CHARISMATIC TEACHING: CULTIVATING MOTIVATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGE CLASSROOMS

Amy M. Anderson, EdD, Spokane Community College

ABSTRACT

There are over six million community college students in the United States. Many non-traditional students face unique obstacles as they balance work, school, and familial responsibilities. As a result, community college students can become unmotivated in their classes, and this lack of internal drive can negatively impact their success and longevity in school. Therefore, college faculty must learn new strategies to cultivate motivation in their classrooms, whether in person or online. One technique instructors can utilize is charismatic teaching, which includes teachers' professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality teaching techniques. This quantitative predictive correlational study examined if, and to what extent, a predictive relationship existed between charismatic teaching and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in community colleges in the Northwest United States. The results indicated that the global score of charismatic teaching (professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques) was the highest predictor of intrinsic motivation ($R2=.51$). Educators can cultivate intrinsic motivation in community college classes, whether in person or online, through charismatic teaching techniques. However, charismatic teaching did not significantly predict students' extrinsic motivation. College faculty may consider employing charismatic teaching techniques to improve community college students' intrinsic motivation in their classes.

Keywords: *charismatic teaching, community colleges, motivation*

INTRODUCTION

Historically, traditional college students enrolled in school full-time after completing high school. These students were financially supported by their parents and had minimal responsibilities besides school obligations (Zerquera et al., 2018). However, not every student can attend classes full-time without outside financial support. Consequently, a growing number of non-traditional students are enrolling in community colleges, where they can pursue cost-effective two-year degrees or vocational certifications while juggling work and other responsibilities. Many community college students face challenges, such as working while attending school due to their lower socioeconomic status, caring for dependents, and being academically underprepared (Zerquera et al., 2018). These challenges can impact students' motivation in the classroom, ultimately affecting their retention and graduation rates. As a result, college faculty often get tasked with motivating students in the community college classroom.

One teaching technique that has been shown to improve motivation in educational settings is charismatic teaching, which is defined as instruction that includes the following components: professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques (Huang & Lin, 2014). Although there is extensive research on ways to motivate students in higher education, there is minimal research on the impact of charismatic teaching on students' motivation. Furthermore, a literature review revealed that most of the

research on charismatic teaching had been conducted at the university level (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2014; Dobrovska, 2018a; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016, 2017). Therefore, additional research was needed on charismatic teaching (professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques) and students' motivation at the community college level.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review was conducted using various techniques, including databases and search terms. The plethora of information was narrowed to find relevant literature for this study. The review will begin with the key themes that emerged while evaluating that literature. These themes include charismatic leadership theory, charismatic teaching, motivation, and community college students.

CHARISMATIC LEADERSHIP THEORY

The theoretical foundation for this study was charismatic leadership theory (CLT), which Robert House created in 1976. CLT is based on the premise that charismatic leaders can influence their followers in several ways. House (1976, 1977) asserted that charismatic leaders' behavior, attributes, and leadership traits help them build connections with their followers. As a result of this connection, their followers exhibit increased motivation and need for achievement (House, 1976, 1977). Since teachers are leaders in the classroom (Archer, 1994; Armandi et al., 2003; Goodboy & Bolkan, 2011; Gunasekare, 2019), and CLT suggests that charismatic leaders influence their followers' motivation and need for achievement (House, 1976, 1977), then charismatic teachers may also influence their students' motivation and need for achievement in a classroom setting.

CHARISMATIC TEACHING

Charismatic teaching includes instructors' positive character traits, professional knowledge, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques (Huang & Lin, 2014; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016, 2017). Lin and Huang (2014, 2016, 2017) studied the relationship between charismatic teaching and student engagement, attitude toward learning, and intention to continue learning, and they found positive correlations for university students. Bolkan and Goodboy (2014) examined the relationship between charismatic teaching and students' moti-

vation at the university level. They found a statistically significant relationship between teachers' perceived level of charisma and students' intrinsic motivation. Wu and colleagues (2015) studied charismatic teaching at the community college level, and they found that this teaching style was directly related to students' intention to continue learning. The following section will elaborate on the four components of charismatic teaching.

Professional Knowledge

One component of charismatic teaching is the instructor's professional knowledge (Huang & Lin, 2014). There are three types of professional knowledge: academic content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, and pedagogical content knowledge (Gess-Newsome et al., 2019). Academic content knowledge is a teacher's expertise on a particular topic (Gess-Newsome et al., 2019). Whether charismatic or not, effective teachers are familiar with their course content (Joseph, 2016; Pinto et al., 2012; Sogunro, 2017). General pedagogical knowledge is the ability to use teaching skills in a classroom context (Shulman, 1986). For higher education classrooms, andragogical knowledge may be more appropriate, as teaching children and adults differs (Kelly, 2017). Therefore, pedagogical (or andragogical) content knowledge combines academic content knowledge and general pedagogical (or andragogical) knowledge (Gess-Newsome et al., 2019). Effective educators and charismatic teachers incorporate content and pedagogical (or andragogical) knowledge into their teaching practice to maintain students' interest in learning and engagement (Huang & Lin, 2014; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016; Shulman, 1986; Sogunro, 2017).

