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ABSTRACT

It is not known to those in higher education at Montana State University-Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman) why tenured faculty chooses to remain in the field of higher education at MSU-Bozeman. Twenty tenured faculty members from five different disciplines in the liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education programs at this land grant, Doctoral II University were asked to participate in the study. Professors were selected purposefully from liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education faculty who were tenured and had at least ten years experience and were available for interview in the spring/summer of 2004. Participants were asked to respond to open ended questions and statements. Data were collected through one-on-one interviews. The purpose of this grounded theory study is to investigate why tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman choose to remain in their faculty positions and to generate a motivational theory using a construct-oriented approach. An audit of the study’s data collection processes, analysis, and conclusions was conducted to confirm the validity of the findings.

The results of this study revealed that tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman were motivated to remain in their positions by, (1) their families, (2) a desire to remain in the geographical area, and, (3) as a result of having achieved tenure. These three facets of employment at MSU-Bozeman were overwhelmingly cited by study participants as motivation to remain in their positions. These three motivational factors evidenced underpinnings of need, emotion, and intellectual evaluation.

The participants were motivated by the interaction of emotion, need, and intellect. In this respect, the theory of motivation generated as a result of the data unearthed by this study took a new step in the development of motivational theory, and moved beyond the boundaries set by Maslow (1943), Herzberg (1966), and Goleman (1998) to define a new paradigm of motivational theory, functional within the context of higher education, as well as a new definition of human behavior applicable within the confines of an industrialized society, inclusive of elements of all three theories. The new three-pronged theory defines need, emotion, and intellect as three interactive motivational forces determining human behavior within the context of the university in industrialized society.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background

The well being of the university depends on its ability to recruit and retain a talented professorate. Our national well-being depends on our ability to develop a happy, emotionally healthy, and productive next generation (p. 79).


Higher education faces the on-going challenge of retaining faculty (Tack & Patitu, 2000). “The American Faculty Poll,” a nationwide survey of 1,511 full-time faculty members at two- and four-year institutions reported that more than forty percent of faculty members have seriously considered switching careers (Sanderson, et al., 2000).

Faculty retention is dependent upon faculty job satisfaction (Tack & Patitu, 2000).

According to a 1998 study conducted by William M. Mercer, Inc., the most objective measures of satisfaction or dissatisfaction in organizations were reported to be employee retention and turnover. A high rate of turnover was found to be expensive and inefficient in any organization. Turnover costs were estimated as ranging from $10,000 to $40,000 per person, depending upon the position, while revenues were increased by retention.

The same study reported that a five percent increase in retention resulted in a ten percent decrease in costs, and, productivity increases ranging from twenty-five to sixty-five percent (Mercer, 1998). As such it is important for higher education to know what motivates faculty to stay in their positions.

Job Satisfaction: An Introduction

In his original seminal motivational research, Frederick Herzberg investigated the
question of why workers remain in their positions in the context of the industrial world. While the Mercer study investigated the economic effects of retention versus attrition in the workforce, Herzberg’s inquiries tried to establish what motivated workers to remain in their jobs. Herzberg is the singular motivational theorist who approached the theoretical concept of motivation specifically within the context of employment. He felt that the all-encompassing “permeation of life by the industrial spirit” justified the contention that business was the dominant institution in society (Herzberg, 1966, p. 10). He contended that industry, as the dominant institution of our society, needed to know what motivated workers to remain in a job long enough to become effective in their positions. Only experienced workers were capable of building a strong and cohesive industrialized workforce. His investigations focused upon whether a worker’s attitude toward his job would affect his productivity or willingness to remain in his position (Herzberg, 1966).

According to Herzberg, a worker’s unwillingness to stick with it or remain in his job resulted in high turnover. High turnover was found to be inefficient and expensive for industry, as reported above by William M. Mercer, Inc. (1998). Workers who are unwilling to remain in their positions present “sunk costs” for industry, when described in the business vernacular. “Sunk costs,” when described in lay terms refer to an unrecoverable deficit for industry as a function of the loss of revenue in training and orientation investments alone. Workers who did not remain in their jobs did not become proficient at their jobs. This phenomenon, when evidenced in higher education, represented an unequivocal expense for higher education (Herzberg, 1966).

