustain these programs. Colleges can proactively identify risk factors to ensure diverse student voices continue to be heard as school priorities and educational trends evolve.

Research Design

This study used a qualitative research design. The purpose of qualitative research is to develop a rich understanding of a problem by relying on experiences and views expressed by participants in the study (Creswell, 2008). First, I performed a series of limited institutional ethnographies regarding critical pedagogy on college campuses using critical discourse analysis to review institutional documents such as mission statements and budgets. Second, I interviewed program directors using a structured set of interview questions designed to elicit open-ended responses about their program's history, future, and overall role in the college's goals and objectives.

An institutional ethnography seeks to understand how institutions make decisions and practice their missions using the perspectives of the individuals involved, their relationships among one another, and the impact of power and authority on institutional policy and procedure (LaFrance & Nicolas 2012). To focus on critical pedagogy, the emphasis was on writing programs that are a common focal point for creating academic discourse on college campuses (Melzer, 2014). I interviewed WPDs to learn about their program's history and challenges, then situate these in the broader institutional context through their experiences with the college's administrative leadership.

Colleges share their institutional values explicitly and implicitly through their stated missions and educational philosophies, as well as by using more mundane documents such as budgets and routine memoranda. Through critical-discourse analysis, researchers can use these texts to identify the social and power structures that drive decision making (Huckin, Andrus, & Clary-Lemon, 2012). Finding, for example, references (or lack thereof) to the value of student voice, particularly for underrepresented students, and the role writing programs have in establishing critical pedagogy for all students, will identify core institutional values and how leaders are currently changing and shaping these to benefit which group of stakeholders: students, faculty, taxpayers, donors, administrators, or others.

The core of the research was interviews with WPDs, discerning their experiences with their programs and the role administrative leaders played in supporting or weakening the program's impact compared to other institutional priorities. Program directors, like academic department chairs, often play a critical mediating role among students, faculty, and administration in communicating and executing directives

(Garipagaoglu & Vatanartiran, 2013). The goal was to provide patterns of common experiences among these program directors that could be useful to others in establishing, building, or protecting writing programs during times of institutional growth and change.

Research Settings

The research settings were five public universities in California that had writing programs for undergraduate students and a diverse student body. In 1960, California's Education Master Plan established two systems of baccalaureate-granting universities known as University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU). UC entities were designated as research institutions and provide undergraduate, professional, and doctoral programs. Undergraduate admissions are highly selective, drawing from the top 12.5% of California high school graduating classes. CSUs, drawing from the top 33.3% of California high school graduates, are primarily teaching institutions with research that focuses on instruction. CSUs also offer master's and professional programs and have limited numbers of doctoral programs (UC Office of the President, 2007).

The UC website speaks proudly of its research discoveries and of the importance of these discoveries to human life and the environment, as well as its international recognition (Regents of the University of California, 2015). UCs are funded according to a state agreement, in that UC admits the top 12.5% of California high school graduates in exchange for funding commensurate with other top research universities. However, in 2009 the Great Recession cut UC budgets by around 30%, causing UC to raise fees for in-state students as well as increase their recruitment of out-of-state and international students who pay higher fees. The impact of these policies is difficult to detect because the actual number of California high school graduates attending UC has remained fairly

steady—between 7 and 9%—and higher fees do pay for more accessible spaces, financial aid, and so on (Geiser, 2014). Although the UC system remains committed to the 12.5% figure, undergraduate applications are increasing from inside and outside of California and certain campuses have become highly competitive and selective, relative to the others. Administrators will experience a need to expand to support this demand while maintaining equitable access in the overall system (Johnson, 2013). UC continued to recognize the importance of access, in that half its newly admitted students in 2015 were first-generation college attendees, and UC serves a higher rate of low-income students than do universities of comparable reputation (University of California, 2015).

The emphasis at CSU, as well as its motto, *Working for California*, is to provide access to quality education while training the local workforce, as well as the jobs created by the CSU system itself, which benefit their local economy (Office of the Chancellor, 2010). However, like the UC system, CSU has been losing financial support. In the 1990s, CSU began raising fees to cover operating expenses. From 2008 to 2012, with the Great Recession, the CSU system lost \$1 billion in funding, forcing colleges to raise fees and turn away up to 25,000 qualified students each academic term. Although the budget crisis is beginning to taper, CSU is still catching up (CSU, 2015).

Of growing importance to UCs and CSUs is that a growing number of California students are nonnative speakers of English, which increases the need for ESL studies and support. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2015), more than 40% of California households speak a language other than English. Further, the number of international students attending California universities continues to grow (Institute of International Education, 2014).

In summary, the systems are different in that UC emphasizes research whereas CSU emphasizes education and workforce development. Both demonstrate a commitment to access for California's high school students. Each serves diverse local and international populations, and each has struggled with budget cuts over the past few years.

Population and Sample

To recruit participants for the study, I created a list of 18 public California universities that could be reached within 1 day's drive from my home in San Francisco. I searched each college website to find the appropriate WPD and contacted them initially by e-mail and then, if necessary, by phone calls and e-mails to explain the project, obtain agreement, and arrange a mutually convenient time to meet. In total, five WPDs were willing and able to meet, which comprised the final sample. Table 1 provides a general summary of the student profiles of the institutions I actually studied. To maintain confidentiality, I assigned pseudonyms to each and the information provided is rounded to the nearest 5% to avoid identifying any particular institution. All the universities surveyed serve a large undergraduate population that enjoys diversity in gender and ethnicity as well as socioeconomic status, demonstrated by the number of students receiving Pell grants.

Instrumentation

This study used a qualitative research design. First, I performed a series of limited institutional ethnographies regarding critical pedagogy and leadership analysis on all represented college campuses, using critical-discourse analysis to review institutional documents such as mission statements and budgets. Next, I interviewed WPDs using a

structured set of interview questions designed to elicit open-ended responses about their program's history, future, and overall role in the college's goals and objectives.

Table 1

Summary of Participating Institutions: Approximate Student Demographics as of Most Recently Reported Semester

Category	Arcadia	Northern	State	Urban	Valley
Male/female %	50/50	40/60	35/65	50/50	45/55
Undergraduate enrollment	5,000	25,000	10,000	25,000	25,000
Ethnicity %					
African American/Black	5	5	5	5	5
Asian/Pacific islander	25	35	35	30	25
Latino	45	15	25	25	20
Native	0	0	0	0	0
Caucasian/White	15	35	25	20	35
Multiracial/unknown	5	0	10	10	10
Foreign students	5	10	0	10	5
Receiving Pell Grants %	65	45	60	40	55

Note: To help protect each institution's confidentiality, all percentages have been rounded to the nearest 5%, and all numbers rounded to the nearest 5,000.

First Stage: Institutional Review

Before each interview, I reviewed institutional websites, budgets, and program information to identify common themes across colleges as well as noticeable outliers. For example, on each university home page I queried the information they chose to emphasize; of what they were most proud; what language they used to describe their students, faculty and community; and if writing program websites were easy to find, or buried deeply. These factors helped position the writing program, its relative importance to the university, and its level of support.

I analyzed organizational factors to see if the college enjoys a stable, long-standing administration and board, which could suggest servant leadership (Beck, 2014) and a stable financial situation, which could imply the college can afford more costly programs that allow for student voice (Christensen et al., 2014). If the institution was undergoing major changes, it could imply the presence of transformational leaders (Smith et al., 2004). The active presence of stakeholders such as donors, trustees, faculty, and students helped identify conflicting pressures on the college (Doh & Quigley, 2014).

Second Stage: Interviews With Writing Program Directors

The most critical perspective was that of the WPDs and their interactions with their administrative leaders. I conducted the interviews in-person between June 2015 and August 2015 at each university campus: four in the WPD's office and one in a conference room at the school's library. I recorded all interviews using a professional microphone on my laptop and had them transcribed professionally. Interviews lasted between 1 and 2 hours each. I obtained written permission to interview, record, and transcribe WPDs' comments and review their institution's documents. I asked all participants the same set of questions in an open-ended format to ensure the participant was sharing concrete examples, I sought clear evidence that the institution's leaders follow or do not follow the servant or transformational leadership patterns. I gained written permission from the University of San Francisco's Institutional Review Board (IRB). Research sites did not require IRB approval; however, the WPDs signed informed-consent forms (see Appendix C) and verbally confirmed on each transcript that they were aware they were being recorded. All were available for any follow-up and clarifications needed to their responses.

To create the questionnaire, I leveraged Thaiss and Porter's (2010) survey of WAC programs to identify where each program stood relative to the national average, and find factors related to age and stability. Additional questions related to critical pedagogy were based on Melzer's (2014) survey of college writing programs. Finally, pertinent questions that drew from the literature on servant leadership (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006; Van Dierendonck & Nuijten, 2011) and transformational leadership (Choudhary et al., 2013; Rafferty & Griffin, 2004) helped discern how the overall experiences of the WPD reflected administrative actions.

I addressed the research questions with the following questions asked of the WPDs about their immediate manager or the administrator they believe had the most impact on the program, positive or negative. I asked questions in a way that encouraged storytelling to develop a richer background than would be the case in a closed-ended format. For a full list of questions and the actual order in which they were asked, see Appendix A.

For the first research question, *what do WPDs perceive to be the factors promoting or restricting writing programs*, the focus was on the answers to these questions.

1. What are cross-campus connections your program has with other programs and academic departments?
2. How has the program changed in the past few years?
3. Can you tell me about a time your manager took a risk, even when he/she was not certain of the support from his/her own manager?

4. Has your manager identified new opportunities for the unit/department/organization? What are these?
5. Has your manager told you where he/she sees your program in 5 years? Can you describe it?

For the second research question, *what factors in educational administrative leadership cause leaders to value student voices and engagement*, the emphasis was on the following questions.

1. When are students ready to be brought into the academic discourse as scholars and resources?
2. Can you tell me about a time your manager focused on the good of the whole instead of a single area or person?
3. Tell me about a time your manager put the students' best interests ahead of his/her own.

For the third research question, *to what extent are critical-pedagogy values, supportive of writing programs, present in higher education leaders, institutional literature, and institutional funding patterns*, emphasis was on a combination of the institutional review and the following questions:

1. In what ways does the (writing) program impact underrepresented groups at your institution?
2. In what ways does your manager emphasize the societal responsibility of your work?
3. Do you believe the college's leadership has a clear, common view of the future? What is that, or do you see conflict among them?

Reliability and Validity

The goal for reliability and validity in qualitative research is not to ensure statistical significance or repeatability, but to ensure the reported research matches that of the experiences of the participants (Creswell, 2008). To be reliable, sufficient numbers of institutions must be reviewed to develop and identify repetitive themes, whereas not so many as to make the in-depth research unwieldy, given the time constraints of the dissertation. I compared the experiences of the WPDs to one another as well as to education research from peer-reviewed journals and educational foundations. The five program directors hailed from a broad variety of institutions in size, diversity, and mission, which was sufficient to establish common themes and clear contrasts.

I made all documents, such as critical-discourse analysis and institutional ethnography, available to participants for critique and feedback. Further, I audiotaped and had transcribed all interviews and made these available to participants as so they could clarify their comments and add additional thoughts. I took all steps to protect the anonymity of the program director such as keeping all electronic files password protected.

Finally, the report showed all information to provide a richly textured picture of WPDs and their interactions with institutional leaders. Despite conflicting and contradictory information, the goal was to identify core success factors for critical pedagogy in higher education. These factors varied by institution depending on the history, politics, and relationships among the constituent groups at a college.

Data Analysis

I explored institutional documents and interview transcripts to identify and scrutinize common themes. For the first question, “What do WPDs perceive to be the factors promoting or restricting writing programs?” the primary data used were responses from the program directors. For the second question, “What factors in educational leadership cause leaders to value student voices and engagement?” emphasis was on the institutional documents, such as the institution’s strategic plan and other public statements. I compared the information in these documents to the answers provided in the interviews with program directors to see whether these were in alignment or apparent conflict. For the third question, “To what extent are critical-pedagogy values, supportive of writing programs, present in higher education leaders, institutional literature, and institutional funding patterns?” I combined the university’s documents and the WPD interviews to create a full view of the role of student voices at the institution.