Positive character traits

In addition to professional knowledge, charismatic teachers exhibit character traits that positively affect and inspire their students (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2014; Huang & Lin, 2014; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016). Charismatic teachers draw students toward them since they build rapport with them through verbal and nonverbal behaviors (Daniels & Goodboy, 2014; Estepp & Roberts, 2015; Lee et al., 2014; Sacavém et al., 2017; Suryani, 2016; Williams & Williams, 2011). These charismatic character traits and behaviors may include empathy, enthusiasm, confidence, and approachability (Archer, 1994; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2014; House, 1976, 1977).

Empathy. Charismatic teachers display empathy, which helps them connect with their students in the classroom (Blaskova et al., 2018; Bolkan & Goodboy, 2014; Choi, 2006; Dobrovska, 2018b). Empathy may be seen in the classroom, as charismatic teachers show sensitivity and connect through shared emotions and experiences (Choi, 2006). Using empathy also helps college faculty members build trust with their students. Joseph (2016) notes that teachers who demonstrated caring were attractive to students, and this characteristic has been associated with charisma in other studies (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2014).

Enthusiasm. Charismatic teachers are enthusiastic in the classroom (Blaskova et al., 2018). Teachers' enthusiasm is positively related to students' learning and academic outcomes and is separated into two major categories: nonverbal expressiveness and instructional behavior (Keller et al., 2016). In nonverbal expressiveness, enthusiasm is seen in the classroom as instructors show excitement and passion in their tone, pitch, volume, and facial expressions. In instructional behavior, enthusiasm is seen when there is "verbal interaction between students and teacher, the types of questions that a teacher asked (varying between factual questions and asking for interpretation and opinion), and regular praise and encouragement" (Keller et al., 2016, p. 747). Charismatic teachers demonstrate enthusiasm nonverbally and through their instructional behavior (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2014; Huang & Lin, 2014; Keller et al., 2016; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016).

Confidence. Charismatic teachers exhibit confidence, or self-efficacy, in the classroom (Bass, 1985; Blaskova et al., 2018; Northouse, 2018). Teachers are confident when they believe in their ability to instruct their students effectively. As a result, their self-confidence can positively impact students' experience in the classroom (Bass, 1985; Blaskova et al., 2018; Northouse, 2018). Furthermore, confident teachers can motivate their students (Zee & Koomen, 2016).

Approachability. Charismatic teachers are also known for their approachability (Dobrovska, 2018a; Huang & Lin, 2014). This approachability may be demonstrated through nonverbal behavior. For example, nodding during a conversation improves likeability and approachability (Osugi & Kawahara, 2018). Smiling at students is another

way teachers show their approachability nonverbally (Miles, 2009). These nonverbal cues make teachers appear open and friendly, which helps build trust between teachers and students and motivates students (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2014).

Sense of Humor

Charismatic teachers' use of humor is valued in the classroom. Content-related humor, including a joke to enhance the class presentation, is an effective teaching tool for enhancing learning (Bieg & Dresel, 2018; Daumiller et al., 2019; Sogunro, 2015). However, the opposite effect happens when teachers use inappropriate humor or humor at others' expense (Daumiller et al., 2019). When teachers display charismatic behavior, like using humor in the classroom, they trigger student excitement in class, which increases engagement and interest in learning (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2014; Daumiller et al., 2019; Huang & Lin, 2014; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016, 2017; Tahir, 2018).

Quality Instruction Techniques

Charismatic teachers exhibit professional knowledge, positive character traits, a sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques (Huang & Lin, 2014; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016, 2017). Quality instruction includes "andragogical competency, adequate preparation and organization, content and currency of knowledge, technological competency, resourcefulness, and dispositional attributes" (Sogunro, 2017, p. 173). Quality instructors use teaching techniques to share their professional knowledge with their students to keep them engaged and motivated. The following list is not exhaustive but highlights some techniques used to enhance student learning and motivation in the classroom.

Active Learning in the Classroom. Charismatic teachers keep students engaged in the classroom by implementing active learning techniques since "students in a traditional lecture style classroom will fail 1.5 times more often than students attending classes taught using active learning techniques" (Stover & Ziswiler, 2017, p. 464). Educational reformers such as Dewey, Knowles, and Kolb challenged the traditional pedagogical model and time-held belief that adult students are best served by the sage-on-the-stage approach to teaching. Although lectures may seem like a time-efficient approach to covering course content, merely listening to a class lecture is not a way to promote

deep and lasting student learning (Eison, 2010). Instead, students learn best when teachers offer a hands-on approach that is self-directed, experiential, and active (Kolb, 2015). Charismatic teachers use quality instruction techniques to positively impact students' engagement and interest in learning (Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016).

Feedback from the Instructor. Quality teachers also communicate with their students and provide thorough and helpful feedback on student performance, which is crucial to successful instruction (Sogunro, 2015; Zhengdong et al., 2018). Written or oral feedback gives students direction for future improvement in class (Cole et al., 2017). One researcher notes, "Constant and continuous feedback is a conscious and deliberate reaction of teachers to offer students qualitative assessments aimed at maintaining a balance in the teaching-learning-evaluation process and to lead to an increased student learning motivation" (Petre, 2017, p. 162). Charismatic teachers communicate with their students about their progress in the class (Huang & Lin, 2014; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016).

