

CHAPTER 10

Motivating Faculty

*James C. McCroskey and
Virginia P. Richmond*

People who are capable and productive at doing something else are most likely to be selected to serve as department chairs. Some are excellent researchers. Some are excellent teachers. Some are excellent in providing service to the institution or larger community. Some are excellent in more than one endeavor. Unfortunately, few people are selected chairs because they have demonstrated excellence in fostering the efforts of their peers, a chair's primary task.

One of the most difficult things for many new chairs to accept is that they are judged more on what their colleagues collectively achieve than what they achieve themselves. No matter how hard a chair tries, he or she cannot conduct enough research for an entire department, nor teach with excellence the majority of the department's courses, nor provide quality service to all constituencies. *The chair's primary task is to coordinate and enhance the efforts of the collective faculty.*

Goal-Setting

A chair must develop clear goals for the department. Coordination and enhancement are virtually impossible without

first establishing a clear direction. Motivation without direction is little better than no motivation at all.

When establishing goals the chair must consider both long-term and short-term outcomes. Often, to achieve long-term goals, some short-term goals must be sacrificed. To establish a new research program that qualifies for a major, continuing grant, some current research may be postponed. To launch courses for a new program, some current courses may be offered less often. Similarly, achievement of long-term goals may be postponed because of temporary emergencies. Launching a new program may be delayed because sufficient funding is not available without decimating current programs.

We will not dwell longer on the importance of goal-setting. Other chapters in this volume deal with it and whole books are available on this important process. Suffice to say, directing the efforts of faculty is difficult, at best, if one does not know where the efforts must be directed.

Compliance Versus Motivation

Motivating people who are not internally motivated is difficult. Attempting such efforts for small, routine matters misuses a chair's resources. Many daily items deal with institutional procedures. Rules are established and people are expected to follow them. Grades must be turned in by a certain date, paperwork must be completed by a given time, and so on. Most of these routine matters are mundane. People do them because they are "supposed to," not because they "want" to. If something is not done, the goal for the chair is simple: get it done — whether they like it or not. *This is a compliance-centered goal.*

It is important that chairs sort out those things for which only compliance is expected from those where motivation is needed. Compliance is comparatively easy to achieve, at least on small matters, unless there is some larger issue between the chair and a faculty member. Most often, compliance is the objective when a faculty member is not engaging in appropriate behavior readily observable by the chair and/or

others. People "comply" even when they would rather not if they know others are watching. On the other hand, people not subject to surveillance generally do what others want only if they are internally driven (motivated). "Motivated" faculty agree to provide assistance to a community group even though it is unpaid and it provides no special recognition. While chairs want "motivated" faculty, often they are lucky to have "compliant" faculty.

Hiring Motivated Faculty

Motivation resides primarily within an individual. Thus, the chair's first task is to hire motivated faculty. This is difficult but not impossible. It involves three steps: (1) attracting motivated applicants; (2) selecting motivated prospects; and (3) recruiting the top prospects.

Attracting Motivated Applicants

The first step in hiring motivated faculty is advertising faculty vacancies. The way a position is advertised often determines what kind of people apply. Advertising rugged mountains, desirable climate, opportunities for sailing, or quality theatre, symphony and sports programs will increase the number of applicants, but not necessarily the number of motivated applicants. As we will note later, virtually all faculty are interested in quality of life issues, not just motivated faculty. *Motivated people are looking for opportunities such as personal growth, recognition, and achievement.* Position advertisements must emphasize these aspects of the position to attract motivated faculty.

Selecting Motivated Prospects

As most people in higher education know, the best predictor of a student's future grade is the student's past grades. A similar rule applies to selecting motivated faculty from a group of prospects. The best predictor of whether one will perform well in the future is that person's past performance. When seeking a person who is motivated to conduct and

publish research, the department's main concern should be whether the person has done so previously. It makes no difference whether the person is a new graduate or an old hand, the issue is the same. The best predictor of future publication is past publication. Truly motivated people publish prior to graduation. People not motivated to publish, seldom do. If the department is seeking a person to develop a program, the best predictor is past success at program development. *Motivation usually is very visible in a resume, if one only looks in the right places.*

Recruiting Top Prospects

Identifying motivated people is easier than hiring them. Motivated people usually know what they are looking for, but do not always make their desires clear in correspondence or interviews. It is very important that all available opportunities are made clear, even if some do not seem particularly important for the individual prospect. *Often prospects have unspoken desires.* We recall an instance during an interview with a prospective faculty member that turned the tide. Mention was made that new computers had been ordered for the faculty. This was very important to this applicant because he had a history of negative experiences with mainframe computers and wanted to operate independently. Until this point the subject of computers had not been mentioned.