A contending motivational study was conducted by Abraham Maslow (Maslow,
Maslow’s theory regarded human motivation. It was comprehensive and did not focus on an exclusive context, but rather the fundamental fulfillment of human needs. Clearly, needs may be satisfied outside work and questions can be raised as to the applicability of the theory to industry, although subsequent writers have applied the self-actualizing approach to the industrial setting. The six different levels of human needs were enumerated as follows. Lower order needs, (in ascending order), included the physiological needs (including but not limited to desires for food, water, air, sleep, and sex), the safety needs (the desire for security and protection against danger), the social needs (the desire to fulfill the need for belonging, love, and affection). The higher order needs included needs for esteem (self-esteem and esteem from others) and self-actualization (the need for self-fulfillment or striving to realize one’s full potential).

Figure 1. Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs.

According to Maslow’s theory these needs were “organized into a theory of relative prepotency” (Maslow, 1954, p. 83). In other words, the lowest ranked unsatisfied need in
the hierarchy would dominate the behavior of the organism in place of a now satisfied lower need or in the absence of an unsatisfied lower need. Gratified needs ceased to play an active determining or organizing role in the behavior of an individual. The one exception to this was the self-actualization need or the need for an individual to fulfill his potential as a human being, which tended to increase with satisfaction (Maslow, 1954). Application of Maslow’s theory to retention in higher education at Montana State University -Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman) would suggest that unfulfilled needs are responsible for attrition among faculty.

Herzberg’s theory and Maslow’s theory are contrasting in structure. Herzberg’s theory was built upon two separate sets of conditions as factors, satisfiers and dissatisfiers. The dissatisfiers in Herzberg’s theory corresponded to the lower order human needs enumerated in Maslow’s theory. The satisfiers correspond to the higher order human needs in Maslow’s theory. Unlike Maslow, Herzberg coined his own terminology and assigned new definitions to terms previously carrying universal connotations (Herzberg, 1966; Maslow, 1943). For example, according to Herzberg’s theory, dissatisfaction was not the opposite of satisfaction. His theoretical scheme employed a two-dimensional design featuring hygiene factors or dissatisfiers, which were incapable of providing motivation or satisfaction, and motivators, which served as satisfiers. Dissatisfiers included company policy, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relations, salary, status, job security, and personal life. Satisfiers included achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

In Herzberg’s theory, dissatisfaction did not automatically result in a lack of
satisfaction, according to the terms of the theory, and it did not automatically control the behavior of the organism. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction were independent of one another. In contrast, in Maslow’s paradigm, the lowest order unmet need would dominate the behavior of an organism and nullify any positive aspects of a satisfied higher order need. According to Maslow, satisfaction of a higher order need was dependent upon the satisfaction of lower order needs and the fulfillment of the two were inextricably intertwined. Here Maslow and Herzberg differed in their assessments of how satisfaction and dissatisfaction of needs operate and affect the behavior of a human being (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Maslow, 1954).

The author has chosen to cite from the original publications of both Maslow’s and Herzberg’s theories. Although numerous subsequent editions of their theories have been promulgated, there are none more reliable than the original publications. Since the development of these two theories by these motivational psychologists, they have dominated the field of motivational psychology. This is not to state that there have not been various other schools of motivational thought, although less influential, that have emerged over the course of time. Psychobiological and biobehavioral approaches marked some of the earliest hypotheses regarding the motivation for human behavior. There have also been theories linking motivation to creativity and human drives. Additionally, human motivation has been described in terms of action, goals, and threats. It was found that these motivating forces accounted for immediate behavior, but failed to explain long-term behavior (Locke & Latham, 1990; Pervin, 1989; Snyder et al., 1991). Perhaps this factor accounts for the fact that these schools of thought never achieved the universal recognition and acceptance awarded to those of Herzberg and Maslow. Recently,
between the years of 1990 and 1995, a new school of motivational thought and theory has emerged. Current research indicated that we cannot consider emotions apart from motivation or motivation apart from emotions. Motivational psychologists are beginning to view emotions as the predominately motivating factor behind human behavior. These researchers, led by the motivational psychologists Epstein, Salovey, and Golemen, espouse a phenomenon known as “emotional intelligence” (Epstein, 1990; Salovey, Rothmna, Detweiler & Steward, 2000; Goleman, 1997 and 2002). These researchers contended that emotions affect the tenacity with which individuals pursue their long-term goals as well as the intensity of their pursuit. They asserted that emotional stress interferes with an individual’s ability to focus and may become the individual’s sole focus. With the exception of motivational theory developed specifically for the learner, to be used within the context of the learning process, the previously described theories represented the most dominating current ideas regarding motivational theory.