Relevance of Course Material. In addition to active teaching techniques and feedback, another element of quality instruction is the relevance of the course material (Sogunro, 2017). Knowles (1980) noted that adult learners prefer relevant and applicable course material to help real-life situations and problems (Pinto et al., 2012; Wlodkowski & Ginsberg, 2017). For example, when teachers offer students an opportunity to learn something relevant to their future careers, they are likelier to stay engaged in class.

Positive Learning Environment. Another important factor of quality instruction is the environment, which should be conducive to learning (Sogunro, 2017). The classroom environment might include the arrangements of desks, the temperature, and the cleanliness of the room. Schools should not underestimate the psychological impact of a safe and maintained classroom (Sogunro, 2017). However, the learning environment includes more than just a classroom setup. Students who feel safe and comfortable in class can more effectively engage in the learning process (Siddig & AlKhoudary, 2018). A safe classroom environment includes a positive social-emotional climate between teachers and students. Charismatic teachers create a safe learning environment by building a positive relationship with students, which begins with a foundation of trust and respect (Bolkan & Goodboy, 2014).

STUDENT MOTIVATION

In the 21st century, educators face a unique challenge as they search for more effective ways to support academic success. Since graduation is prioritized in higher education, institutions must keep students engaged and focused on their education. Therefore, colleges and universities may need to incorporate new motivational strategies in the classroom.

Teachers influence student outcomes positively by enhancing students' internal (intrinsic) or external (extrinsic) motivation. Intrinsic motivation is a desire to learn for the satisfaction that comes with it, which impacts academic achievement, competency, and academic learning (Deci & Ryan, 1985). In contrast, extrinsic motivation is external to the individual and is influenced by promises of reward (Deci & Ryan, 1985). In an academic setting, grades, positive reinforcement from instructors, incentives, or the prospect that increased education might better one's life are examples of external motivators (Chamberlin et al., 2018; Herranz-Zarzoso & Sabater-Grande, 2018; Maharaj et al., 2018; Nurra & Oyserman, 2018; Zhengdong et al., 2018).

Keller (1987) noted that teachers impacted students' motivation in the classroom. College faculty capture learners' interest, stimulate their curiosity to learn, meet students' personal needs and goals, help them feel confident, and reinforce their accomplishments (Keller, 1987). This motivation is critical for academic success and is linked to a greater understanding of class concepts, satisfaction with school, self-esteem, social adjustment, and higher retention rates (Gottfried, 1985, 2009; Hornstra et al., 2018; Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2009; Yilmaz et al., 2017).

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS

It is important to include the theme of community college students in this literature review as these students are the population under investigation in this study. Furthermore, community college students differ from typical university students in three ways. First, community college students are usually considered non-traditional students. Second, students at the community college level are often academically underprepared for college. Third, the socioeconomic status of community college students is typically lower than their university coun-

terparts. These differences may impact the levels of motivation of community college students.

A non-traditional student is one whose academic journey might look different from a traditional student who enrolls full-time after graduating high school. While traditional students often have financial support from their parents while attending school, many non-traditional students rely on financial aid and grants to help fund their education (Zerquera et al., 2018). Many non-traditional students also balance work while attending college, which can lead to additional stress (Anderson, 2021; National Center for Education Statistics, 2019; Peterson, 2016). Increased stress from attending school while juggling many responsibilities can affect students' academic success and the likelihood of graduating (Anderson, 2021; Saunders-Scott et al., 2018).

Non-traditional students at the community college level also tend to be academically underprepared and may arrive on campus lacking the necessary skills for academic success (Chen, 2016; Lavonier, 2016). Placement testing is one way students can enroll in appropriate courses (Lavonier, 2016). Furthermore, students may need to take study-skills classes and remedial courses to prepare them for the rigor of college (Bailey et al., 2015; Chen, 2016; Zerquera et al., 2018).

Along with the stress of multiple responsibilities and lower academic preparedness, many community college students also struggle with financial insecurity, which can be an additional challenge that impacts academic success (Anderson, 2021). For example, these students may experience food and housing insecurity while attending school (Martinez et al., 2018). When students' basic needs are unmet, they struggle with critical thinking and problem-solving in their classes (Maslow & Lewis, 1987).

Non-traditional community college students often have stress that stems from balancing family, work, and school responsibilities. Sharififard and colleagues (2020) studied factors leading to academic burnout, and they found that academic and life stress can impact students' motivation and ultimately cause them to lose interest in their education. Therefore, it is important for community colleges to explore alternative options, such as charismatic teaching, to increase motivation for this student population.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study examined if, and to what extent, a predictive relationship existed between charismatic teaching (operationalized as professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques) and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in community colleges. In order to address this problem statement, two research questions and corresponding non-directional hypotheses were developed. These questions were derived from the charismatic leadership theory, which identifies leaders' characteristics that may influence their followers' motivation and need for achievement (House, 1976, 1977).

RQ1: If, and to what extent, do professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques individually predict intrinsic motivation within the overall model in community college students in the Northwest United States?