Protection of Human Subjects

Due to the potentially highly political and sensitive nature of the topic, I kept all institutional and individual names confidential. Participants chose a pseudonym for themselves and their institutions. I made great effort to avoid linking comments from a person to their specific institution in the final dissertation to ensure they cannot be searched, either by paraphrasing politically sensitive public documents to avoid word/phrase searches and by avoiding the use of identifiable information such as particular events. I afforded each participant the opportunity to review what was said about their institution and made changes when necessary to better disguise the specific

program. I obtained written permission from all participants, who were made aware of the purpose of the research, to address concerns of research deception.

I kept all electronic documents and recordings on a password-protected computer and password protected individual files where possible. Physical documents were kept in a locked file drawer with only my access. All documents with identifying information and all recordings will be destroyed upon completion of the research. I will keep consent forms for 3 years in alignment with the University of San Francisco's IRB guidelines.

Background of the Researcher

I have more than 15 years of corporate experience in finance and marketing and 10 years of teaching experience at the college level. During my business career, I developed budgets and analyzed financial statements to create and execute strategic plans. Thus, I have experience performing this type of research. I hold a BA in Political Economy of Industrial Societies from the University of California and an MBA from Santa Clara University.

During my business career, I clearly saw the importance of writing as a communication tool. When I began teaching, I insisted students write regularly to practice and develop this skill and developed a deeper appreciation of the challenges of so-called "proper" writing. First, poor writing did not mean the writer was intellectually deficient; rather, the writer's home culture was different from that of the business world. This insight led to a natural interest in methods of providing remedial composition to expose these diverse writers to the logic and values of business. For example, in business, facts tend to be more valued than feelings, and factual evidence is more important than respect for the individual presenting the ideas. Improvements in grammar and spelling

came easily with practice. Discussing the cultural barriers of apparent logic and neutrality became an interesting challenge as what was “logical” and “neutral” became defined by those in power, rather than those for whom the impact of a policy or action was most critical. In other words, critical pedagogy was emerging.

With this increased level in writing came an increased willingness for students from backgrounds different from my White, middle-class American background to point out their own concerns. For example, although business classes tended to assume that economic development is a good thing for a national economy, a student from a developing country wrote a short paper pointing out examples in which multinational corporations were mandating changes from the government and conditions for the people remained extremely difficult. Students seemed more comfortable writing about their disagreements with assumptions and attitudes in a business class than speaking out, perhaps because writing seemed more anonymous and students had time to develop and refine their arguments, rather than needed to respond in the moment during class discussion. Later, as I learned about critical pedagogy, the connection between writing and the importance of developing diverse viewpoints to achieve the promise of democracy in a constantly changing world became even clearer.

As a product of California public education, I also took access to education for granted. Therefore, recently being on the front lines of watching cuts to public higher education in California made it clear that decisions were not based only on money, but on the values of educational leaders in choosing one group of students over another or one set of priorities over another. The role of leaders in advocating for their own systems and students spoke directly to servant leadership, illustrating the importance of protecting the

increasingly diverse students who seek to access higher education. Equally, leaders' roles spoke to transformational leadership, in these leaders' ability to articulate a vision, then effectively enact that vision by engaging the academic community and taxpayers in supporting higher education.

I currently serve as a full-time faculty member in the School of Business, Fashion and Hospitality at City College of San Francisco. In addition, currently I serve on the Basic Skills Committee and am faculty cochair of the Enrollment Management Committee. These experiences provide exposure to institutional leadership as well as shared governance practices that support higher education decision making at the administrative and faculty levels.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Overview of Data

The purpose of this study was to find the connection between support for diverse voices and administrative leaders' values, reflected in their actions and decisions in higher education. Writing programs are essential for students, particularly those from underrepresented backgrounds because these programs help students find their academic voices. As a result, these students can engage more deeply in school and later in life as they address social and scientific issues that affect their communities. Support for writing programs, then, is a proxy for the values of the administration in support of student voices and engagement.

I reviewed five universities. For each university, the homepage and leading information revealed what they perceived as most important to tell those who visited the website. Each had some form of strategic or long-range plan, which I studied to see where they planned to commit resources. I gathered the demographic data on each institution from the website or Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, and, in several cases, confirmed with the personnel at each university's office of institutional research to create a profile. Then, I evaluated each writing-program site to ascertain where it fit in the overall institution's culture.

For each university profiled, I interviewed the WPD in person. Four interviews took place in that WPD's office, whereas one was held in a conference room in the library. Each lasted between 1 and 2 hours. I recorded all five interviews on my laptop using a professional microphone to assure audio quality. I had the interviews transcribed

by a professional transcription service. The WPDs were available for follow-up questions and clarifications. Each reviewed the comments related to their institution to provide needed clarification. Table 2 provides a general summary of the writing programs for the universities where the WPDs served.

Table 2

Summary of Writing Programs Reviewed

Program facts	Arcadia	Northern	State	Urban	Valley
Job title of WPD	Tenured professor	Tenured professor	Tenured professor	Tenured professor	Tenured professor
Load reduction	60%	50%	25%	50%	75%
Age of program	10+ years	10+ years	10+ years	One year	10+ years
Period of time director has been in role	Codirector now stepping up, previous director in place for 10+ years	4 years	7 years	1-year program is brand-new	10+ years, though is now stepping down. New WPD not yet named.
Where reports in organization	Separate department reports to college dean	Separate department, reports to college dean	Part of English Department: Reports to chair	Split authority between English Department, college dean	Part of English Department: Reports to chair

Note. WPD = writing program director.

Profiles of Each Institution

To protect anonymity, each university was given a pseudonym. The information in the profiles was drawn from a combination of the universities' public statements and the interviews with the WPDs.

Arcadia

Arcadia, the smallest and most diverse of the universities reviewed, stated that its mission emphasizes research as well as access for local high school graduates. The university prizes engagement with the local community and has been recognized for these

efforts through its recent Carnegie Community Engagement Classification. Future plans emphasize dramatically increasing the size of the student population, with special attention to graduate students in the sciences to build their research profile.

The Arcadia website prominently features the writing program, which functions as an independent department. The writing program includes remedial composition, first-year composition, WID, and a writing minor for undergraduates. Because in the WID program, writing faculty teach specialized courses in departments such as psychology or engineering, the writing program collaborates closely with all other academic departments. Because of the large Latino population, the writing program is quite active with the Spanish Department and works with Department of Education Title V grants for Hispanic Serving Institutions and Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors Act initiatives for U.S.-born children of undocumented California residents.

Northern

Northern University, according to its Carnegie Classification, is a high undergraduate (HU) institution in which more than 75% of its students are undergraduates. It is a large, selective 4-year institution with very high research activity. Of all the universities profiled, Northern places the greatest emphasis on research, with global recognition for their accomplishments. Their communication describes the university's groundbreaking research as well as high-profile donations, placing themselves among the top tier of institutions. Still, the university boasts its diversity, its large population of first-generation students, and its commitment to the California Education Master Plan. Their growth and future direction did not indicate any dramatic

change, simply to grow in size to support more students while continuing their impressive research activities.

Northern's writing program was the most comprehensive of those profiled and enjoys national recognition. Its founder and director emeritus is highly respected and known in the writing world. The scope of the program includes preparatory ESL, first-year composition, WAC, WID, Master's, and PhD programs in writing, and offers professional development to noncomposition faculty along with corporate seminars to the private sector. Because of its cross-curricular offerings, the writing program has strong connections and support throughout the university. Unlike the other universities profiled, remedial composition is assigned to the local community college rather than performed onsite. Northern's WPD noted several times, however, that an influx of international students was impacting the department's offerings. The writing program recently took over preparatory ESL, and is seeking to grow this part of the program to include ESL courses for upper division students who need support, but at a higher level than fundamentals knowledge.

State

State's current Carnegie Classification is an HU medium sized 4-year inclusive campus that is primarily nonresidential. The college offers a range of master's degrees. They have been also been recognized by Carnegie Community Engagement for Curricular Engagement and Outreach and Partnerships.

State's website leads with messages about affordability and diversity. Like other California public universities, State found that budget cuts dramatically impacted its ability to implement its strategic plan over the past few years. Their future goals are to

continue doing their best for student success while attracting a diverse population, and more broadly, engaging the local community and businesses to ensure State's program offerings meet local needs. A key stated initiative is building effective writing skills for students to build communication skills that will serve students personally and professionally throughout their lives.

At State, the writing program includes remedial composition, first-year composition, a tutoring center, and WID. The writing program has shifted from a separate remedial English course to a "stretch" model in which first-year composition can be taken over 2 semesters, allowing students whose skills might not be as developed to build these skills over time. This change allows students to take 2 semesters of English as general-education credit toward graduation. The university is putting resources toward writing in line with the writing initiative; a new hire will be tasked with professional development for faculty and developing a WAC program. The writing program is also developing an upper-division writing certificate that will help students get internships in the local community to build the connections described in the overall direction of the university.

Urban

Urban university's website focuses on its successful job placement after graduation, particularly in engineering and business, as well as honoring its diverse student communities. The university expresses a sense of excitement about its students, emphasizing their high potential and passion for excellence. Community ties are deep, with programs connecting local social services, scientific and policy research institutions, and arts and history. Future initiatives include making Urban a more efficient, more

effective university for its students by using innovative curriculum and student support while upgrading the technology and capital infrastructure.

Until last year, writing outside the English Department was an uncoordinated effort that became a concern for their accreditation agency. As a result, the college dean advocated for bringing in two senior faculty to develop a WAC program and a first-year composition program. The WAC program is currently run as a separate unit in that college rather than reporting to the English Department or standing alone as a single writing program. For this research project, I interviewed only the WAC program director because of the focus on writing in non-English or traditional composition courses. The WPD is now establishing a Writing Fellows program in which undergraduates can earn money by helping faculty in writing-intensive classes, tutoring students and leading study groups. Although the university community has been very welcoming of the WAC program director, developing and implementing the necessary program assessments will be a challenge due to the inherent subjectivity of assessing writing, as well as the various disciplinary conventions that arise from comparing different departments to one another.

Valley

Valley's current Carnegie Classification is an HU large 4-year inclusive campus that is primarily nonresidential. The college offers a range of master's degrees and one doctoral program. They have been also been recognized by Carnegie Community Engagement for Curricular Engagement and Outreach and Partnerships.

Valley University's ambition is to grow from a local regional university to an international-destination campus that will have strong ties with the business community. The website's focus is on the future of the institution. The well-articulated strategic plan

seeks to increase the preparedness of incoming first-year and transfer students before they arrive at Valley, revamp the curriculum so students can graduate more quickly, build the research profile for students and faculty, become a flagship center for the community, and enjoy a strong academic reputation outside its traditionally served region.

The writing program includes first-year composition, the tutoring center, WAC, a graduate certificate, and an MA in Composition. Despite the national reputation of the program and its WPD, the WPD has stepped down and its future is uncertain. The faculty community is divided between those who supported the writing program and sought to defend it from the “curricular revamps” mentioned above, and those who saw finding efficiencies in the writing program as ways to increase resources for their own research and department’s prestige.

Research Questions and Findings

The five institutions were quite different: writing programs had different scopes of responsibility and were at different stages. Still, common themes emerged that mirrored those for other programs and for national trends.

Factors Promoting or Restricting Writing Programs

For the first question, *what do WPDs perceive to be the factors promoting or restricting writing programs*, the key issues were the university’s current mission and future goals for their student body. If a university’s primary mission was research, then undergraduate education and writing programs tended to be limited by the number of sections, shifting composition courses to community colleges, and using lower-cost, untenured faculty and graduate students to teach in the program, relegating more resources to research. In contrast, universities that led with a message about workforce

development put greater resources into writing programs due to the recognized need for these skills by employers. Schools seeking to increase their selectivity, that is, the rate at which applicants would be rejected, thereby hoping to increase the strength of their student body, tended to also limit their writing programs because writing was seen as less of an attraction for potential students. Universities that were generally satisfied with their selectivity had more stable writing programs. Below, I analyze experiences at the studied universities.