As important as it is to recruit the best prospects, it is even more important to discourage people who would be unhappy if they were hired. Honesty is the best policy in the hiring process. If a department places a low value on teaching, it is important that applicants who are motivated to excel in their teaching be aware of that. The same goes for research, public service, campus politics, or any other aspect of the position that might attract a motivated person. *There are few, if any, things more discouraging than to find what a person is motivated to do with excellence is not valued by others.*

Influencing Faculty Behavior

Even if one is fortunate enough to have a motivated faculty, they are not motivated to do *everything* the chair

would have them do. Thus, much of a chair's time is spent attempting to influence individual faculty members' behavior. This communication process is often referred to as "motivating" faculty, of providing reasons why they should do what the chair wants.

Behavior Alteration Techniques (BATs)

Although many techniques have been developed from which a chair may choose, the following 23 "Behavior Alteration Techniques" (BATs) offer the chair communication strategies to influence faculty members. (See Figure 10.1 for an overview of each technique and examples of the kinds of statements used with each.) No one BAT is the "best" in all circumstances, some work better under certain circumstances.

Table 10.1
Common Behavior Alteration Techniques

<i>Category</i>	<i>Sample Message</i>
1. Immediate Reward from Behavior	You will enjoy it. It will make you happy. Because it is fun. You'll find it interesting. It's a good experience.
2. Deferred Reward from Behavior	It will help you later on in your career. It will prepare you to take a higher level position. It will count in your favor for promotion.
3. Reward from Chair	I will make you "X" if you do. I will make it beneficial to you. I will count it toward your merit evaluation.
4. Reward from Others	Others will respect you if you do. Your students will respect you if you do. Your colleagues will like you for it. The dean will be pleased if you do.
5. Internal Reward: Self-Esteem	You will feel good about yourself if you do. You are the best person to do it. You always do such a good job. You are so good at it.
6. Immediate Punishment from Behavior	You will lose if you don't. You will be unhappy if you don't. You will be hurt if you don't. It's your loss if you don't.

Table 10.1 continued

7. Deferred Punishment from Behavior	It will hurt you later in your career. It will work against you for a promotion. You won't be able to qualify for a higher position.
8. Punishment from Chair	I will punish you if you don't. I will make it miserable for you. I will make sure you are an outcast. I will take away "X" if you don't.
9. Punishment from Others	No one will like you. Your students will make fun of you. Your colleagues will reject you. The dean will be angry with you.
10. Internal Punishment: Guilt	If you don't, others will be hurt. You will make others unhappy if you don't. Your students will be punished if you don't.
11. Positive Chair Relationship	I will like you better if you do. I will respect you. I will be proud of you. It will indicate you are one of my kind of people.
12. Negative Chair Relationship	I will dislike you if you don't. I'll be disappointed in you. I won't be proud of you. I won't like it.
13. Legitimate Chair Authority	Because I told you to. You don't have a choice in this. I'm in charge, not you. I'm the person you answer to. Don't ask; just do it.
14. Legitimate Higher Authority	Do it; I'm just telling you what I was told. It is a rule; I have to do it and so do you. It's a rule; others expect you to do it.
15. Personal Responsibility	It's your obligation. It's your turn. Everyone has to do his or her share. It's your job. Everyone has to pull his or her own weight.
16. Responsibility to Colleagues	Your colleagues need it done. The department depends on you. All your colleagues are counting on you. Don't let us down.
17. Normative Rules	We voted and the majority rules. All your colleagues are doing it. Everyone has to do it. The rest of the department is doing it.