RQ2: If, and to what extent, do professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques individually predict extrinsic motivation within the overall model in community college students in the Northwest United States?

METHODOLOGY

A predictive correlational research design was chosen to examine if there was a predictive relationship between charismatic teaching and students' motivation in community colleges. Correlational studies determine if potential relationships exist between two or more variables without manipulating any variables (Gravetter & Forzano, 2012). Moreover, predictive correlational designs predict the value of one variable based on the acquired values of another variable (Grove, 2019). This study examined if a statistically significant predictive relationship existed between the predictor variable (charismatic teaching) and the criterion variables (students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation). Therefore, a predictive correlational design was most appropriate for this study.

SAMPLE STRATEGY AND PROFILE

After IRB approval from the institution where the research was conducted, participants were recruited. A convenience sampling technique is

a non-probability sampling method where the researcher selects participants for their study based on ease of access to the participants and their ability to meet the eligibility criteria (Etikan et al., 2016). This sampling technique allowed the researcher to access students at the community college where they are employed. The criteria for participation in this research were that students must be 18 years or older, currently enrolled in the institution where the research was conducted, and not be one of the researcher's current or former students. The last criterion was chosen to reduce undue influence (Klitzman, 2013).

The researcher began the recruitment process by emailing faculty at the institution. With approval, the researcher visited their classrooms and explained the criteria for participation. Any eligible and interested students signed the informed consent and completed the research in about 20 minutes of class time.

The sample consisted of 176 community college students. Demographic frequency counts were calculated to create a sample profile. The sample was nearly equal in both participants who identified as male (51%) and those who identified as female (47%). Of the 176 student participants, nearly three-quarters reported being Caucasian/White (73.9%), and the remaining participants identified as Hispanic (6%), Asian/Pacific Islander (8%), African American/Black (9%), American Indian/Alaskan Native (2%), or other (1%). The output of the G* Power post hoc power analysis for this study indicated that with this sample size, the power was .966. In other words, the sample size for this study had high power and thus had a lower chance of type 2 error.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Two instruments collected data to answer these research questions. First, the Inventory for Teaching Charisma in College Classroom (ITCCC) assessed students' perceptions of their instructor's level of charisma. Second, the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) measured students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation orientations. These instruments collected data for the predictor variable (the global and four subscales scores of charismatic teaching) and the criterion variables (intrinsic and extrinsic motivation).

INVENTORY OF TEACHING CHARISMA IN COLLEGE CLASSROOM

The ITCCC measured students' perceptions of their instructors' level of charisma and examined four factors: professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques (Huang & Lin, 2014; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016). There were 23 questions in the ITCCC relating to teacher charisma, which were divided between the four subscales. Six questions assessed teachers' character traits, seven measured teachers' knowledge, six evaluated teachers' humor, and four measured the quality of their teaching techniques. The questions on the ITCCC collected ordinal data using a Likert scale; however, this instrument had a format that approximated continuous data (Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016, 2017). As scores increased, the level of the teacher's charisma increased (Huang & Lin, 2014; Lin & Huang, 2014, 2016). Data collected from this instrument were converted using data aggregation to calculate the mean for each subscale.

According to Lin and Huang (2014), the instrument is valid and reliable. The internal consistency of the ITCCC was measured using a Cronbach's alpha analysis. The results indicated that the overall scale was .95, and the subscale scores were .91 (professional knowledge), .91 (positive character traits), .92 (sense of humor), and .88 (quality instruction techniques).

MOTIVATED STRATEGIES FOR LEARNING QUESTIONNAIRE

This inventory measures students' academic motivation and types of learning strategies in a specific class (Pintrich et al., 1991). The inventory has 15 scales that can be used together or separately (Pintrich et al., 1991, 1993). Data for this study were collected from the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation orientation scales, which contained four questions each. Students self-reported the extent to which each statement was true to them using a Likert scale (1=*not at all true of me* to 7=*very true of me*).

This instrument is valid and reliable (Duncan & McKeachie, 2005; Pintrich et al., 1993). Dayel et al. (2018) reported that the Cronbach's alpha score for the MSLQ was .75 for intrinsic motivation and .78 for extrinsic motivation. Moreover, additional tests assessed the validity of the MSLQ, including a chi-squared to degrees of freedom test (3.49), a goodness of fit test (.77), and root mean residual analysis (.07) (Pintrich et al., 1993).

The collected data from the ITCCC and MSLQ were cleaned and then converted using data aggregation in SPSS. Then, the mean was calculated for

each subscale. Finally, a stepwise multiple linear regression analysis was conducted to assess the predictive relationship between teachers' perceived level of charisma and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation orientations to address the research questions and corresponding hypotheses.