Subsequent studies and literature have been published regarding the subject of motivation, and most recently, the subject of publications written and/or edited by Linda Serra-Hagedorn (2000) and Martha W. Tack and Carol L. Patitu (2000) was that of motivation of faculty in higher education. Both of the aforementioned offerings relied heavily upon the theories of Herzberg and Maslow.

**Job Satisfaction in Higher Education**

The focus of this study addressed the problem of not knowing what motivates workers to remain in their positions in the context of higher education. Since workers leave their jobs for a plethora of reasons, the scope of which far exceeds the boundaries of this study, the focus of this investigation was to investigate why tenured faculty remain
in their positions at Montana State University Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman). Just as knowing why industrial workers remain in their jobs has provided insight and information for members of industry responsible for recruiting and retaining a quality workforce, knowing why faculty remain in their jobs provides insight and information for members of higher education responsible for recruiting and retaining a quality faculty.

In moving from the industrial world to the microcosm of the university, the intrusion of the business ethos is evident (Herzberg, 1966). The university has become as complex an industrial organization as exists and the same laws that govern industry govern the effective operation of a university (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). The same principles governing the turnover of employees in the industrial sector, according to Herzberg’s parallel within the university setting, apply to the efficient operation of the university (Herzberg, 1966).

At this stage in the research, motivation will be generally defined as presumed internal forces or tensions generated by unsatisfied needs within an individual that inspire and define a course of action to satisfy those needs or wants. This definition combines elements included in definitions offered by three different theorists/authors, Maslow, Russel, and Yorks (Maslow, 1954; Russel, 1971; Yorks, 1976).

**Statement of the Problem**

It was not known by higher education leaders why tenured faculty chose to remain in the professorate at Montana State University Bozeman. Not knowing why faculty chose to remain in higher education presented a problem for university faculty and officials responsible for recruiting and retaining a stable faculty work force. The stability of the faculty are important to afford the institution a professorate that have remained in their
positions long enough to be effective and proficient at their jobs affording students cohesive, fluent, and efficient academic programs. Knowing why faculty chose to remain in the professorate afforded strategic insight to those responsible for recruitment and retention of faculty.

**Statement of the Purpose**

The purpose of this grounded theory study was to explore what motivated tenured faculty at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) to remain in their faculty positions. Specifically, twenty tenured faculty members from disciplines in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman, a land grant, Doctoral II university, were interviewed to determine why they remained in their faculty positions. From their responses, a theory was developed to explain the motivation for remaining.

**Theoretical Framework of the Study**

The study was grounded in motivational theory. Since the purpose of the study was to investigate what motivated tenured faculty to remain in the arena of higher education at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman), it was essential to understand motivational theory as a vehicle by which to ascertain the significance of the research. Understanding motivational theory allowed the author to understand and analyze faculty behavior and the motivation behind that behavior. A review of the classical literature on motivation identified the following major theories: 1) Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs; 2) Herzberg's Motivation/Hygiene Theory; 3) McGregor's X Y Theories; and 4) McClelland's Need for Assessment Theory (Bryans & Cronin, 1992), and Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence
(Goleman, 1997, 2002). The major components of each of these areas of motivational theory were reviewed and explored.

As a group, motivational psychologists presented differing paradigms regarding what motivated individuals to remain in their jobs and experience job satisfaction. Whether motivated by psychobiological and/or biobehavioral needs and drives, satisfiers and dissatisfiers, the need for achievement and/or self realization, curiosity, creativity, and/or emotions, it was generally agreed upon that, for an individual to remain in a position for any period of time he/she must have experienced some form of self-realization resulting in emotions of well being. There was a general consensus that satiation of lower order needs was not enough to motivate an individual to remain in his/her job. The implication of this observation for tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman was that they are not remaining in their positions at the institution for financial reasons (Franken, 2002).