Table 10.1 continued

18. Debt	You own me one. Pay your debt. You promised to do it. I did it last time. You said you would do it this time.
19. Altruism	If you do this it will help your colleagues. Your students will benefit if you do. I am not asking you to do it for yourself, do it for the good of the department.
20. Peer Modeling	Your colleagues do it. Good faculty members do it. Faculty you admire do it. Your friends on the faculty are doing it.
21. Chair Modeling	This is the way I always do it. When I first started out, that is the way I did it. Most people like me do it that way. I used to do it.
22. Chair Expertise	From my experience, it is a good idea. From what I have learned, it is what you should do. This has always worked for me. Trust me; I know what I am doing.
23. Chair Feedback	Because I need to know how well you understand this. To see how well I have explained it to you. It will help you understand your problem areas.

IMMEDIATE REWARD FROM BEHAVIOR

Often the chair attempts to elicit specific faculty behaviors by suggesting that they are inherently rewarding and fulfilling. The rewarding consequences from engaging in the desired behavior are emphasized. This "try it, you'll like it" approach is useful in situations where faculty are reluctant to engage in behaviors that deviate from the "old way" of doing things. This technique is often helpful in developing a trusting relationship between the chair and a given faculty member. The key is to insure the faculty member *is* rewarded for engaging in the new behavior. If the reward is not forthcoming, not only will the behavior be discontinued but the relationship between the chair and that faculty member may be seriously damaged.

DEFERRED REWARD FROM BEHAVIOR

Sometimes the chair attempts to elicit specific faculty behaviors by suggesting that, if certain behaviors are engaged in, rewards will come at a later time, a later date or later in one's career. For example, the chair might ask faculty members to teach an overload one term, assuring them that their load will be reduced later. In this approach the chair can be explicit about the types of rewards that will come later or they might be inferred. While this technique is not immediately reinforcing, more mature faculty recognize that many rewards are not immediate, but come later in their careers (e.g., working hard early in one's career can have payoffs at a later time).

REWARD FROM CHAIR

This technique is straightforward and clear cut. A chair's influence takes the form of, "If you do this for me, I'll do X for you." This type of reward is usually clear in its orientation: there is a request and an established reward that goes with it. It also is clear the chair is the one granting the reward, not someone else. While this technique can be used occasionally, its impact diminishes if used too often. Chairs realize very early in their careers that they possess a limited number of rewards, rewards better saved for very special situations. This type of influence is often seen as a "bribe." If used too often, a chair will find faculty replying to the request, "What will you do for me if I comply with your request?" Thus, our advice is not to use this technique too often.

REWARD FROM OTHERS

The chair using this technique to elicit a behavior might suggest that "Others will respect you if you do this," or "Your colleagues will like you for this." In this situation the faculty member does something because others (such as colleagues) will be pleased and, as a result, provide him or her some kind of reward. The "others" need not be colleagues. They could

be more senior administrators, students, community members, granting agency evaluators, or any other individual or group in a position to provide reward.

INTERNAL REWARD: SELF-ESTEEM

Often a chair attempts to elicit desired behaviors by making the faculty feel good about themselves. This technique centers on people feeling good about themselves for engaging in a desired behavior. The chair might say "You are so good at it," "Only a few people can do such a good job on this" or "You are the best person to do it." This technique usually appeals to a faculty member's better side. It implies that he or she is a worthwhile member of the faculty, capable of making an important contribution. One caution in this regard: this technique works best with faculty who have *high* self-esteem. It validates their own self-perceptions. In contrast, faculty members with *low* self-esteem may be suspicious of such suggestions, seeing the effort as an attempt to "con" them.

IMMEDIATE PUNISHMENT FROM BEHAVIOR

The chair attempts to elicit faculty behavior by suggesting that if the desired behavior is not performed, or some inappropriate behavior is performed, there will be an immediate punishment or loss of some type. This is the flip side of immediate reward from behavior. While immediate reward is dependent upon immediate reinforcement, immediate punishment from behavior is dependent upon some immediate negative outcome. While this technique might be implicit, it often is explicit. For example, a chair might say "If you do X, you will not receive a raise" or "If you don't do X, then you will have to spend all weekend in meetings with colleagues." Note that in both examples, the chair does not say he or she will withhold a raise or force meetings. These negative outcomes are projected as coming from certain behavior choices immediately and automatically.