RESULTS

This study examined the predictive relationship between charismatic teaching and students' motivation. The stepwise multiple linear regression analysis results revealed that the global score for charismatic teaching was the variable that most significantly predicted intrinsic motivation (R^2=.507). Overall charisma (professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques) accounted for 51%

(R^2) of the variance in the criterion variable of intrinsic motivation (See Table 1). Also, the F statistic of 178.93 (df=1,174) was statistically significant at the p <.01 level (See Table 2). This result was not surprising since the global score was a composite score of the four other predictors. Also, the unstandardized beta score for overall charisma and intrinsic motivation was B=1.148 (see Table 3). In other words, with each unit increase in charismatic teaching, there should be a 1.148 unit increase in intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, the correlation matrix included in the stepwise analysis uncovered that the global score for charismatic teaching had the most statistically significant relationship with intrinsic motivation (.712) (see Table 4). In contrast, the results showed that charismatic teaching did not significantly predict community college students' extrinsic motivation.

Table 1.

Model Summary- Overall Charisma and Intrinsic Motivation

					Change statistics				
Model	R	R^2	Adj. R^2	SE	R^2 change	F change	df1	df2	p
1	.712a	.507	.504	.78025	.507	178.934	1	174	.00

Table 2.

ANOVA Model- Overall Charisma and Intrinsic Motivation

Model	SS	df	MS	F	p
Regression	108.933	1	108.933	178.934	.000
Residual	105.929	174	.609		
Total	214.862	175			

Table 3.

Coefficients- Included Variable Overall Charisma and Intrinsic Motivation

Variable	B	SE B	β	t	p
Constant	.644	.359		1.793	.075
Overall charisma	1.148	.086	.712	13.377	.000

Table 4.

Pearson Correlation Matrix with Criterion Variable Intrinsic Motivation

	Intrinsic motivation	Positive character traits	Professional knowledge	Sense of humor	Quality teaching techniques	Overall charisma
Intrinsic motivation	1.000	.603	.597	.637	.649	.712
Positive character traits	.603	1.000	.749	.712	.623	.853
Professional knowledge	.597	.749	1.000	.700	.607	.835
Sense of humor	.637	.712	.700	1.000	.759	.919
Quality teaching techniques	.649	.623	.607	.759	1.000	.886
Overall charisma	.712	.853	.835	.919	.886	1.000

Note. All correlations were significant at the *p* = .000 level.

The stepwise multiple linear regression analysis also revealed that overall charisma was the only significant predictor of intrinsic motivation. However, a Pearson Product-Moment correlational analysis, part of the stepwise analysis process, indicated that the remaining variables were still positively correlated with intrinsic motivation. The correlation matrix (see Table 4) revealed a statistically significant relationship between the global score for charismatic teaching and intrinsic motivation (.712). Additionally, the four subscales of charismatic teaching, including quality teaching techniques (.649), sense of humor (.637), positive character traits (.603), and professional knowledge (.597), also indicated strong correlations that were statistically significant as well. These results indicated that as each predictor increased, so did the criterion. In other words, as the elements of charismatic teaching went up (together or individually), so did the intrinsic motivation for students at the community college level.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

Students motivated to succeed in academics often have a higher internal drive. This internal motivation occurs when individuals participate in an activity for the satisfaction that comes with it (Deci & Ryan, 1975). Intrinsic motivation impacts students' academic achievement, competency, and learning (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Students with higher intrinsic motivation are more competent in school and may experience greater academic achievement. Moreover, internally motivated students positively perceive their academic competency (Gottfried et

al., 2005). The following section includes the summary and findings for the research questions, limitations and practical implications of the study, and recommendations for future research.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS FOR RQ1

This study's first research question examined whether charismatic teaching (using the global and four subscale scores) individually predicted community college students' intrinsic motivation. The results revealed that charismatic teachers positively influence students' intrinsic motivation. These findings align with charismatic leadership theory, based on the premise that charismatic leaders' personality traits and behavior impact their followers' motivation (House, 1976). According to Shamir et al. (1993), one of these motivational effects is increased intrinsic motivation. In an academic setting, teachers who exhibit charismatic leadership in the classroom show their professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques.

This study examined if these traits and behaviors (individually and collectively) predicted students' intrinsic motivation in community college classes. The individual elements of charismatic teaching positively impacted students' intrinsic motivation. However, the results of this research indicated that charismatic teachers who exhibit professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques simultaneously could have a higher chance of increasing community college students' intrinsic motivation in their classrooms.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS FOR RQ2

This study's second research question examined whether charismatic teaching (using the global and four subscale scores) individually predicted community college students' extrinsic motivation. The results indicated no statistically significant predictive relationship between charismatic teaching and students' extrinsic motivation. Since community college students enroll in school for various reasons, such as job training, personal edification, or plans to transfer to a university (Martin et al., 2014), these goals might be at the forefront of students' minds while in school. For example, if students plan to transfer to a university after graduation, they are keenly aware that their grades impact their ability to achieve this goal. As a result, extrinsic motivation, such as grades, may outweigh the professors' traits or behavior.

LIMITATIONS

1. One limitation of this research was the correlational nature of the study. Causality was not determined, so other factors may have contributed to the students' motivation.

2. Another limitation of this research was the location of the research institute. Since the study was conducted at a community college in the Northwest United States, the sample represented the geographic area's diversity but not the general population's.

3. A limitation also emerged in the data analysis procedure as there were intercorrelations between the predictor variables. As a result, the researcher opted to conduct a stepwise multiple linear regression analysis instead of a standard multiple linear regression analysis, which allowed the researcher to examine the impact of the individual predictor variables on the regression equation.