Research Mission

The key factor that supported the writing program was how writing fit into the overall mission of the institution. For those with a strong research agenda, such as Arcadia, Northern, and Valley the writing program was limited, balancing between research and undergraduate education. As mentioned earlier, Northern's writing program is well-established and brings recognition to the university. Still, the WPD at Northern commented, "As a writing program, we tend to emphasize undergraduate education and developing undergraduate students, but at a research one institution, maybe overall, research dollars tops. ... It's an interesting balance." Several years earlier, the university was not offering enough required upper division writing courses, so students were delaying graduation or fitting these courses into the summer session. A dean intervened from the jurisdiction of undergraduate programs, overstepping the dean of the research-oriented college where the writing program resides, to increase the number of sections offered so students could graduate on time. The WPD would like to innovate with new programs to serve undergraduates, and continues to advocate for these, but noted "that's going to put me in conflict with the dean of (college) who might have a different

agenda.” Although research and writing programs are well-established and supported at Northern, these build to different and apparently conflicting goals for the institution: prestige and recognition in academia versus providing an undergraduate education. Any research-oriented institution will experience these multidirectional strains on resources.

At Arcadia, the writing program is also highly visible and well-established; however, the institution’s plan clearly articulates an increasing emphasis on research. The WPD commented, “We’re shifting so heavily towards hiring in the sciences.” Each new science faculty member requires start-up costs for their laboratories beyond their salaries, so the writing program is not just holding steady, but is under pressure.

The writing program at Valley also experienced pressure from increased emphasis on research. This shift was reflected in the overall institutional mission as well as in the departmental home in English. First, Valley’s plan clearly indicates a desire to engage in more research, with specific goals of increasing the level of research-oriented grants, the number of publications, and mentoring for new faculty in research, suggesting a clear change in tenure requirements. The university specifically mentioned research as an area in which new funding will be prioritized. The plan also references streamlining the path to graduation, which implies eliminating certain courses that could lead to cost savings; these funds would be put toward research.

One example of streamlining impacted the writing program. Valley is unusual among California universities in that it has an additional sophomore composition requirement for graduation, in addition to their first-year composition and major-specific writing requirements. Several years ago the administration tried to eliminate this

requirement and after a heated battle with the faculty senate, was out-voted and the requirement remained. However, the political scars remain.

I think there is a perception on campus that the people who were proposing it were kind of the social climbers as far as the people who wanted to move up the ladder of administration. On this campus we are really divided: there is the, either you are “pro faculty” or you’re “pro administration.” ... The “pro faculty” people were against getting rid of the sophomore composition, the “pro administration” people were for it, so it was going to be hard for them to win that vote. (Former WPD, Valley University)

At Valley, sides were drawn regarding putting resources into writing as a critical component of undergraduate education, which faculty supported, versus achieving the administration’s vision of a university with international recognition through research. Faculty who hope to have their own initiatives supported or even move into administrative roles in the future faced much pressure to support administrative priorities, even at the expense of students.

In the English Department at Valley, the former WPD noted, “Well, we had the classical English Department battle. What happened was ... this is a story that’s out there everywhere.” As can happen in other universities in which the writing program reports to the English Department, a newly elected chair wanted to shift the department’s emphasis on research in traditional English (British) literature, relegating composition to service courses. As a result, any new tenure hires went to English literature whereas composition faculty, who were mostly untenured lecturers with no faculty voting rights, were shunted to the side. The writing program, in a state of flux as the WPD has stepped down, has limited organizational support for its activities. Although the courses will continue, the program’s lack of a leader to provide visibility and advocacy will likely cause it to shrink further in the future.

Workforce Development Mission

State and Urban, in describing their missions, are quite pragmatic and focus on workforce development and the economic impact on the local region. State's new initiative on writing clearly describes the professional benefits of good writing, and is building the writing certificate, which will help students get internships that may lead to jobs after they graduate. The writing program statement for State emphasizes communication skills and helping students raise their individual voices in the academic community. State's WPD emphasized the importance of the writing program by stating that "critical academic thinking is still the highest order of thinking. If you can do that, everything else is easier." The program is growing, with new personnel being hired to expand the program's offerings to include WAC, as well as writing-focused internships to build ties with the local business community while building students' experience. Unlike at Valley, although the program at State reports to the English Department chair, the chair is quite supportive of the program.

Urban's writing program is being formalized. A workforce-development theme, articulated by the WPD, means learning how to "write like a 'blank' and what's important about that is that's how as a professional you participate in your career, through writing." Like State, Urban recognizes that writing is an essential tool for business and community and is investing in the program.

Increasing Selectivity Versus Writing Program

A third factor that impacted universities' prioritization of writing programs was whether they were interested in increasing their selectivity, meaning the rate at which students would apply and not be accepted to the institution, thereby raising the academic

preparedness of incoming students. Increasing selectivity means fewer students will enter who need remediation in writing or basic tutoring support: activities viewed as pure cost centers that do not necessarily lead to increased prestige for the institution. For example, Northern is the most selective of all the universities profiled and the WPD indicated that as many as 70% of students achieved their remedial and first-year composition requirements off-campus, either transferring these from another institution or achieving scores on the English Advanced Placement Test. As a result, the university can focus resources on upper division students who have passed the first hurdle and are more likely to graduate, or on research activities.

Arcadia and Valley both seek to increase their selectivity in the coming years. As mentioned earlier, Arcadia seeks to increase emphasis on research, which in turn would raise the profile of the university, increase the rate of applicants, and allow the school to turn away less prepared students who would need additional services. As mentioned earlier, one potential strategy, now in abeyance, was to mimic that of Northern and send remedial students off-campus, along with their extra needs for tutoring and counseling. For Valley, the strategic plan states a desire to increase the rate of students who do not require remedial composition, as well as to increase the rate of transfer students who would already have completed their first-year composition requirements, similar to Northern. This means increasing selectivity, which will be driven by an increasing number of applicants drawn by the institution's increased prestige. Underneath this goal is the impact on underrepresented students, who are disproportionately placed into remedial composition. The result is that these students will be less visible at the

university, and sent the message that they do not really belong at college, thus marginalizing them before their academic careers even begin.

State and Urban apparently seem satisfied with their selectivity as it stands, and are investing in their writing programs. Their plans did not include any mention of making changes to their student profile or other activities. Rather, they plan to continue to better serve the students who come to them.

Conclusion

The mission of the institution—research or workforce development—was a clear factor in support or opposition to the writing program. Research activities tended to conflict with the writing program because of their focus on graduate students and faculty-driven projects. Workforce development supports the writing program because employers recognize the importance of writing skills, and the benefits are tangible for students' employability upon graduation. Finally, in a desire to increase selectivity and have less need for remedial and first-year composition, writing programs are diminished, allowing schools to assign greater resources to support students who are least likely to struggle: upper division and graduate students.

Value Student Voices and Engagement

For the second question, *what factors in educational administrative leadership cause leaders to value student voices and engagement*, the answer was less clear. In higher education it is impossible to have a singular vision or set of values for an institution as stakeholders have many competing needs and agendas. Further, administrators and faculty have very different spheres of influence. Educational leaders may highly value or have great disdain for student voices and engagement. However,

higher education is not a classic hierarchical model in which leaders set an idealized vision, then motivate followers to achieve these goals. Rather, colleges have a shared governance model in which administrators are responsible for budgets, human resources, fundraising, and other background efforts. Meanwhile, faculty are responsible for developing and executing academic programs such as a writing program or a curriculum that focuses on critical pedagogy, neoliberalism, or any other theme considered appropriate for that discipline. In addition, academic departments function independently of one another, so some factor accepted as truth in one field may be hotly disputed in another.

Further, the WPD might have particular views about weaving ideology and student voices into the classroom, but faculty in the disciplines must to incorporate or set aside these perspectives. For example, Northern offers a class in writing for social justice, yet the WPD noted, “You get the requirements in, and everyone spends a lot of time on it, and then 15 years later, the courses look very different.”

College executives’ influence on academic programs is limited to emphasis on where they recommend to assign budgets and personnel, yet the faculty hold votes to accept or reject administrative edicts that impact academic matters. For example, many years ago, Northern’s writing program was part of the English Department. The administration wanted to cut back on the university requirements and redirect the cost savings toward other initiatives. However, faculty across the campus valued the contribution of the writing program and, as a result, the writing program became an independent department with established tenure lines, where it remains today. In the same way, history repeated itself at Valley when administrators sought to eliminate the

sophomore composition requirement to cut costs and streamline graduation requirements. The faculty voted to keep this requirement, which caused a deep rift between the administration and faculty. However, administrators' values do impact in how they establish and communicate the overall vision and mission; invest in the long-term benefit of the future of the university; the service and support they provide to underrepresented students; and how much empowerment they allow in the overall university, as well as the writing program.

Establishing a Student-Centered Vision and Mission

Any institution needs a clear vision for the future so all stakeholders—students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the community—can work toward a common goal. Each university sought to express a unifying theme: research excellence that would help the overall human condition for Arcadia and Northern; commitment to workforce-development initiatives to build the economy at State and Urban; or Valley's aim of becoming a flagship institution for the region. As mentioned earlier, research requires competing for resources that are needed by the writing program, as experienced at Arcadia, Northern, and Valley, whereas workforce development and writing support each other, as experienced at State and Urban.

As mentioned earlier, Arcadia and Northern have research missions which, at times, put pressure on the writing program because writing programs are seen as a support function rather than one that is highly visible. At Valley, the desire to build the prestige and visibility of the university is clearly stated and articulated, but again, at the expense of the writing and other educational supports students felt they needed.

The students in a landslide said, "We want a refocus on educational support." That was really beneficial to us. Because out of that survey, the Writing Center

got additional funding. ... When the president was going through his “No Confidence Vote,” he took out a full page out. He didn’t take it out. The local business community took out a full page out, and that (city) was supporting him and saying what a wonderful guy he was. (Former WPD, Valley University)

As the changes were taking place at Valley, it was clear that the administration, in reaching out to the local business community, was making commitments that were not supported by students and faculty. However, the strategic plan clearly states that the intention is to align more fully the faculty and students’ personal goals with the institutional goals of growing research by tying mentoring to research and community internships. Although not everyone is happy with the changes, the university is consistently applying the changes and making sure resources align to these efforts.

Urban’s WPD had a positive sense about the workforce development mission and believed strongly in it.

There is a real mission here. We have tons of first-generation college students and somewhat lower socioeconomic class students and underrepresented minorities. This is a real ... I can’t think of the term. Someone was telling me that there’s some measure that schools will have of how many students they bring in who come from lower middle classes and lower class families and then this allows them to firmly get into the middle class or upper middle class. [Urban] is definitely one of those schools. (WPD, Urban University)

Writing is a tool for upward mobility, and thus provides access to civic and economic power for students. However, the deeper purpose for writing programs and the reasons for administrative support came with concerns as well. The emphasis on using writing as a job skill did not sit well with another WPD.

I designed a course for nursing students. One of the things I found, the students were not engaged in what we were having them write about. I’m pretty Marxist in my orientation. I didn’t like the fact that I’m using somebody’s future job to design a writing course. I had ethical dilemmas about that. I’m a humanitarian. I want that course to be about humanities issues. (WPD, State University)

Workforce development and making students better employees is a classic neoliberal, capitalist argument for investing in education. The WPD sensed a Faustian bargain in that, while believing strongly in education for social benefit, the WPD was reluctant to see the education being provided used simply to benefit employers and the economy. State's administration, believed the WPD, was more about business and budgets than about pure learning and intellectual pursuits.

Investing for the Long-Term Future

A university must put the long-term needs of the community and institution first. The most important example impacting writing programs was the backlog in required upper division writing classes at Northern, as mentioned earlier. State also had this issue at the remedial composition level. As mentioned before, State shifted from a 1-semester remedial composition class plus a 1-semester first-year composition class to a "stretch" class that covered first-year composition over 2 semesters. State was having difficulty scheduling enough sections of remedial composition and students were being forced out of the university for not having met this requirement. Both eventually got the problem solved by realizing it was grossly unfair to students whose education was being derailed. At Urban, simply creating the writing program is a sign of the long-term health of the institution, recognizing the importance of writing and investing in it.