DEFERRED PUNISHMENT FROM BEHAVIOR

Sometimes the chair attempts to elicit specific faculty behaviors by suggesting that if the behaviors are not engaged in, there will be punishment(s) or losses that will occur at a later time, later date or later in a faculty member's career. This is the flip side of deferred reward from behavior. Its negative impact is not immediate but an implied or explicit threat for the future is used. For example, to get a faculty member to publish more research the chair may say (or write) "If you do not conduct and publish more research you will not be retained in this Department." Or, to encourage a faculty member to be more careful in grading, "The amount of time it takes to check your grades is nothing compared to the amount of time it takes to deal with one irate student or dean."

Most chairs can count the number of times they have clearly stated — or put in writing — what is expected of a faculty member and what the negative consequences will be if the standard is not met. However, faculty often ignore these warnings because the punishment is "down the road" in their professional careers. These same faculty are then "shocked and surprised" to learn they have been denied tenure because their performance was below expectation. Thus, chairs should not expect too much from this technique. People are told not to smoke or they will get lung cancer; they are told to wear seat belts or they will be injured or killed in auto accidents. But people still smoke and ride with belts unfastened. Both insecure and highly future-oriented people respond well to this technique. But most simply do not believe the threat is real until the punishment is immediate.

PUNISHMENT FROM CHAIR

To get faculty to engage in specific behaviors the chair suggests that the faculty will be punished if the request is not complied with. For example, the chair might say, "I will punish you, if you don't do X" or "I will not recommend you for a raise if you don't do X." This technique requires the

chair's request to be very clear. In other words, the faculty defying the chair using this technique knows he or she is going to get whatever the chair can mandate as a punishment. As with reward from chair, punishment from chair should be clear, direct, and from the chair, not some other source. Chairs using this technique must be able to institute the punishment; they must also realize that frequent use of this technique destroys relationships.

This type of influence rarely yields more than compliance and often leads to an ineffective relationship between chair and faculty member. However, there are times when a chair may have limited ways to deal with a particular faculty member. If a faculty member is unmotivated, immature, or constantly challenging the chair's authority, then the chair may have to resort to punishment.

PUNISHMENT FROM OTHERS

The chair using this technique to elicit desired behaviors from his or her faculty might say things like, "Others will not like or respect you, if you don't do X" or "No one will want to work with you and you might be disliked by not complying." This type of influence implies that others, such as colleagues, will punish the faculty member if he or she does not do what is expected. This is a very threatening type of influence because peers often *do* punish each other for lack of compliance with rules, requests, and other job duties. Thus, this is a very real form of compliance. Although this type of compliance is not motivating, it frequently gets faculty to do given tasks.

INTERNAL PUNISHMENT: GUILT

This technique elicits behaviors by suggesting the faculty member will feel badly because others, such as colleagues and friends, will be hurt, unhappy, or disillusioned if he or she does not comply. This is a commonly used influence strategy. For example, parents use it with children, saying things like, "How will your Dad feel if you bring home an

'F' in mathematics?" College professors use it, "How will your parents feel when you take home an 'F' in communication?" Department chairs also use this strategy, saying things like, "How will your colleagues react when they hear you didn't do what they were doing?" Or, "How will the co-authors of your convention paper feel when they find out you aren't going to the convention?" The chair might even imply that others will be hurt or punished for lack of compliance. This strategy works well with insecure faculty and those with a high need for approval from their colleagues. More self-confident and less sensitive faculty often care little about how others view them. Thus, a chair must use this technique sparingly and with considerable care.

POSITIVE CHAIR RELATIONSHIP

Sometimes certain faculty behaviors can be elicited by suggesting that the faculty member will be better liked and respected by the chair if certain expectations are met. The chair might say things like, "I will respect you, if you do X" or "I really like people who do X." This technique is particularly useful in compliance gaining because it is based on *referent power*. It assumes that faculty want the respect and liking of their chairs and willingly comply with reasonable requests to gain the chair's respect. Many times a faculty member not only complies with the chair's request, but actually identifies with and internalizes it.