PRACTICAL AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Many non-traditional students in community colleges face challenges as they balance work, school, and family responsibilities, which can add stress to their lives. As a result, their motivation in the classroom may dwindle, keeping students from graduating. Community college instructors are often tasked with teaching students the course curriculum and keeping them motivated enough to attend classes. Although college faculty may be experts in their fields, they may be novices regarding student motivation.

The results of this research could provide community colleges and administrators with information about practical ways that faculty can increase their students' intrinsic motivation. The results indicated that students' intrinsic motivation could increase when instructors displayed their professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques in the classroom. Therefore, teacher training should include professional development in charismatic teaching.

The results of this research also align with CLT, the theoretical foundation for this study (House, 1976). House (1976) posited that charismatic leaders have characteristics and behaviors that impact their followers' motivation. In an academic setting, instructors may be charismatic leaders, and their students in class can be seen as their followers. This research examined if these charismatic teacher-leaders' professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality teaching techniques impacted community college students' motivation. The results of this study indicate that charismatic leaders can positively influence their followers' intrinsic motivation in this setting.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This quantitative predictive correlational study examined the relationship between charismatic teaching (professional knowledge, positive character traits, sense of humor, and quality instruction techniques) and students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. This study could be replicated in other regions for a more diverse sample population. Furthermore, this study could be replicated using a random sampling technique. Additional research could also be conducted on charismatic teaching with other factors relating to academic success, such as engagement or interest in learning at the community college level.

References

Anderson, A. M. (2021). *Examining if charismatic teaching predicts community college students' intrinsic and extrinsic motivation* [Doctoral dissertation, Grand Canyon University]. ProQuest.

Archer, A. C. (1994). *The measurement of charismatic teaching in the college classroom* [Paper presentation]. The Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED374758.pdf

Armandi, B., Oppedisano, J., & Sherman, H. (2003). Leadership theory and practice: A "case" in point. *Management Decision, 41*(10), 1076–1088. doi:10.1108/00251740310509607

Bailey, T. R., Smith-Jaggars, S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges: A clearer path to student success.* Harvard University Press.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations.* Free Press.

Bieg, S., & Dresel, M. (2018). Relevance of perceived teacher humor types for instruction and student learning. *Social Psychology of Education, 21*(4), 805–825. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-018-9428-z

Blaskova, M., Blasko, R., & Polackova, K. (2018). Motivation and charisma of university professors. *Human Resources Management & Ergonomics, 12*(1), 21–31. https://frcatel.fri.uniza.sk/hrme/files/2018/2018_1_02.pdf

Bolkan, S., & Goodboy, A. (2014). Communicating charisma in instructional settings: Indicators and effects of charismatic teaching. *College Teaching, 62*(4), 136–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/87567555.2014.956039

Chamberlin, K., Yasué, M., & Chiang, I. C. A. (2018). The impact of grades on student motivation. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 24*(2), 109–124. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787418819728

Chen, X. (2016). *Remedial coursetaking at U.S. public 2-year and 4-year institutions: Scope, experience, and outcomes (NCES 2016-405)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2016/2016405.pdf

Choi, J. (2006). A motivational theory of charismatic leadership: Envisioning, empathy, and empowerment. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 13*(1), 24–43.

Cole, A., Anderson, C., Bunton, T., Cherney, M., Fisher, V. C., Featherston, M., Motel, L., Niccolini, K. M., Peck, B., & Allen, M. (2017). Student predisposition to instructor feedback and perceptions of teaching presence predict motivation toward online courses. *Online Learning Journal, 21*(4), 245–262. https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i4.966

Daniels, R., & Goodboy, A. K. (2014). Transformational leadership in the Ghanaian university classroom. *Intercultural Communication Studies, 23*(2), 90-109. https://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/R.-Daniels-A.-K.-Goodboy.pdf

Daumiller, M., Bieg, S., Dickhäuser, O., & Dresel, M. (2019). Humor in university teaching: Role of teachers' achievement goals and self-efficacy for their use of content-related humor. *Studies in Higher Education, 45*(12), 2619–2633. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2019.1623772

Dayel, S. B., Al Diab, A., Abdelaziz, A., Farghaly, A., & Al Ansari, A. (2018). Validity of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Medical Education, 9,* 309–315. https://doi.org/10.5116/ijme.5bec.81cf

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation.* John Wiley & Sons.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* Plenum.

Dobrovska, D. (2018a). *Charismatic teaching* [Conference session]. In Proceedings of International Academic Conferences (No. 7209103). International Institute of Social and Economic Sciences.