Service To Most Vulnerable Students

In the earlier discussion about the importance of writing to provide a platform for marginalized students to build their cultural capital and engage with the institution, support for the writing program becomes a proxy for support for an empowering education. As the WPD for Urban noted "Stanford takes the rich kids and helps them

shine themselves up a little bit more and sends them on to still be rich. [Urban] takes poorer kids and we help them to have better lives.” State and Urban both led with an emphasis on diversity and both actively build their writing programs, implying a desire to support students in tangible ways.

For students, how colleges handle remediation has the most profound impact.

Said one WPD,

If they drove here and they showed up, they’re “college ready,” so then let’s design a curriculum that will [count for college credit]. If half of our students fail the English placement test, they’re not, “not college ready.” That’s who we have as students. (WPD, State University)

State, Urban, and Valley offer what is informally called a “stretch” version of first-year composition, in which takes a 1-semester class and slows it into 2 semesters so students who need more time to learn the concepts can take extra time to do so. The stretch version means all students integrate into the college community from the beginning, rather than immediately being labeled as remedial students, as any student can choose the traditional or stretch version of the course.

Empowerment

If the writing program is empowering to students, then empowering the writing program creates that platform for students’ empowerment. At all five universities, the writing programs, although led by tenured faculty, were mostly staffed by lecturers and adjuncts who were not empowered by voting rights, academic freedom, or job security. However, another factor for empowerment is the amount of time key individuals serve in their roles, so they can develop relationships and some level of institutional power. All WPDs except the one at Urban were long-time, tenured faculty, although Urban’s WPD was brought in with full tenure to ensure the ability to get things done and as a mark of

organizational support. Because four of the WPDs had been with their universities for several years and worked closely with multiple departments due to their WAC and WID programs, they had long-term and deep political networks across campus. These networks helped them be effective in building support across the faculty. For example, two WPDs experienced turf battles with other departments. In one case, disagreement arose over ownership of the tutoring center versus student services. In another case, adversity emerged over how much professional development the writing program should engage versus the official faculty-training department. Resolving these differences required long-term relationships across the organization so that, regardless of which department “won,” the necessary services could be effectively provided to the faculty and students.

Although the writing programs were stable, all the universities were experiencing some level of churn at the administrative level. Arcadia and State were hiring new administrators whose experience was outside of higher education, raising concerns for WPDs about fit for academia as well as whether priorities would remain on education. Northern and Valley had experienced many changes in leadership in the past few years and Northern was preparing, at press time, to reorganize again. The Valley WPD decided to leave because of lack of support from the new administration. At press time Urban was about to get a new president, perhaps leading to new impacts. However, because four of the WPDs were long-term tenured faculty with strong connections across campus and solid faculty support from other tenured faculty, these programs should be buffered from sudden changes in leadership direction.

Most important is the funding situation to ensure the writing program can meet its goals while ensuring all competing stakeholders at the university are reasonably satisfied. All WPDs mentioned the impact of budget cuts on the size and scope of their programs. Northern boasts of its big donors, mostly for research, though several were for scholarships; none were featured for undergraduate education. The WPDs mentioned additional resources such as Title V, which helps Hispanic-serving institutions as well as First in the World grants for innovation.

Support for Critical Pedagogy

The third question, *to what extent are critical-pedagogy values, supportive of writing programs, present in higher education leaders, institutional literature, and institutional funding patterns*, tied clearly back to the role for writing programs. None of the institutions or writing programs explicitly used the term “critical pedagogy” though all focused on making the world a better place through their missions of research (Arcadia and Northern) or local economic benefit (State, Urban, and Valley). A place persist to question the social impact of the results of these missions, and to ensure members of that society equally share the benefits and costs. However, these discussions would be taking place at the individual academic program level, which was outside the scope of this research. The connection is loose because each academic department works independently of the writing program and the university’s overall administration. Still, the institutional reviews and interviews with the WPDs demonstrated evidence of the opportunity for critical pedagogy.

Education for Social Change

Critical pedagogy is education for social change. Arcadia and Northern seek to make the world better through scientific research which, superficially, does not connect to social change. However, the WPD at Northern articulated the connection between the research mission, the writing program, and critical pedagogy with the following statement:

How do you translate the benefit of that really specific research for a more general audience? How do you make political decisions? How do you make decisions around water and water resources and those pluses and minuses clear to a more general public? How do you engage people in those debates? Those are things we think about in the program. (WPD, Northern University)

The writing program's role, then, is to help communicate the results of whatever research is created, and then provide students with the tools to engage, ensuring the costs and benefits of this research are shared equitably.

On a more pragmatic level, Urban's view of social change is that "we take poorer kids and we help them to have better lives." Access to education means access to economic power and the resulting social and political capital needed to drive social change. Hopefully these graduates will remember their communities and return to support them. Another WPD articulated this by stating,

My concern is all these students over here are going to vote someday. They're all going to have a public voice someday. They're all going to be in some way oppressed someday. If they don't have rhetoric and critical thinking, those skills to be able to think through, they're at a disadvantage. (WPD, State University)

The mission of the writing program is to develop these rhetoric and critical-thinking skills, along with the communication skills to enable students to advocate for themselves and their communities in the future.

Message That Students Are Important

A second focus of critical pedagogy is the message that students are important. At Arcadia, the writing program gives students a chance to participate in research through an undergraduate research journal. Valley and Northern feature examples of excellent student writing on their websites. These writing programs help show students, early in their academic careers, that their ideas and experiences matter. The challenge, however, is encouraging students to look outward.

You push as hard as you can to get students to think like academics think, critically. It begins with paper number one. . . . Critical pedagogy is trying to get students to say, "Here's my experience, and here's why it matters socially and culturally." It's not this, "I graduated from high school, and my parents were so proud of me. I learned that if you try hard, you can do it." (WPD, State University)

Simply making students write a narrative essay is not enough. Students must be pressed to make the connection between themselves and broader trends, and be willing to challenge basic assumptions.

However, in the case of Valley and changing priorities in the English Department, a deeper message emerged: for non-European, non-Anglophone students, their culture is not worthy of academic study.

Our (English) Department is very focused on kind of, the idea that British literature is civilizing to these diverse students. It's really old fashioned. Our department reminds me of like 1950s. The faculty is very 1950s in their thinking. They don't really want literary theory. They don't want multiculturalism. They just want to focus on traditional close reading, formalized close reading of the great texts and the canon of literature and that means dead White guys. (WPD, Valley University)

Rather than exposing students to diverse literacies and points of view, the goal of this department was to uphold one culture and its body of literature as the ideal. Losing the writing program and narrowing the cultural focus of the department might be

coincidental, or it might send the message to students that their ideas and cultures are not only unimportant in the English Department, but throughout the entire university.

Empowerment Through Constructivism

A third tenet of critical pedagogy is that students are empowered by constructing knowledge. The writing programs clearly state outcomes related to this approach, rather than expecting students to repeat and recite, or simply to practice their grammar and spelling. For example, one writing program specifically asks students to reconcile multiple perspectives. Another asks students to use their critical-thinking skills to combine their own ideas with those of others in the discourse community. The writing program is a key way for students to build the necessary skills to engage in their other coursework.

Cross-Curricular Connections

Critical pedagogy also means students should be able to make connections across academic departments. All the writing programs enjoyed deep relationships because they work with other departments to help create and develop their writing programs. In addition, Arcadia works closely with the Spanish Department due to the large Latino population. Northern has a course that meets the first-year composition requirements in the Native American Studies Department, and offers a class in writing for social justice that attracts students majoring in subjects such as ethnic studies, community studies, and gender studies.

Challenging and Engaging Discussions

Critical pedagogy means engaging in challenging discussions. As discussed earlier, critical pedagogy is enabled through critical thinking, developing communication

skills, and making connections to oneself and broader issues. One university clearly recognizes the power given to students by giving them the tools to enter the public discourse. Having those challenging discussions means having the tools to do so.

Access To The Language of Power

Essential to writing programs and to critical pedagogy is teaching the so-called *language of power*. At a basic level, it is the grammar and spelling that marks the writer as having social and cultural capital, and thus the credibility, to be heard. One university clearly states the importance of appropriate language.

Further, Urban sees access to the language of power as a deeper mission than just providing basic writing hygiene.

We're doing good in the world and I'd say our dean really emphasizes that a lot. These students are having this wonderful opportunity. A lot of their parents are immigrants who don't speak English. They're going to come out with a degree and good skills in the English language. That sort of deals with the writing program and that'll allow them to live more secure and better lives. (WPD, Urban University)

Providing students with writing skills is more than just providing workers for the neoliberal U.S. economic engine. When a student comes to college, they have the skills to provide a secure financial future for themselves, their families, and their communities. Writing is a crucial part of participating in professional and civic life, but more broadly, writing is an essential skill for completing that undergraduate education.

However, tension exists between teaching the hegemonic forms of communication and forcing these over a community's own language. Northern's WPD described this tension:

The old forces the students' right to their own language versus immersing the students in academic discourse. Where does a writing program fit on that? In many ways, a writing program, particularly one that's very sort of WID-based, probably falls more on the lines of pushing students towards conventional forms

of discourse. I think our faculty think really hard around how do you prepare students for when you're doing a business writing course? How do you prepare students both for the conventions of business writing within a capitalist enterprise, international global enterprise? How do you do that in a way that engages ethics, engages critical inquiry? It's really to think about the students we get and not rob them of their own languages but teach code switching or maybe even code matching, as much as just academic discourse forms. (WPD, Northern University)

The goal, then, is to encourage students to find the balance: learning to use the language of power as a tool while using their community forms of discourse as another tool, depending on the circumstances.

The role of remediation must be addressed in this discussion because of the high proportion of students from underrepresented communities who require extra help before first-year composition. The way these students are treated has a marked bearing on how engaged they will be in the college curriculum. Northern has few of these students initially, as many have already passed first-year composition before attending Northern. However, for Arcadia, one key area where the writing program was seen as a potential source for cost savings was the idea to send remedial English students to the local community college. The WPD was concerned about the reduction in scope for the overall writing program, but further, the impact on the most vulnerable students.

We think writing is so important. Why would we not have experts at our campus to do this with our students? Why would we put our students who are multilingual, at risk, all those things, in large classroom environments off campus? Isn't that sending the wrong message? (WPD, Arcadia University)

Arcadia's WPD is concerned that students start with a solid footing in their writing skills, and is concerned that the writing program's loss of control over the students' entry into a core skill development could put the student at longer term risk, due to inconsistencies in scope and content as they matriculate into first-year composition and beyond. Although the plan to relegate students to off-campus courses is in abeyance, it

may arise again in the future. Another California university has recently brought their remedial composition back into their writing program from the local community college for these very reasons. In a different approach, State, Urban, and Valley developed more innovative programs such as the “stretch” program, which engages students immediately and avoids the stigma of being placed in remedial composition. However, Valley’s stated goal is to admit fewer students who need first-year composition in the first place. The long-term result may be less diversity at Arcadia and Valley.

Writing courses have a higher cost than traditional large lecture courses, and this was also seen at the universities. Classes are limited in size to assure personal attention to students. Northern, Urban and Valley also offer professional development to non-composition faculty to help them use writing assignments more effectively. However, all the programs relied on non-tenured faculty – full-time lecturers or adjuncts – who are paid less than tenured faculty and lack job security and academic freedom.

Summary of Findings

Writing programs are a solid microcosm for the overall university’s values. The WPDs perceived that their programs are most supported when emphasis is on students’ skill development, engagement with the university community, and future participation in the economy and society. Pressure to diminish the program accrues when the focus is on research, which has a broader view than just the benefit of the students, as well as growing the prestige and visibility of the university.