NEGATIVE CHAIR RELATIONSHIP

The chair attempts to elicit certain faculty behaviors by suggesting the faculty member will lose the chair's respect and liking if certain expectations are not met. This is the flip side of positive chair relationship. The chair might say, "I will lose respect for you if you don't do X" or "I don't respect faculty members that do X." This is negative use of referent power. As with its positive use, many faculty comply with the chair's requests to avoid losing his or her respect.

LEGITIMATE CHAIR AUTHORITY

The chair using this technique suggests that he or she has the "legitimate right" as chair to ask faculty members to comply with certain requests or demands. This form of influence stems from the institution assigning chairs the responsibility for enforcing institutional "rules." For example, a chair has the right to request that faculty members teach a certain number of courses, perform duties in a professional manner, and be in attendance at faculty meetings. However, he or she does not have the right to mandate clothing styles or lifestyles. While this form of influence is not perceived as negatively as punishment, its impact is often equally negative. This occurs when a chair relies too heavily on the fact that he or she is the boss and overemphasizes that role. There are some chairs who take assigned authority to extremes, becoming "little Hitlers."

This type of compliance seeking is often seen in memos or departmental meetings where the chair sets forth expectations for faculty to follow. Examples include: "Anyone planning to be out-of-town and miss a class must file Absence Form B before leaving campus." "Please complete a 'delete form' on any student not present on the first day of classes." As can be seen, use of legitimate supervisor authority is grounded in routine matters. When it is extended into more important aspects of a faculty member's life, the chair may encounter substantial resistance.

LEGITIMATE HIGHER AUTHORITY

A chair using this influence strategy suggests the faculty should do what the chair asks, not because of his or her own authority, but because both the chair and the faculty are expected to comply with the requests of a higher authority, such as a dean or provost. For example, chairs and faculty are expected to complete annual personnel reports and return them to a higher source, such as a dean. In most cases, faculty will comply with higher authority *if the request is reasonable*. However, if the requests are unreasonable, the faculty find

ways not to comply. Then the higher authority has to try another strategy to get compliance — or delegates the problem to the chair for solution.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

With this technique the chair attempts to elicit faculty behaviors by pointing out that "Everyone has to do his or her share," "It's your turn" or "It's your responsibility." This obligatory strategy usually leads to compliance with the request without negative feelings because the faculty can see that others have done "their share." In many institutions, this technique is employed through the use of "position descriptions." These instruments enumerate the responsibilities of each individual. Thus, if some responsibility is not being met, the chair has easy access to the "it's your responsibility" claim.

RESPONSIBILITY TO COLLEAGUES

Sometimes faculty behaviors can be elicited by suggesting that the faculty member's colleagues are depending on his or her compliance and responsibility. Few faculty members want to be responsible for their department missing out or not sharing in possible rewards because someone did not "carry his or her load." To influence the faculty member, the chair might say, "Your colleagues need this done, they are depending on you" or "You'll let the group down if X isn't done." This could apply to a number of situations. For example, if a group of faculty are writing a grant proposal, each has a responsibility to the overall group to do his or her share so that the proposal can be finished.

NORMATIVE RULES

The chair using this strategy to elicit faculty behavior depends on majority rule, or the idea that the faculty member should conform because colleagues are following certain behavior patterns. For example, "We voted and the majority

rules," "All of your colleagues are doing X," "The entire group is doing X, hence you need to go along with the group." Many times, if the requests are reasonable, faculty conform to the demands because of the norms. Often it is easier to comply with the norm than resist it.

DEBT

A chair may elicit certain behaviors by suggesting that a faculty member "owes" it to the chair to perform some task. Perhaps the chair has done some favors or granted some requests and is "calling in a debt." People often do favors for others, and then expect the favor to be repaid: "I took your class while you were ill, would you attend this meeting for me?" This strategy works well if not abused or used too often. However, overuse leads to strong resentment.

ALTRUISM

The chair using this strategy to elicit faculty member behavior is suggesting that compliance will be beneficial to others, that others will be happier or better off in some way because of the faculty member's behavior. Of course, the faculty member has to want to make others' lives better, such as wanting to make classes more conducive to learning. This strategy works well with some faculty and has little or no impact on others. Some faculty do not have an altruistic "bone in their bodies," while others are very altruistic. A chair can usually tell the difference. For example, the faculty member who insists on creating an impossible learning environment, will not do extra tasks to improve the work environment, and constantly complains about his or her students and colleagues is unlikely to be swayed by altruistic appeals. Whereas the person who is willing to redesign classes for optimal learning, and work with students and other faculty is more likely to be altruistic. Therefore, a chair needs to know his or her faculty well before using this strategy.