Dobrovska, D. (2018b). One more way how to improve the higher education teaching. *An Independent Scientific Journal for Interdisciplinary Research in Pedagogy, 4,* 7–15. https://www.pdf.upol.cz/fileadmin/userdata/PdF/ePedagogium/e-Pedagogium_4-2018online.pdf#page=9

Duncan, T. G., & McKeachie, W. J. (2005). The making of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire. *Educational Psychologist, 40*(2), 117–128. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep4002_6

Eison, J. (2010). Using active learning instructional strategies to create excitement and enhance learning [Manuscript in preparation]. https://appliedecon.oregonstate.edu/sites/agscid7/files/eison.pdf

Estepp, C. M., & Roberts, T. G. (2015). Teacher immediacy and professor/student rapport as predictors of motivation and engagement. *NACTA Journal, 2,* 155–165.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1–4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Gess-Newsome, J., Taylor, J. A., Carlson, J., Gardner, A. L., Wilson, C. D., & Stuhlsatz, M. A. (2019). Teacher pedagogical content knowledge, practice, and student achievement. *International Journal of Science Education, 41*(7), 944–963. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2016.1265158

Goodboy, A. K., & Bolkan, S. (2011). Leadership in the college classroom: The use of charismatic leadership as a deterrent to student resistance strategies. *The Journal of Classroom Interaction, 46*(2), 4–10.

Gottfried, A. (1985). Academic intrinsic motivation in elementary and

junior high school students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*(6), 631–645. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.77.6.631

Gottfried, A. (2009). The role of environment in contextual and social influences on motivation: Generalities, specificities, and causality. In K. R. Wentzel & Wigfield, A. (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 462–475). Routledge.

Gottfried, A. W., Cook, C. R., Gottfried, A. E., & Morris, P. E. (2005). Educational characteristics of adolescents with gifted academic intrinsic motivation: A longitudinal investigation from school entry through early adulthood. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 49*(2), 172–186.

Gravetter, F. J., & Forzano, L. A. B. (2012). *Research methods for the behavioral sciences* (4th ed). Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Grove, S. K. (2019). *Understanding nursing research: First South Asia edition, e-book: Building an evidence-based practice.* Elsevier.

Gunasekare, D. U. (2019). Teacher leadership: Charismatic characteristics of Sri Lankan school teachers. *KINERJA, 23(*2), 143–152. https://doi.org/10.24002/kinerja.v22i2.2417

Herranz-Zarzoso, N., & Sabater-Grande, G. (2018). Monetary incentives and self-chosen goals in academic performance: An experimental study. *International Review of Economics Education, 27,* 34–44. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iree.2018.02.002

Hornstra, L., Stroet, K., van Eijden, E., Goudsblom, J., & Roskamp, C. (2018). Teacher expectation effects on need-supportive teaching, student motivation, and engagement: A self-determination perspective. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 24*(3-5), 324–345. https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2018.1550 841

House, R. J. (1976). *A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership.* [Manuscript in preparation]. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED133827.pdf

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189–207). Southern Illinois University Press.

Huang, Y., & Lin, S. (2014). Assessment of charisma as a factor in effective teaching. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 17*(2), 284–295.

Joseph, S. (2016). Teachers who attract or repel: A glimpse at student expectations of their tertiary-level teachers. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 15*(2), 21–31. http://www.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/viewFile/590/261

Keller, J. M. (1987). Strategies for stimulating the motivation to learn. *Performance & Instruction, 26*(8), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.4160260802

Keller, M. M., Woolfolk Hoy, A. E., Goetz, T., & Frenzel, A. C. (2016). Teacher enthusiasm: Reviewing and redefining a complex construct. *Educational Psychology Review, 28*(4), 743–769.

https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9354-y

Kelly, J. (2017). Professional learning and adult learning theory: A connection. *Northwest Journal of Teacher Education, 12*(2), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.15760/nwjte.2017.12.2.4

Klitzman, R. (2013). How IRBs view and make decisions about coercion and undue influence. *Journal of Medical Ethics, 39*(4), 224–229.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy* (2nd ed.). The Association Press.

Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Pearson Education.

Lavonier, N. (2016). Evaluation of the effectiveness of remedial reading courses at community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 40*(6), 523–533. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1080200

Lee, D. C., Lu, J. J., Mao, K. M., Ling, S. H., Yeh, M. C., & Hsieh, C. L. (2014). Does teachers' charisma can really induce students learning interest? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 116,* 1143–1148. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.359

Lin, S., & Huang, Y. (2014). Examining teaching charisma and its relation to student engagement. *Cross-Cultural Communication, 10*(6), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3968/5631

Lin, S., & Huang, Y. (2016). Examining charisma in relation to students' interest in learning. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 17*(2), 139–151. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787416637481

Lin, S., & Huang, Y. (2017). The effect of teacher charisma on student attitude towards calculus learning. *International Journal of Science, Technology, and Society, 5*(2), 26–32. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijsts.20170502.12

Maharaj, C., Blair, E., & Chin Yuen Kee, S. (2018). The motivation to study: An analysis of undergraduate engineering students at a Caribbean university. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 42*(1), 24–35. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2016.1188901

Martin, K., Galentino, R., & Townsend, L. (2014). Community college student success: The role of motivation and self-empowerment. *Community College Review, 42*(3), 221–241. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552114528972

Martinez, S. M., Frongillo, E. A., Leung, C., & Ritchie, L. (2018). No food for thought: Food insecurity is related to poor mental health and lower academic performance among students in California's public university system. *Journal of Health Psychology, 25*(12), 1930–1939. https://doi.org/10.1177/1359105318783028

Maslow, A., & Lewis, K. J. (1987). Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Salenger Incorporated, 14*(17), 987–990.