In valuing student voices, universities with well-supported writing programs were also those that had a more student-centered mission. Their websites led with pride in students’ contributions and in their service to diverse students. Although the connection

to critical pedagogy was less overt, universities with stronger writing programs took pride in social change and these programs were well-connected through the institution. These connections helped ensure challenging discussions in which students would be empowered to build social and cultural capital to advocate for their communities.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND FURTHER STUDY

The purpose of this study was to identify the impact of leaders' values on critical pedagogy in higher education settings, as enacted through writing programs. The support for writing programs depends, in part, on the value an institution's leaders places on hearing diverse student voices as an essential part of the academic discourse. These leaders' values are represented at the most tangible level by funding writing programs. Connecting institutions' stated values with actual funding patterns and strength of writing programs, a greater understanding emerges of how to best empower diverse populations by protecting academic programs that invite these students to bring new perspectives that continuously advance academic theory and public policy.

Discussion Regarding Research Questions

Research Question 1: Factors

This question primarily explored the relationship between the writing program and the overall institution from the perspective of the WPD. If the institution focused on research or was seeking to increase its selectivity and reputation, the writing program was seen as a cost center and a source of potential savings, enabling resources to be used elsewhere in the college. However, if the institution focused on workforce development and had a strong student-centered mission, then the writing program became strategically important.

Underrepresented and marginalized peoples must become empowered to speak up for their own needs rather than waiting for a leader from outside their community to hear their concerns and respond (Freire, as cited in Greenleaf, 1977). Fundamentally, UCs and

CSUs exist to empower California residents. Both systems boast of serving a high rate of first-generation and low-income students as well as drawing from the 40% of California households that are multilingual. All five universities serve ethnically and economically diverse populations. By nature, their presence is a solid example of servant leadership on the part of the State of California.

Universities with a strong student-centered mission and emphasis on workforce development were more supportive of writing programs, evidenced by State and Urban. This result ties to transformational leadership, in that leaders at these colleges articulated a clear vision for the institution and tied employees personally to these goals, ensuring a level of organizational consistency (Rafferty & Griffin, 2004). Similar results emerged when one university included writing in the mission statement and strongly supported the program (Jackson & Morton, 2007). This same dynamic put pressure on the writing programs at Arcadia, Northern, and Valley, when the emphasis was more on research than on student learning. The WPDs experienced direct competition with research and other initiatives designed to raise the prestige of the institution. Jackson and Morton's (2007) and Brady's (2013) studies experienced similar patterns when the research universities they studied decided to put more effort into research and less into teaching and learning. In the Jackson and Morton example, the writing program was implemented as an afterthought, whereas for Brady, the studied university sought to increase its research reputation, rendering writing programs less valuable to the overall mission. It should be noted, however, that Northern's program was the largest and most comprehensive of all the writing programs reviewed, even though the university is also the most heavily research-oriented, so these are not directly in conflict with one another.

In 2004, Smith et al. found that servant leadership exists in a stable organization whereas transformational leadership is most often associated with organizational change. All the universities profiled were undergoing some form of change in administration and focus during the period when the interviews took place. Evidence emerged of transformational leadership, meaning that the writing programs' goals and direction were changing to fit the new vision; in another leadership model, the writing programs might have experienced the university vision as a series of statements that did not align with their own activities. For Arcadia and especially Valley, the push for increased research budgets meant pressure to diminish the writing program, although Arcadia continued to emphasize its special role in serving the local community of underserved high school students. Valley was shifting in the opposite direction, hoping to attract more students from outside its immediate service area who were better prepared and thus there would have less need for first-year composition other writing supports. Meanwhile, changes in leadership at State and Urban drove increased support for the writing program. The impact on Northern remained undetermined at the time of this publication, as the college was likely about to be reorganized. As mentioned earlier, this was similar to the experiences in the Brady (2013) and Jackson and Morton (2007) studies, when colleges were balancing student learning and research.

On a more empirical level, at the research sites themselves, servant leadership, is more strongly demonstrated the longer the leader has been in the organization because they have been able to nurture relationships and negotiate for resources over a period of time to benefit their constituents (Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006). To illustrate this theory, four of the five WPDs were tenured faculty who had served at their universities (Arcadia,

Northern, State, and Valley) for at least 10 years and supported long-standing writing programs. Urban's WPD had been recently hired with tenure to lead a new program, demonstrating the university's commitment and ensuring the WPD had the stature needed to work across campus. Cross-campus connections and long-standing relationships were very important to the first four WPDs in developing support among the faculty when the administration was putting pressure on their programs, or when there were interdepartmental battles with student services over who owned writing-support programs, or who owned professional development. For Urban, while too new to have had any meaningful conflicts, the support of tenure is expected to help as changes resolve.

In Brady's (2013) case study of two writing programs, both relied on at-will administrators and were primarily staffed by untenured adjuncts, thereby relying on tenured faculty outside the program for support and stability. In this case, the California programs were in a relatively strong position. This observation supports the concept that servant leadership also thrives, found when deep personal relationships and organizational stability are essential, but also that transformational leadership most aligns with dynamic, rapidly changing environments (Smith et al., 2004). At Urban, the decision to increase emphasis on workforce development meant the writing program was created and nurtured, whereas at Valley, the shift in focus from academic fundamentals to research and institutional prestige meant the writing program was scaled back in favor of other priorities.

These writing programs come at a higher cost than a traditional lecture model due to smaller class sizes and additional support (Townsend, 2001). Although the university

is research-oriented, Northern boasts of large donations, which mean the college can support an altruistic and long-term mission (Christensen et al., 2014). Strong financial resources mean multiple and conflicting stakeholder requests can be satisfied (Doh & Quigley, 2014). Northern can afford to support research as well as a comprehensive writing program rather than being forced to balance priorities as at less well-funded universities. The other four universities mentioned additional resources such as Title V and First in the World grants, which helped boost funding for writing programs. Jackson and Morton's example of a failed program noted the impossibility of teaching 75 students in a weekly, 1-hour section. To manage expenses, using a strategy observed by Kilgore and Cook (2007), the writing programs at all five universities were staffed predominantly by lecturers or adjuncts who did not have tenure and could not vote on department or faculty-senate issues. This high rate of untenured, nonvoting faculty positioned the writing program in a weaker position than departments with a large number of tenured faculty, despite the strong position of an individual tenured faculty director, because such a small voting pool could easily be overwhelmed. As a result, as in the case of Valley, because the faculty who staffed the program lacked voting rights, the program was diminished in favor of other initiatives.

Strong writing programs need visibility above the department level to be autonomous, and this is especially important in light of the nontenure-track, adjunct status of the faculty who teach the classes (Townsend, 2008). To offset the weaker position of the writing faculty, writing programs should be independent of the English Department, so that these would be perceived as valuable disciplines in themselves rather than negotiating interference from a different academic department (Anson, 2006;

McMullen-Light, 2010). Arcadia and Northern report to a college dean, Urban reports to the English Department and a college dean. Although State reports to the English Department chair, the writing program enjoys strong support due to the overall institutional mission. Valley's reporting relationship to a narrowly focused English Department rather than a college-wide administrator, along with the changing direction of the university, left it vulnerable. The two most supported programs—State and Urban—reported directly to the English Department chair. Northern and Arcadia were independent programs and, while well-supported, competed for funds with research priorities. For Valley, reporting to the English Department did not hurt its support in other disciplines, but the English Department had its own priorities and decided to scale back the program on its own. Thus, the reporting relationship, at least in these institutions, did not seem particularly important to support for the program.

Students from underrepresented backgrounds are more likely to require remediation (National Center of Education Statistics, 2012). In other words, these students lack skills in using the language of power (Shor, 1992). Servant leadership, by serving the most vulnerable populations (Greenleaf, 1977), was demonstrated at Arcadia, State, Urban, and Valley by supporting students who needed help with writing, either by offering remedial composition on campus or a 2-semester “stretch” version of first-year composition. Northern is not ignoring these students, but because they are a highly selective institution with approximately 70% of its students not needing remediation or first-year composition, the writing program puts more of its emphasis on upper-division students. However, the desire to increase selectivity at Arcadia and Valley means fewer

remedial students—those who derive from underrepresented backgrounds—will be admitted in the future.

The key factor supporting any writing program is that the institution's mission supports student learning and sees writing as core to that mission. Ideally the program should report directly to a college dean rather than be part of the English Department, and should be staffed and led by tenured faculty; however, actual results were mixed when profiling these programs. Competition with the research agenda for funding and institutional visibility arose several times in the five profiled programs as well as the literature, and this ties back to the institutional mission. The next question explored factors related to the values the administrative leadership held and displayed, and how these might be reflected in support for writing programs.

Research Question 2: Values

Question 2 explored educational leaders' actions that nurtured student voices and engagement. I sought evidence of servant leadership and transformational leadership using the factors in Greenleaf's (1977) theory of servant leadership and Burns's (1978) theory of transformational leadership, tying these to the support, or lack thereof, of factors in student engagement. Parolini, Patterson, and Winston (2009) differentiated between servant and transformational leadership in that servant leadership addresses relationships between leaders and constituents, whereas transformational leadership emphasizes the connection between organizational and constituent goals to accomplish an overall mission. In this study, the connection between leadership theory and valuing student voices was unclear because educational leaders have little influence on what happens in academic departments. However, the values of the administration do emerge

in how they describe their vision and mission in relation to students; how they invest in the long-term benefit of the future of the university; how they provide service and support to underrepresented students; and how much empowerment they allow in the university and in the writing program.

As noted earlier, writing programs are costly due to their teaching-intensive nature. Kuh et al. (2008) and Pike et al. (2011) found strong positive relationships between spending on teaching and student engagement, learning, and persistence, particularly among underrepresented students. Strong investment in writing programs, and thus teaching, reflect the institutional leadership's value of student voice and engagement, as well as the long-term benefit of the institution.

When schools demonstrated servant leadership, it was in support of writing programs. Barbuto and Wheeler's (2006) definition included altruistic calling and organizational stewardship, in that leaders work to make a positive difference in their constituents' lives. Again, the missions of State and Urban were quite student-centered and their needs for writing programs were met and supported. Further, procedural justice, defined by Mayer, Bardes, and Piccolo (2008) as fair and thoughtful treatment, was clear when Northern and State added sections to the writing program so that students who had delayed graduation or were disqualified from the university due to overregistration in their writing course could attend the required class.

The servant leadership idea of supporting and engaging the most vulnerable members of the community, in this case, the remedial and first-year composition students who were most likely to need remediation, and statistically most likely to be from underrepresented populations, came forward. At Arcadia, State, and Urban, students are

immediately part of the community, although Arcadia had been recently asked to copy Northern's model of sending remedial students to the local community college. Although Arcadia decided not to execute this plan for the time being, it may come up again. State had difficulty aligning its curricular offerings by ensuring sufficient numbers of remedial composition classes were available to students for a period of time, causing them to be ousted for not meeting their academic goals. Caution should be taken in putting too much judgment on Northern because they had relatively few students who required these courses; however, Valley has an explicit goal of reducing the number of students who require remediation and first-year composition, which will likely reduce the number of underrepresented students.

The servant leadership theme of empowerment appeared in Van Dierendonck and Nuijten's (2011) factor analysis on servant leadership as well as the literature on critical pedagogy. Empowered organizations mean that constituents—in this case, faculty and students—have a strong voice. Faculty do not view themselves as “followers” of the administration who need to be empowered, but as a source of their own power through their control of curricular matters (T. Heaney, 2010). At Valley, the opposite of empowerment took place when faculty and students expressed preference for a strong writing program but were ultimately overruled by administrators with other priorities.

Positive leadership models such as servant leadership and effective forms of transformational leadership strongly aligned with support for writing programs with consistently roles in creating and nurturing student voices in the academy. Transformational leadership, which tends to come with changes to the organization—ranging from the mission to the daily activities of constituents—could go either direction.

In the cases of State and Urban, clearly articulated missions of student learning and workforce development led to increased support for the programs and new resources. In the case of Valley and, to a lesser extent Arcadia, the new focus on research and institutional prestige meant that transformational leadership aggressively diminished programs such as writing, that were believed not to align with these new goals.