PEER MODELING

At times the chair attempts to elicit behaviors by suggesting that a faculty member should comply because friends, colleagues, and admired others are already engaging in the behaviors. For example, the chair might say, "People you respect and like are doing X," or "Others like you are doing X, perhaps you should try it." This is a very appealing form of compliance because people generally try what their trusted friends and colleagues feel is best. Much of the literature on opinion-leadership suggests that an individual is most influenced by people he or she respects and likes. Thus, this is a very potent strategy. Additional reinforcement is present for compliance because colleagues reinforce the faculty member for doing what they are already doing.

CHAIR MODELING

A chair using this technique to influence a faculty member's behavior is suggesting that the faculty person should comply because the chair is engaging in the behavior and the behavior is one the chair thinks is important. The chair might suggest that "this is the way I usually do X" or "people who are like me do it this way." The chair might even suggest "real-life" models that he or she respects, likes, and even models herself or himself as a means of getting a faculty member to engage in appropriate professional behaviors. This strategy will work well if the chair is liked and respected by his or her faculty members. It will not work at all if the chair is disliked or is not respected by her or his faculty members.

CHAIR EXPERTISE

A chair attempts to elicit certain faculty behaviors by suggesting faculty compliance with his or her request because of the chair's expertise and experience in the area. Statements like "I have found this to be the best way" or "From my experience, this usually is the best thing to do" represent use

of this technique. If pressed, the chair can substantiate his or her claim by discussing why certain requests are desirable and others are not. This is a very effective means of influencing faculty, particularly if they were originally hired by the same chair. Many times faculty members take positions in a department because of the chair or because of the faculty the chair has hired. This often implicitly speaks to the chair's perceived expertise.

CHAIR FEEDBACK

This technique centers on faculty behaviors that the chair might reasonably be expected to observe and provide advice or assistance in his or her role as an administrator. Such influence attempts are characterized by comments such as "... so I can see if this will work" or "... so that I can see if you need some assistance." Chairs often use this technique to help in their supervisory role. Sometimes it is used as an excuse for the faculty member to do the chair a small "favor." By "trying" the requested behavior as a favor, the faculty member may find that it is one to his or her liking and continue it.

Strategies

None of the Behavioral Alteration Techniques is a guaranteed method of influencing faculty behavior. Their potential usefulness varies sharply from situation-to-situation. Any one of the methods loses its value through overuse. It is very important, therefore, that the chair recognize the wide array of techniques available to better adapt to both the individual faculty member and to the particular situation.

It is also important for the chair to recognize that any motivation for behavior change produced by the BATs is likely to be transient. *The techniques are more likely to produce movement than motivation.* Such movement, or short term compliance, is not to be disparaged. Most of needed or desired changes in faculty behavior are of the smaller, transient

variety. Motivation is an individual internal state. To produce larger, more long-term behavioral changes involves producing changes in the long-term motivational state of the individual. Producing such change is a much more complex process, one that requires an understanding of the nature of human motivation.

The work of Frederick Herzberg, under the rubric of "motivator-hygiene theory," has provided valuable insight into the complexities of motivation in the workplace.¹ While this overall theory has not been fully supported through research, its main tenets provide insight which is particularly helpful to department chairs. Of prime importance is the recognition that factors facilitating and inhibiting motivation may co-exist. In the following sections we consider each factor.

Permitting Motivation to Surface — Inhibiting Factors

It is difficult to be highly motivated if one is miserable. Such a situation is analogous to having a pebble in a shoe. Most people, try as they might, cannot focus on anything except that pebble until it is removed. All of the problems, all the hopes and aspirations, everything becomes secondary to that irritating pebble. This feeling represents the essence of what we mean by "inhibiting" factors; factors that do not relate to motivation directly. Rather, they are the "pebbles in the shoe" that do not allow motivation.