Miles, L. K. (2009). Who is approachable? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45*(1), 262–266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.08.010

National Center for Education Statistics. (2019). *Fast facts.* https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=40

Northouse, P. G. (2018). *Leadership: Theory and practice.* Sage Publications.

Nurra, C., & Oyserman, D. (2018). From future self to current action: An identity-based motivation perspective. *Self and Identity, 17*(3), 343–364. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2017.1375003

Osugi, T., & Kawahara, J. I. (2018). Effects of head nodding and shaking motions on perceptions of likeability and approachability. *Perception, 47*(1), 16–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0301006617733209

Peterson, S. (2016). Community college student-parents: Priorities for persistence. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 40*(5), 370–384. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2015.1065210

Petre, A. (2017). The role of constant and continuous feedback on students' learning motivation. *Scientific Research & Education in The AirForce, 21*, 61–166. https://doi.org/10.19062/2247-3173.2017.19.2.23

Pinto, L., Portelli, J., Rottman, C., Pashby, K., Barrett, S., & Mujawamariya, D. (2012). Charismatic, competent, or transformative? Ontario school administrators' perceptions of "good teachers." *Journal of Teaching and Learning, 8*(1), 73–90. https://doi.org/10.22329/jtl.v8i1.3052

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1993). Reliability and predictive validity of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 53*(3), 801–813.

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. F., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W. J. (1991). *A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1) 68–78. https://doi.org/10.1037110003-066X.55.1.68

Ryan, R., & Deci, E. (2009). Promoting self-determined school engagement: Motivation, learning, and well-being. In K.R. Wentzel & Wigfield, A. (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation at school* (pp. 171–196). Routledge.

Sacavém, A., Martinez, L. F., da Cunha, J. V., Abreu, A. M., & Johnson, S. K. (2017). Charismatic leadership: A study on delivery styles, mood, and performance. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 11*(3), 21–38. https://doi.org/10.1002/jls.21519

Saunders-Scott, D., Braley, M. B., & Stennes-Spidahl, N. (2018). Traditional and psychological factors associated with academic success: Investigating best predictors of college retention. *Motivation & Emotion, 42*(4), 459–465. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-017-9660-4

Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4*(4), 577–594. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/2635081

Sharififard, F., Asayesh, H., Hosseini, M. H. M., & Sepahvandi, M. (2020). Motivation, self-efficacy, stress, and academic performance correlation with academic burnout among nursing students. *Journal of Nursing and Midwifery Sciences, 7*(2), 88.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15*(2), 4–14. https://www.jstor.org/stable/1175860

Siddig, B. E., & AlKhoudary, Y. A. (2018). Investigating classroom interaction: Teacher and learner participation. *English Language Teaching, 11*(12), 86–92. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1197582.pdf

Sogunro, O. (2015). Motivating factors for adult learners in higher education. *International Journal of Higher Education. 4*(1), 22–37. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v4n1p22

Sogunro, O. A. (2017). Quality instruction as a motivating factor in higher education. *International Journal of Higher Education, 6*(4), 173–184. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v6n4p173

Stover, S., & Ziswiler, K. (2017). Impact of active learning environments on community of inquiry. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 29*(3), 458–470. https://www.isetl.org/ijtlhe/

Suryani, A. (2016). Redefining the potential role of charismatic language teachers in creating supportive academic atmosphere through students' motivational arousal. *Jurnal Sosial Humaniora, 9*(1), 59–77. https://doi.org/10.12962/j24433527.v9i1.1279

Tahir, K. (2018). Transformational teaching: Pakistani students' perspectives in the English classroom. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 30*(1), 61–69. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1169803.pdf

Williams, K. C., & Williams, C. C. (2011). Five key ingredients for improving student motivation. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 12*, 1–23.

Wlodkowski, R. J., & Ginsberg, M. B. (2017). *Enhancing adult motivation to learn: A comprehensive guide for teaching all adults.* John Wiley & Sons.

Wu, Y. C., Hsieh, L. F., & Lu, J. J. (2015). Can teacher charisma really spark adult intention in continuing learning? *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 191*, 396–401. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.152

Yilmaz, E., Sahin, M., & Turgut, M. (2017). Variables affecting student motivation based on academic publications. *Journal of Education and Practice, 8*(12), 112–120. https://eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=EJ1140621

Zee, M., & Koomen, H. M. (2016). Teacher self-efficacy and its effects on classroom processes, student academic adjustment,

and teacher well-being: A synthesis of 40 years of research. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 981–1015. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654315626801

Zerquera, D. D., Ziskin, M., & Torres, V. (2018). Faculty views of "non-traditional" students: Aligning perspectives for student success. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice, 20*(1), 29–46. https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025116645109

Zhengdong, G., Honghan, N., & Kejuan, M. (2018). Trainee teachers' experiences of classroom feedback practices and their motivation to learn. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 44*(4), 505–510. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2018.1450956

Zumbrunn, S., McKim, C., Buhs, E., & Hawley, L. R. (2014). Support, belonging, motivation, and engagement in the college classroom: A mixed method study. *Instructional Science, 42*(5), 661–684. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-014-9310-0