Research Question 3: Critical Pedagogy

For this question, the connection was loose. Not only do university leaders lack control over curriculum matters, but writing programs themselves do not influence content in other academic departments. Further, Institutions defined social responsibility and social change differently. Freire's (1970) definition of education as a source of revolutionary change was not apparent. Arcadia and Northern, and to growing extent, Valley, are research-driven institutions that seek to improve the world through scientific discovery. Still, Arcadia has a special role in its local service area of providing access to higher education. In contrast, State and Urban seek to provide education that will help students participate in the economy from a more empowered position. Both perspectives are valuable; still, what students would do with this education depends on the individual student's inclinations and what they learned in their academic majors.

Sidler (2005) and Kapp and Bangeni (2009) remembered that each generation of college students will be the first to grapple with certain significant advancements, such as genetic research or the changes to South African society and culture, as apartheid loses its official grip. Students' ability to work with these issues in a just way must be nurtured from the beginning. In the five profiled programs, students are immediately told their points of view are important by stimulating them to do academic research from early in

their education, demonstrated at all five universities by examples of student research and explicitly articulated writing program outcomes that encourage engagement with the academic discourse. The presence of the writing program sends the message that students are expected to be active learners and that their point of view is important (Macedo, 1994; Pobywajlo, 2001). Simply having the writing programs in place is not an automatic guarantee that students will be able to critique the curriculum (LeCourt, 1996; Villanueva, 2001). However, the writing programs created a platform and internal culture at all the universities so that students could, if so inclined, take their learning to practice engaging with the academy and perhaps, later, help empower their own communities. Education such as this is empowering (Shor, 1992), situating the student immediately in the academic discourse.

Empowerment through constructing knowledge for oneself and engaging in rigorous discussions (Freire, 1998b) was clearly described in writing-program outcomes. Students were given the tools to think for themselves and communicate their ideas. Writing programs, with their connections to other departments—WID approaches used by Arcadia and State, or the WAC models in Northern, Urban, and Valley—would ideally shift to students, helping them make cross-curricular connections by establishing a common communication platform across all academic disciplines so students could communicate and critique one another (Macedo, 1994; Russell, 2002).

Crucially, education provides students with the skills to participate in economic and civic life from an empowered, rather than a dependent position, evidenced by Arcadia, State, and Urban, with their clear messages of pride of access and diversity, as well as State and Urban's explicit expression of writing as a critical skill for workforce

engagement. A tension emerges here in that education has become more overtly focused on job training and less on pursuing knowledge, critiquing theory, and developing new ideas (Harris, as cited in Rutz, 2012). As mentioned earlier, the writing that is being provided is not merely correcting sentence construction but research and academic engagement, providing exactly the format needed to enable critical pedagogy at the university and beyond.

A writing program has a profound impact on underrepresented students by providing access to the language of power (Macedo, 1994; Russell, 2002; Shor, 2009). This impact starts by providing remedial and first-year composition to students who might not have been exposed to academic forms of discourse in their homes and communities. The student has now moved from outsider to insider, situating them inside the academy with the appropriate communication modes so as they move toward graduation, they can accumulate their own social and cultural capital. These young adults can now educate their peers in college and expose them to new ideas, while perhaps recounting contradictions and inaccuracies in current academic theory.

Support for a writing program is, in itself, is a first step to critical pedagogy and empowering marginalized groups, because even if not explicitly stated as a goal, these are the results. Students are told their voices are important because they are asked to discuss and research, rather than memorize current topics. They are asked to find answers for themselves and argue their points of view from their own experiences and perspectives rather than mimicking an official stance. Finally, they are presented the access to power through higher education and the tools to engage, through training in

language and forms of discourse used in business, government, and academia, to ensure they will be heard.

Implications

California is emerging from its budget crisis, and funding is flowing back into its public university system. Meanwhile, demographics in California are changing, with a growing number of English-language learners and students of color graduating from high school and accessing higher education. In this changing environment comes the need to engage these new student voices to ensure California citizens are empowered both narrowly, through improved employment options, and broadly, with their newfound access to social and cultural capital. Writing programs provide a marketable skill for college students, but more important, programs align to critical pedagogy and engage the next generation of Californians to ensure these communities' diverse voices will be heard.

One surprising contradiction was that, despite real concern about neoliberalism, with corporate America turning higher education into overblown trade schools, the colleges that seemed most explicit about preparing students for the workforce were the most willing to support their writing programs. Although mixed feelings emerged among WPDs about the direct connection between writing and employability, these fears of coopting the idealistic mission of higher education can be allayed through emphasis on writing programs. To do so, assumptions must include that critical pedagogy and writing programs are natural partners, and access to jobs and economic power are critical to resolving issues of social injustice for previously excluded communities

Recommendations for the Profession

For WPDs, the key factor is connecting to institutional outcomes, reflected positively at State and Urban, negatively at Valley, and with mixed results for Arcadia and Northern. Workforce development and student future employability were the strongest messages, despite some discomfort about being so direct about economic benefits rather than social or intellectual justification. As the WPD at Northern clearly articulated, writing is essential to successfully communicating the results of research, thereby making the argument for support for both programs. New leadership brings change, and effective transformational leaders will ensure changes are worked through the organization in the business world (Choudhary et al., 2013) and in university writing programs (Jackson & Morton, 2007).

Although Anson (2006) and McMullen-Light (2010) had different experiences, the reporting relationship for the writing program—English or as a separate department—was not consistently meaningful in aligning with institutional support. Writing programs must have deep ties and support across the university to continue to evolve and grow (Anson et al., 2003; Brady, 2013). Having long-time administrators and faculty allows these relationships time to develop (Barbutto & Wheeler, 2006).

The National Center for Education Statistics (2014) noted that college students are increasingly coming from underrepresented backgrounds, and in California, this trend is clear and is expected to continue (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). For California public universities to graduate excellent researchers and contributors to the California economy, as well as to ensure all communities are empowered to advocate for themselves, writing

programs and the anticipated resulting critical pedagogy will be necessary for the system to retain its relevance in the future.

Recommendations for Future Study

Several WPDs mentioned they had never been asked, until now, about administrative or political issues for their programs; yet these issues were very important to the survival of these programs on campus. Although I found several studies that considered cross-campus issues around writing programs, more opportunities exist to study the relationship among a university's administrative leadership, its writing programs, and its overall mission.

I profiled only five universities for this study. Each WPD had a very different personality, and each university varied in environment and focus. Applying the same methodology to more universities would help reinforce and clarify the themes found in the first few profiles and, most likely, identify new factors that support or restrict writing programs, or find ways of enabling student empowerment and critical pedagogy.

Next, the connection between writing programs and critical pedagogy was simply an enabling relationship; not a direct one. An opportunity may exist to seek writing programs that have an explicit focus on critical pedagogy to discern if these have a direct influence on the content and teaching in other academic departments. Related to this issue is the impact of cultural diversity on writing programs: how do highly diverse writing programs differ from those that are more monocultural? Further, how do diverse programs adapt to include or manage the many voices and perspectives?

Another opportunity for further study is the way universities handle remedial composition, because this has a disproportionate impact on underrepresented students.

The language and priorities around decisions is essentially speaking to the university's perception of these students. As several California universities, including those profiled in this study, seek to change their approach to remedial composition, a series of case studies could illuminate how higher education institutions in California are handling increasing social and ethnic diversity. Are they seeking to include and engage students creatively, or are they seeking to isolate these students further from university life until they pass some arbitrary skills test?

Because writing programs are generally staffed by contingent, nontenure-track faculty and adjuncts, the lack of training and engagement for these faculty members is a general concern across all subject areas nationwide. Faculty need training in pedagogy as well as handling sensitive issues as these arise; some universities provide this training whereas others do not. Further, the connection between writing and critical pedagogy may risk situating writing instructors, who may be providing the tools to critique the rest of the academy, too far outside the academic mainstream to effectively deliver the promised connection of critical pedagogy through writing programs. This concept has several potential layers: the composition of the writing-program faculty and their relative support on campus; the training these faculty receive; and how active and engaged the rest of the institution is in supporting student critiques and challenging discussions.

One limitation of the study was that not all the universities profiled participated in the NSSE. The survey asked questions related to the amount of writing students do as well as their opportunity to engage in critical pedagogical activities such as engaging with students from different ethnic backgrounds or studying alternative points of view. Finding a relationship between the amount of writing and the types of student

engagement would be another way to evaluate the importance of writing programs on a broad scale. Although correlation is not causation, if there is a strong correlation, colleges that seek to improve their engagement, and thus persistence and success, could do so by simply putting more resources into their writing programs.

A final issue that has piqued the media is that UC and CSU institutions are accepting increasing numbers of international and out-of-state students who pay higher tuition and fees than in-state students. Concerns emerged about access for the children of California taxpayers who support these institutions with their tax dollars. Despite anecdotal data, the facts are not entirely clear in that not all eligible California students choose to attend UC or CSU because these students also have private and out-of-state public options; their decision factors are unknown. Analyzing the actual equity impact on these shifting policies will help determine whether these nonresident attendees affect California residents' access to higher education, particularly for first-generation students. This issue has broader implications for student access and impacts on writing programs in that increasing numbers of foreign students require a different form of writing support and pedagogy than is necessary for native English speakers whose home dialect may not match that of the university. For example, are foreign students whose English writing skills need work kept at the university on a special track of composition for ESL while Californian underrepresented populations are sent to the local community college? Approaches to writing programs for these students can provide understanding of the values of administrative leaders in inclusion and critical pedagogy.

Concluding Thoughts

Fundamentally, UCs and CSUs exist to serve the California population. Both systems boast of serving first-generation students, and as mentioned earlier, 40% of California households are multilingual. The universities profiled all had highly ethnically and socially diverse student populations who will become the next generation of economic and political leaders in California and the United States, if not across the world. Writing programs are a crucial path for students to find a common platform to engage with one another, as well as with the institution, and later with the broader community and society. Having these communication tools means future leaders can engage in social justice and social change.

When I first began teaching business at a community college, I would make my students write papers to help build their skills and was soon fascinated by their diverse points of view, which forced me, as well as other instructors, to rethink accepted norms and dispositions of our own academic disciplines. I learned of critical pedagogy and writing programs, and that these were quite controversial in certain circles. Critical pedagogy meant students who “lacked sophistication” were allowed to challenge canonic ideas before they had earned the right, so to speak. Those who were unsupportive of critical pedagogy would argue that students’ own experiences and perspectives were simply not sufficient to allow them to do more than politely regurgitate the theories presented by instructors, rather than pointing out information from their own cultures and histories that directly contradicted those in the class. Writing programs were accused of being monolingualistic and monocultural, forcing a form of White middle-class writing on diverse populations and thus imposing another form of oppression by curtailing students’

language expression. More recently, teaching academic writing could be considered merely tedious busywork for students who today are called “digital natives,” who do not need to write papers or do thoughtful analysis to compete today’s online, global, 140-character world.

Engaging in this study meant uncovering the deeper role of California public universities in responding to an increasingly diverse population. It also meant applying leadership theory to academic programs and making connections to serving diverse populations by focusing on writing as one of the most foundational academic skills students need. Finally, I sought to find ways students could engage in critical pedagogy across the entire curriculum and asked whether writing programs could deliver on their potential in doing so. Although results were mixed due to the inherent independence administrative leadership and the various academic departments have from one another, the fact that writing programs and critical pedagogy are connected to one another became clear.