In academia, these inhibiting factors are elements that make a faculty member dissatisfied. Again, consider the pebble. If the pebble is removed, it is not some wondrous, exhilarating experience; there is temporary relief that it is gone, then the mind moves onto something else. That something else could well be another irritant. The important point to remember is that *an irritant's removal produces no more than momentary pleasure*. It removes dissatisfaction. It does not produce motivation. However, it produces a situation where motivation is a possible outcome, if other circumstances are supportive.

Some of the inhibiting factors that prevent motivation from surfacing in an academic environment include: salary,

job security, work conditions, institutional policies and administration, interpersonal relations with the chair, peers, and subordinates, and personal life.

SALARY

When faculty think of job satisfaction, one of the first things coming to mind is salary. On the surface at least, most people think they would be satisfied making a certain amount of income, usually substantially more than currently made. They think that if they could get a raise, they would be happy. While there probably is such a thing as "enough money," it is not something most people are going to have, particularly those in academia. Raises are somewhat like meals. Just because I received one today, do not expect me to turn one down tomorrow. Receiving a significant raise temporarily removes dissatisfaction with salary. However, that dissatisfaction is likely to come back again, often very soon. Since salary is so closely associated with having the "good things in life," pressure to increase salary is a constant irritant.

JOB SECURITY

People who worry about having a job tomorrow cannot be expected to be motivated to perform quality work today. For this reason unions and employee rights have come into existence. Higher education has a unique form of job security called "tenure." Tenure is the goal of almost all young faculty. Once tenure is achieved, or so untenured faculty think, one has "made it." Academic institutions have established tortuous systems which untenured faculty must go through to achieve tenure. Untenured faculty argue they do not have time to be motivated to do anything except achieve tenure. After that is accomplished, so the story goes, the real work begins. Of course, once tenure is granted, the world does not automatically become a wondrous place. Rather, in short order, the issue of tenure fades and other problems are confronted. Another pebble has been removed. On to other irritants.

WORKING CONDITIONS

Working conditions relate to the environment where faculty work. Such basic things as temperature, lighting, size, and comfort come to mind. Generally working conditions are satisfactory unless some environmental element is focused on, rather than on the job. Working in an office that reaches 120° in the summer inhibits motivation, as does having to park a half-mile from the office in a blinding snow storm. Four faculty in a 6' x 6' office tends to block motivation, as does carrying armloads of material across campus while passing dozens of empty classrooms to reach a classroom some clerk decided was the "right" one. All faculty expect reasonable work conditions. If those expectations are not met, motivation will not occur.

INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATION

Academic institutions are bureaucracies. Some are enormous, larger than moderate-sized cities. Nevertheless, they are created to facilitate the efforts of faculty and students. All policies and administrative efforts are presumably directed toward that objective. When things are going as they should, faculty are hardly aware of the bureaucracy. When they are not, faculty and the bureaucracy often go to war. It is critical that policies and the administration of those policies not interfere with the faculty's day-to-day efforts. When faculty and bureaucrats are in conflict, motivation drops to zero.

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Faculty expect positive relationships with their chair, colleagues and students. This expectation is not always met, and when it is not, the conflict that arises often overshadows faculty motivation.

PERSONAL LIFE

A faculty member's personal life is not left at home. It goes to work, particularly if there is a problem in it. While

personal problems may not be caused by what occurs on the job, those problems often profoundly impact on that person's work. While it is obvious that one could not expect high motivation from a faculty member who has a child dying of cancer, it is less obvious that motivation may be no higher for a faculty member who recently lost an election to some office. The personal life of a faculty member is just that, personal. However, personal problems may make motivation at work impossible.

INHIBITING FACTORS AND THE CHAIR

Given all of these inhibiting factors, it is reasonable to wonder if anyone can be motivated in the academic workplace. Yet we know that highly motivated people *do* exist. In many cases, if it were not for an effective chair, however, such motivation would not be achieved.