REFERENCES

- Anson, C. M. (2006). Assessing writing in cross-curricular programs: Determining the locus of activity. *Assessing Writing, 11*, 100–112. doi:10.1016/j.asw.2006.07.001
- Anson, C. M., Carter, M., Dannels, D., & Rust, J. (2003). Mutual support: CAC programs and institutional improvement in undergraduate education. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines, 6*(3), 25–37. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Barbuto, J. E., Jr., & Wheeler, D. W. (2006). Scale development and construct clarification of servant leadership. *Group & Organization Management, 31*, 300–326. doi:10.1177/1059601106287091
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). London, England: Psychology Press.
- Bean, J. C., Carrithers, D., & Earenfight, T. (2005). Transforming WAC through a discourse-based approach to university outcomes assessment. *WAC Journal, 16*, 5–21. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Beaufort, A. (2012). College writing and beyond: Five years later. *Composition Forum, 26*(Fall). Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ985817.pdf>
- Beck, C. D. (2014). Antecedents of servant leadership: A mixed methods study. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 21*, 299–314. doi:10.1177/1548051814529993
- Boyd, J. (2010). The best of both worlds: The large lecture, writing-intensive course. *Communication Teacher, 24*, 229–237. doi:10.1080/17404622.2010.513992

- Brady, L. (2013). Evolutionary metaphors for understanding WAC/WID. *WAC Journal*, 24, 7. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Braun, S., Peus, C., Weisweiler, S., & Frey, D. (2013). Transformational leadership, job satisfaction, and team performance: A multilevel mediation model of trust. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 270–283. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.11.006
- Brown, F. W., & Moshavi, D. (2002). Herding academic cats: Faculty reactions to transformational and contingent reward leadership by department chairs. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8(3), 79–93. doi:10.1177/107179190200800307
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial Political Classics.
- California State University. (2015). *California State University*. Retrieved from <http://www.calstate.edu/>
- Cavdar, G., & Doe, S. (2012). Learning through writing: Teaching critical thinking skills in writing assignments. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 45, 298–306. doi:10.1017/S1049096511002137
- Choudhary, A., Akhtar, S., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of transformational and servant leadership on organizational performance: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116, 433–440. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1470-8
- Christensen, L. J., Mackey, A., & Whetten, D. (2014). Taking responsibility for Corporate Social Responsibility: The role of leaders in creating, implementing, sustaining, or avoiding socially responsible firm behaviors. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28(2), 164–178. doi:10.5465/amp.2012.0047
- Creswell, J. C. (2008). *Educational research* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

- DiGrazia, J., & Stassinis, E. (2011). The writers and the detectives: Cultural difference, identity, and pedagogical disciplines in an integrated classroom. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2011(125), 33–42. doi:10.1002/tl.431
- Doh, J. P., & Quigley, N. R. (2014). Responsible leadership and stakeholder management: Influence pathways and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 28, 255–274. doi:10.5465/amp.2014.0013
- Elmore, R. F. (2004). *School reform from the inside out: Policy, practice and performance*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Press.
- Ewen, C., Wihler, A., Blicke, G., Oerder, K., Ellen, B. P., III, Douglas, C., & Ferris, G. R. (2013). Further specification of the leader political skill–leadership effectiveness relationships: Transformational and transactional leader behavior as mediators. *Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 516–533. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.03.006
- Fiore, K., & Elsasser, N. (2001). Strangers no more: A liberatory literacy curriculum. In K. Halasek & N. P. Highberg (Eds.), *Landmark essays on basic writing* (pp. 69–82). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Franz, T. M., & Green, K. H. (2013). The impact of an interdisciplinary learning community course on pseudoscientific reasoning in first-year science students. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 13(5), 90–105. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1017127.pdf>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th ed.). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power and liberation*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

- Freire, P. (1998a). *Pedagogy of freedom: Ethics, democracy, and civic courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Freire, P. (1998b). *Teachers as cultural workers: Letters to those who dare teach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Garipagaoglu, B. C., & Vatanartiran, S. (2013). Why do department chairs suffer the most in higher education hierarchy? *The Business Review, Cambridge, 21*, 189–196.
- Geiser, S. (2014). *Back to the future: First year admissions at the University of California, 1994 to the present and beyond*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Studies in Higher Education.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. New York, NY: Paulist Press.
- Heaney, A. (2006). The Synergy Program: Reframing critical reading and writing for at-risk students. *Journal of Basic Writing, 25*(1), 26–52. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ773396.pdf>
- Heaney, T. (2010). Democracy, shared governance, and the university. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 2010*(128), 69–79. doi:10.1002/ace.392
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the act of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Huckin, T., Andrus, J., & Clary-Lemon, J. (2012). Critical discourse analysis and rhetoric and composition. *College Composition and Communication, 64*(1), 107–129. Retrieved from <http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Journals/CCC/0641-sep2012/CCC0641Critical.pdf>

- Institute of International Education. (2014). *Open doors fact sheet: California*. Retrieved from <http://www.iie.org/~media/Files/Corporate/Open-Doors/Fact-Sheets-2014/States/California-State-Sheet-2014.ashx?la=en>
- Jackson, R., & Morton, D. (2007). Becoming landscape architects: A postmodern approach to WAC sustainability. *The WAC Journal*, 18, 43.
- Jaschik, S., & Lederman, D. (2014). *The 2014 Inside Higher Ed survey of faculty attitudes on technology*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/survey/online-ed-skepticism-and-self-sufficiency-survey-faculty-views-technology>
- Johnson, G. (2013). *Impact of the new first year eligibility policy at the University of California*. Oakland: University of California, Academic Senate, Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools.
- Kapp, R., & Bangeni, B. (2009). Positioning (in) the discipline: Undergraduate students' negotiations of disciplinary discourses. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14, 587–596. doi:10.1080/13562510903314988
- Kezar, A. (2012). Spanning the great divide between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. *Change*, 44(6), 6–13. doi:10.1080/00091383.2012.728949
- Kilgore, D., & Cook, M. D. (2007). In things and in minds: Scholarly teachers' struggles for legitimacy in a research-oriented institution. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 18, 143–161.
- Kuh, G. D., Cruce, T. M., Shoup, R., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2008). Unmasking the effects of student engagement on first-year college grades and persistence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 79, 540–563. doi:10.1353/jhe.0.0019

- LaFrance, M., & Nicolas, M. (2012). Institutional ethnography as materialist framework for writing program research and the Faculty-Staff Work Standpoints Project. *College Composition and Communication*, 64, 130–150. Retrieved from <https://secure.ncte.org/>
- Lancaster, Z. (2014). Exploring valued patterns of stance in upper-level student writing in the disciplines. *Written Communication*, 31, 27–57. doi:10.1177/0741088313515170
- LeCourt, D. (1996). WAC as critical pedagogy: The third stage? *Journal of Advanced Composition*, 16, 389–405. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/>
- Legislative Analyst's Office. (2013). *LAO 2013–14 budget: Analysis of the higher education budget*. Retrieved from <http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis/2013/highered/higher-education-021213.aspx>
- Macedo, D. (1994). *Literacies of power: What Americans are not allowed to know*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mayer, D. M., Bardes, M., & Piccolo, R. F. (2008). Do servant-leaders help satisfy follower needs? An organizational justice perspective. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 17, 180–197. doi:10.1080/13594320701743558
- McMullen-Light, M. (2010). Great expectations: The culture of WAC and the community college context. *Across the Disciplines*, 7. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Melzer, D. (2014). *Assignments across the curriculum: A national study of college writing*. Boulder, CO: University Press of Colorado.

- Mullin, J., & Schorn, S. (2007). Enlivening WAC programs old and new. *WAC Journal*, 18, 5–13. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Mumford, M. D., & Fried, Y. (2014). Give them what they want or give them what they need? Ideology in the study of leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 35, 622–634. doi:10.1002/job.1921
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2012). *Table 270: Percentage of first-year undergraduate students who took remedial education courses, by selected student and institution characteristics: 2003–04 and 2007–08*. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d12/tables/dt12_270.asp
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2014). *Table 306.10: Total fall enrollment in degree-granting postsecondary institutions, by level of enrollment, sex, attendance status, and race/ethnicity of student: Selected years, 1976 through 2013*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d14/tables/dt14_306.10.asp?current=yes
- Office of the Chancellor. (2010). *Working for California: Impact of the California State University*. Retrieved from <http://www.calstate.edu/impact/?source=homepage>
- Parolini, J., Patterson, K., & Winston, B. (2009). Distinguishing between transformational and servant leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 30, 274–291. doi:10.1108/01437730910949544
- Pennington, J., & Boyer, R. (2003). A reflective strategy for writing across the curriculum: Situating WAC as a moral and civic duty. *The WAC Journal*, 14, 87–100.

- Pennock, A. (2011). The case for using policy writing in undergraduate political science courses. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 44, 141–146. doi:10.1017/S1049096510002040
- Phillips, W., Sweet, C., & Blythe, H. (2011). Using professional learning communities for the development of shared governance. *Journal of Faculty Development*, 25(2), 18–23.
- Pike, G. R., Kuh, G. D., McCormick, A. C., Ethington, C. A., & Smart, J. C. (2011). If and when money matters: The relationships among educational expenditures, student engagement and students' learning outcomes. *Research in Higher Education*, 52, 81–106. doi:10.1007/s11162-010-9183-2
- Pobywajlo, M. (2001). Changing attitudes about general education: Making connections through writing across the curriculum. *WAC Journal*, 12, 9–19. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Rafferty, A. E., & Griffin, M. A. (2004). Dimensions of transformational leadership: Conceptual and empirical extensions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15, 329–354. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.02.009
- Regents of the University of California. (2015). *University of California*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/>
- Rose, L., & Theilheimer, R. (2002). You write what you know: Writing, learning, and student construction of knowledge. *WAC Journal*, 13, 17–29. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>

- Rusch, E. A. (2004). Gender and race in leadership preparation: A constrained discourse. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 40, 14–46. doi:10.1177/0013161X03259110
- Rusche, S. N., & Jason, K. (2011). You have to absorb yourself in it: Using inquiry and reflection to promote student learning and self-knowledge. *Teaching Sociology*, 39, 338–353. doi:10.1177/0092055X11418685
- Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history* (2nd ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Rutz, C. (2012). Joe Harris: Teaching writing via the liberal arts. *WAC Journal*, 23, 83–91. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Rutz, C. (2013). Committed to WAC: Christopher Thaiss. *WAC Journal*, 24, 83–94. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Shafer, G. (2012). On spooky stories, the war and “This I Believe.” *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, 39, 398–406. Retrieved from <https://secure.ncte.org/>
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Shor, I. (2001). Errors and economics: Inequality breeds remediation. In G. McNenny & S. H. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Mainstreaming basic writers* (pp. 29–54). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Shor, I. (2005). Why teach about social class? *Teaching English in the Two Year College*, 22, 161–170. Retrieved from <https://secure.ncte.org/>
- Shor, I. (2007). Can critical teaching foster activism in this time of repression? *Radical Teacher*, 79, 39.

- Shor, I. (2009). Critical pedagogy is too big to fail. *Journal of Basic Writing*, 28(2), 6–27.
Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Sidler, M. (2005). Claiming research: Students as “citizen-experts” in WAC-oriented composition. *The WAC Journal*, 16, 49–60.
- Singer, M. (2001). Moving the margins. In G. McNenny & S. H. Fitzgerald (Ed.), *Mainstreaming basic writers* (pp. 101–120). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Smith, B. N., Montagno, R. V., & Kuzmenko, T. N. (2004). Transformational and servant leadership: Content and contextual comparisons. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(4), 80–91. doi:10.1177/107179190401000406
- State Higher Education Executive Officers Association. (2014). *State higher education finance FY13*. Boulder, CO: Author.
- Thaiss, C., & Porter, T. (2010). The state of WAC/WID in 2010: Methods and results of the U.S. survey of the international WAC/WID mapping project. *College Composition and Communication*, 61, 534–570. Retrieved from <https://secure.ncte.org/>
- Thomson-Bunn, H. (2014). Are they empowered yet? Opening up definitions of critical pedagogy. *Composition Forum*, 29. Retrieved from <http://compositionforum.com/issue/29/are-they-empowered.php>
- Townsend, M. A. (2001). Writing intensive courses and WAC. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum programs* (pp. 233–258). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

- Townsend, M. A. (2008). WAC program vulnerability and what to do about it: An update and brief bibliographic essay. *WAC Journal*, 19, 45–61. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/>
- Trowler, V. (2013). Leadership practices for student engagement in challenging conditions. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 17(3), 91–95. doi:10.1080/13603108.2013.789455
- University of California. (2015). *Annual accountability report 2015*. Oakland: University of California.
- University of California Office of the President. (2007). *Major features of the California master plan for higher education*. Retrieved from <http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/mpsummary.htm>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2015). *Language other than English spoken at home, percent of persons age 5 years+, 2009–2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/POP815213/00,06>
- Van Dierendonck, D., & Nuijten, I. (2011). The Servant Leadership Survey: Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 26, 249–267. doi:10.1007/s10869-010-9194-1
- Van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., de Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014). Same difference? Exploring the differential mechanisms linking servant leadership and transformational leadership to follower outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 25, 544–562. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.014

- Villanueva, V. (2001). The politics of literacy across the curriculum. In S. H. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, & C. Thaiss (Eds.), *WAC for the new millennium: Strategies for continuing Writing-Across-the-Curriculum programs* (pp. 165–178). Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Hartnell, C. A., & Oke, A. (2010). Servant leadership, procedural justice climate, service climate, employee attitudes, and organizational citizenship behavior: a cross-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 517–529. doi:10.1037/a0018867

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR WAC PROGRAM COORDINATOR

The first set of questions were asked to obtain general writing program information as well as get a sense of the philosophy of the writing program.

1. Job title of program leader: (Associate/full professor; administrative faculty; assistant professor; part-time, non-tenure line; full-time, non-tenure line; other)
2. Course release for program leader. Course(s) per year:
3. Number of years current director has led program:
4. Program leader primarily reports to: (Department chair; academic vice president; college or division head; other)
5. Program category at present: (Writing across the curriculum; WAC emphasis in writing center (WAC)/writing in the disciplines; WAC in course models; Writing and speaking across the curriculum; other)
6. Program emphases: (Writing and/or speaking to learn; applying new technologies to learning; learning disciplinary conventions; critical thinking of writing and/or speaking; proficiency in standard written English; preparing students for the workplace; critical pedagogy; other)
7. Number of years program has been in existence:
8. Sources of program funding: (Internal: department, college or division, central administration, cross-college; External: government agency, foundation or private donor; other)
9. What are cross-campus connections your program has with other programs and academic departments?

10. How has the program changed in the past few years?
11. When are students ready to be brought into the academic discourse as scholars and resources?
12. In what ways does the program impact under-represented groups at your institution?

To find out if the institution is led by servant leaders, the following questions will be asked of the WAC program director of their immediate manager or the administrator they believe has the most impact on the program, either positive or negative. Questions were asked in a way that encouraged storytelling to develop a richer background than in a closed-ended format.

13. Can you tell me about a time your manager took a risk, even when he/she was not certain of the support from his/her own manager? (Courage, per Van Dierendonck and Nuijten, 2011).
14. Can you tell me about a time your manager focused on the good of the whole instead of a single area or person? (Stewardship, per Van Dierendonck and Nuijten, 2011).
15. In what ways does your manager emphasize the societal responsibility of your work? (Stewardship, per Van Dierendonck and Nuijten, 2011).
16. Tell me about a time your manager put the students' best interests ahead of his/her own. (Altruism, per Barbuto & Wheeler, 2006).

To find out if the program is led by transformational leaders, the following questions were be asked of the WAC program director of their immediate manager in the same format as those for the servant leadership questions.

17. Tell me about a time your manager challenged you to rethink basic assumptions about your work, or to think about old problems in new ways? (Intellectual stimulation, per Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).
18. Has your manager identified new opportunities for the unit/department/organization? What are these? (Goal-oriented, per Choudhary, Akhtar, & Zaheer, 2013).
19. Has your manager told you where he/she sees your program in 5 years? Can you describe it? (Vision, per Rafferty & Griffin, 2004).
20. Do you believe the college's leadership has a clear, common view of the future? What is that, or do you see conflict among them? (Goal-oriented, per Choudhary, Akhtar, & Zaheer, 2013).

Finally, the closing question:

21. Is there anything else you would like to discuss?

APPENDIX B: SAMPLE INTRODUCTORY LETTER

Dear Dr. X,

My name is Carole Meagher, and I am a doctoral student at USF working on my dissertation proposal for my EdD in Organization and Leadership. My dissertation topic is on the intersection of WAC, Critical Pedagogy and Leadership Values.

I came across your article in Journal (Title) and really appreciated how you work to get history students to look at different perspectives, including power structures.

The purpose of this letter is to ask for your participation in my dissertation. I would be seeking from you:

- General approval to use publicly available institutional information such as program descriptions and college budgets.
- Approximately one hour of your time to be interviewed.
- Availability for feedback, clarification and updates.

Any interviews conducted will be audiotaped and occur at your convenience at your campus or over the phone.

In writing the findings of my research I will protect the identity of anyone interviewed, as well as your institution through the use of pseudonyms and paraphrased statements that could be publicly searched. Quotations used from interviews, documents, and observations will be carefully protected to keep confidentiality.

Thank you again for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best,

/s/

Carole K. Meagher

APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT



CHANGE THE WORLD FROM HERE

Informed Consent for Critical Pedagogy and Leadership Study

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Below is a description of the research procedures and an explanation of your rights as a research participant. You should read this information carefully. If you agree to participate, you will sign in the space provided to indicate that you have read and understand the information on this consent form. You are entitled to and will receive a copy of this form.

You have been asked to participate in a research study conducted by Carole Meagher, a graduate student in the Department of Leadership Studies at University of San Francisco. This faculty supervisor for this study is Patricia Mitchell, a professor in the Department of Leadership Studies at University of San Francisco.

WHAT THE STUDY IS ABOUT:

The purpose of this study is to review the state of critical pedagogy in higher education settings as enacted through WAC programs. The support for WAC programs depends, in part, on the value an institution's leaders places on hearing diverse student voices as an essential part of the academic discourse. These leaders' values are represented at the most tangible level by funding WAC programs. By connecting institutions' stated values, actual funding patterns and strength of WAC programs we will be able to gain a greater understanding of how to best empower diverse populations through protecting academic programs which invite these students to bring new perspectives that will continuously advance academic theory and public policy.

WHAT WE WILL ASK YOU TO DO:

During this study, the researcher will review publicly available institutional documents such as the college and program websites, budgets.

As WAC Program Director, you will be interviewed and will be asked to be audiotaped to provide your experiences as to the leadership environment and its impact on your program. A follow-up audio recorded in-person interview may be requested to clarify or expand on information collected in the first interview. After the interviews are completed, written transcripts will be created and you will be offered the opportunity to review the transcripts for accuracy. Audio taping and other notes collected during the interviews are beneficial to capture exact wording for use in qualitative research analysis. This will ensure the best accuracy in any information collected from you.

DURATION AND LOCATION OF THE STUDY:

Your participation in this study will involve a one-hour interview, plus opportunity for follow-up and feedback. Your total participation is anticipated to require one to three hours in total. The study will take place either over the phone, by email, or at your campus site when practicable.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS:

The research procedures described above may involve discussion of highly political and or otherwise sensitive subjects, which may be psychologically or emotionally uncomfortable for you. Further, due to the length of the interview, you may become tired or bored and choose to stop and continue the interview at a later date. If you wish, you may choose to withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation at any time during the study without penalty.

BENEFITS:

You will receive no direct benefit from your participation in this study; however, the possible benefits to others include (1) A better understanding of leadership theory and its application to concrete decision-making in the academic world in an area that is challenging higher education today – engaging and increasing success rates for diverse populations; and (2) Practical implications for WAC program directors and the content-area faculty who use WAC principles to engage with their students by providing both diversity and equity frames to generate support and visibility for their programs.

PRIVACY/CONFIDENTIALITY:

Any data you provide in this study will be kept confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In any report I publish, I will not include information that will make it possible to identify you or any individual participant. Specifically, I will use pseudonyms for your identity. This includes during the use of direct quotes from interview notes, and recordings, collected documents, and notes and recordings from observations. All electronic files, recordings, and physical documents will also use a pseudonym in place of your identity. A master list with your identity and contact information will be kept separately from the collected research data in a password protected file. All electronic data will be kept in password protected software, files, and folders. Physical documents will be kept in locked file drawers. Electronic documents will be deleted upon completion of the research. Physical documents with links to your identity will be shredded upon completion of the research. Audio recordings will be kept electronically in a password protected folder and deleted upon completion of the research. Consent forms will be destroyed approximately three years after the completion of the research per IRB requirements.

COMPENSATION/PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION:

There is no payment or other form of compensation for your participation in this study.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF THE STUDY:

Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate without penalty or loss of benefits. Furthermore, you may skip any questions or tasks that make you uncomfortable and may discontinue your participation at any time. In addition, the researcher has the right to withdraw you from participation in the study at any time

OFFER TO ANSWER QUESTIONS:

Please ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you should contact the principal investigator: Carole Meagher at 415-531-2415 or ckmeagher@dons.usfca.edu. If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the University of San Francisco Institutional Review Board at IRBPHS@usfca.edu.

I HAVE READ THE ABOVE INFORMATION. ANY QUESTIONS I HAVE ASKED HAVE BEEN ANSWERED. I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS

RESEARCH PROJECT AND I WILL RECEIVE A COPY OF THIS CONSENT FORM.

PARTICIPANT'S SIGNATURE

DATE

APPENDIX D: IRB APPLICATION



CHANGE THE WORLD FROM HERE

REQUEST FOR IRB VERIFICATION OF EXEMPT RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

If you believe your study meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review, complete the following form and upload this document to the online IRB system in Mentor.

COMPLETE **ONLY ONE** EXEMPTION SECTION BELOW BEST DESCRIBING YOUR RESEARCH

EXEMPTION 2: FOR PROTOCOLS INVOLVING TESTS, SURVEYS, INTERVIEWS, OR OBSERVATION OF PUBLIC BEHAVIOR [CFR 46.101(b)(2)]

2a. What type(s) of instruments/activities will be used (*Check all that apply.*)

Educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement)

Questionnaire/survey

Interviews

Observation of public behavior

If the research involves other activities, it is not eligible for this exemption. Do not proceed.

2b. Will information be recorded in a manner that participants can be identified (e.g., name, social security number, license number, phone number, email address, photograph)? Yes No

2c. Would disclosure of information obtained put participants at risk for civil or criminal liability or damage to their financial standing, employability or reputation (e.g., drug or alcohol use; criminal or other illegal activity)?

Yes No

If the answer to 2b and 2c is "Yes," the research is not eligible for this exemption. Do not proceed.

2d. Will your participants include anyone under the age of 18 years old? Yes No

If the answer to II "d" and II "c" is "Yes," the research is not eligible for this exemption. Do not proceed.

Provide, in lay terms, a detailed summary of your proposed study by addressing

each of the following items.

2e. Clearly state the purpose of the study.

The purpose of this study is to review the state of critical pedagogy in higher education settings as enacted through WAC programs. The support for WAC programs depends, in part, on the value an institution's leaders places on hearing diverse student voices as an essential part of the academic discourse. These leaders' values are represented at the most tangible level by funding WAC programs. By connecting institutions' stated values, actual funding patterns and strength of WAC programs we will be able to gain a greater understanding of how to best empower diverse populations through protecting academic programs which invite these students to bring new perspectives that will continuously advance academic theory and public policy.

Budgets in higher education are being scrutinized at the same time student populations have become more diverse. By analyzing institutional budgets as connected to organizational priorities, and ultimately, the core values of the administrative leadership, we can know whether or not diverse student populations are valued as a resource for institutional learning. The support for the college's WAC program, which often serves as resource for critical pedagogy in higher education, is one crucial measure of the value the administration holds for its diverse populations. WAC becomes a signal of how that institution's leadership genuinely values these students' voices and the leadership's willing to protect these when there are other demands on resources.

2f. Describe the research procedures and who will be included in the study as participants.

This study will use a qualitative research design. I will perform a series of limited institutional ethnographies regarding critical pedagogy college campuses by using critical discourse analysis to review institutional documents such as mission statements and budgets, as well as interviewing program directors using a structured set of interview questions designed to elicit open-ended responses about their program's history, future, and overall role in the college's goals and objectives.

2g. For studies using questionnaires, surveys, and interviews, provide a description, example questions, and/or upload as additional documentation the tests, questionnaires, interview questions, etc. that will be used.

(See Appendix A)