One of the most important tasks a chair has is aiding faculty members in preventing and overcoming these dissatisfaction producing, motivation killing factors. A quick reading of the material above indicates, of course, that no chair can be expected to overcome all of the potential inhibitors that could occur. Nevertheless, a concerned chair can be helpful with many. He or she can help the faculty member develop reasonable expectations for salary adjustments, thus avoiding disappointments. The faculty can be informed (if it is true) that the chair is working to help them gain tenure. The chair can work to establish reasonable policies and to administer them in ways that help rather than hinder faculty effort. He or she can serve as an intermediary when faculty run afoul of policies or procedures. The chair can work to establish positive relationships with the faculty. He or she can serve as a trouble-shooter for problems occurring between faculty members or between faculty and students. Finally, while the chair is not a counselor, it is often possible to direct faculty to people who can provide professional help for personal problems. In short, the chair is in a prime position to help remove barriers to motivation that inhibit faculty achievement. The chair *can* be part of the solution.

Encouraging Motivation to Surface — Facilitating Factors

Now that we have examined the things that can get in the way of developing high levels of motivation, we turn to the facilitating factors, those which truly can be said to motivate people. The following are the more important ones: the work itself, potential for personal growth, recognition, responsibility, achievement, and advancement.

THE WORK ITSELF

The work that faculty members do may be the most motivating factor of all. Often it is interesting, challenging, even inspiring. Few things are more motivating than seeing a student learn an important concept or first see the results of a research project that portend a breakthrough in the field. Such motivators are available to people in few occupations. It might be said that if we can just keep the rest of the world out of the way and allow faculty to be faculty, motivation would be a natural outgrowth of the work itself.

POTENTIAL FOR PERSONAL GROWTH

The first time a person is allowed to teach a class usually is an exciting, motivating experience. The 500th time he or she teaches that same class usually is not. Unless constraints are placed on a faculty member, he or she will be motivated to improve his or her teaching or research if for no other reason than to avoid the boredom that can set in otherwise. *Being allowed to grow and change for the better is highly motivating to most faculty members.*

RECOGNITION

While modesty does not permit most people to talk about it, most people like to have their work noticed by others. People want to be recognized when they do things well. If faculty believe they will be recognized, it motivates them to do their best work. While doing a good job is motivating in

itself, and becoming better at it motivates people even more, having others notice those efforts takes motivation that extra step higher.

RESPONSIBILITY

Many people are motivated to do better work when they are put "in charge" of that work. While there are exceptions, most people enjoy some control over their environments. When one assumes the responsibility for a task, all of the motivators discussed above are enhanced even more.

ACHIEVEMENT

Being able to achieve something one has not achieved before is very motivating. One of the main reasons people set goals is because they realize pleasure from such achievement. Of course, some people are more motivated to achieve; we refer to these people as having a "high need for achievement." Nevertheless, achievement is motivating even to people who are not high in this need.

ADVANCEMENT

Opportunities for advancement in higher education vary by type and faculty. One may advance by accepting a new position in a more prestigious institution, by being promoted in one's own department or by moving into administration. While some faculty have little desire for any of these types of advancement, most are motivated by the possibility of moving to a higher position or rank in their own department. Thus, care should be taken to give full consideration of the present faculty when positions open in a department before hiring someone from the outside.

FACILITATING FACTORS AND THE CHAIR

The role of chair in facilitating motivation deals primarily with "opening doors." When possible, faculty members should

be assigned duties they prefer. They should be allowed to "stretch" themselves into new areas. Their good works should be publicly noticed. They should be allowed to have as much responsibility for their own efforts as possible. They should be encouraged to set realistic goals and be provided assistance, when necessary, to help them achieve those goals. Finally, they should be allowed to advance within the department as opportunities become available.

Summary

To be motivated is as normal as not being motivated. Thus, if a chair has one or more unmotivated faculty members, he or she should look first for possible inhibitors in the environment. Once these are reduced, it is time to begin work on the factors which facilitate motivation. It is vital, however, to keep in mind that motivation must come from within, it cannot be "transplanted." Some people never become motivated toward their work, although they might be motivated to something else, such as a hobby.

Awareness of inhibiting and facilitating factors provide the background for selecting the most appropriate means of influencing faculty (BATs) over time toward self-motivation. The chair must be satisfied that he or she has done all that is reasonable to allow motivation to surface. If chairs could perform miracles, they would hold other positions than chair.

1. F. Herzberg, *Work and the Nature of Man* (New York: World Publishing Co., 1966).