Job satisfaction research has identified four major areas that are critical for enjoyment of work. First, individuals must feel appreciated, second, they must perceive that their work is of some significance, third, they must be happy with their work environment and location, and fourth, they must feel that they are equitably remunerated for their work. In all situations, individuals must experience a sense of overall well being when holistically considering global feelings regarding all four areas. This sense of satisfaction was critical for professors of higher education. Creation of knowledge required substantial freedom and autonomy. In higher education where tenured faculty had had considerable discretion over how they spend their time, the quality of their work could suffer an enormous decrease in the event of job dissatisfaction (Tack & Patitu, 2000).
Daniel Goleman (1997, 2002) and motivational psychologists promoting the concept of emotional intelligence have hypothesized that an individual’s behavior is largely a product of either negative or positive emotions. In the past, psychologists have treated emotions as distinct from motivation, but the contemporary perception was that emotions play a fundamental role in motivation. Goleman and these psychologists believe that job satisfaction is a result of a position in which an individual experiences positive emotions through his/her work. Application of this theory to retention of tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman indicated that professors who choose to remain in their positions experience positive emotions as a result of their work (Goleman, 1997, 2002).

This study focused on Goleman’s motivational theory regarding emotional intelligence as the underlying explanation of the motivation of tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their jobs. This research examined conditions and events at MSU-Bozeman that caused tenured faculty to remain in their jobs.

**Research Questions**

It was not known why tenured faculty at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) remained in their positions in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education. The following questions were examined:

1. Was there a select set of motivators that explained the decision of tenured faculty from disciplines in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education to remain in the professorate at MSU-Bozeman?

2. If in fact there was, were they consistent with those that had been found to motivate workers in industry, or were they unique to the professorate?

Comparison of findings of research conducted in higher education with those
findings resulting from research conducted in the industrial sector was essential, as most existing motivational theory evolved from research conducted in industry. The answers to these questions provided insights into the problem of not knowing why tenured faculty remained in the field of higher education at MSU-Bozeman and fulfilled the purpose of this grounded theory study which was to examine what motivates tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study was that it provided a basis for further study of why some tenured faculty chose to remain in higher education at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) when attractive alternative positions were available in industry and at competing institutions. The results of this study provided information that will be useful in the recruitment and retention of professors of higher education within the university system. The results furnished resolutions that will enable MSU-Bozeman to retain its qualified and valuable professorate in the face of stiff competition for faculty from other institutions and the industrial sector.

The bulk of research regarding job satisfaction has been conducted in the industrial sector, while informative studies regarding job satisfaction in higher education are lacking (Tack & Patitu, 2000). With collection of data from a purposeful sample of the tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman, the results of this study attempted to begin to fill that void.

In an effort to minimize turnover among faculty, it became imperative that higher education take immediate steps to ensure that the present competent faculty be retained and that the recruits for the faculty of the future were competent, and reflected the
diversity of the population to be served by colleges and universities. This faculty must be satisfied enough to remain in the positions they are recruited for (Tack & Patitu, 2000).

To ensure the presence of a competent faculty, academia needed to furnish a workforce within higher education capable of providing for future and evolving needs of a diverse student populace. Universities needed to provide employment that was satisfying to minorities and women, as well as the general populace. Competition for eligible candidates was and will be more aggressive than ever with the advent of the technological revolution and the industrial sector vying for new recruits (Tack & Patitu, 2000).

Current faculty and university officials must make it their goal to recognize, analyze and eliminate factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. On the other hand, they must recognize factors that do contribute to job satisfaction among the professorate and augment them (Tack & Patitu, 2000).

The results of this study enable university faculty, officials, and administration to better understand what contributes to job satisfaction among the professorate and retain faculty at MSU-Bozeman in a more effective way.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms, which are used throughout the study, are defined below:

1. Motive—the incentive that incites a particular behavior in a person which results in his acting in a specific manner or beginning to acquire a proclivity for an express mode of action or behavior (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1970).

2. Motivation - presumed internal forces or tensions generated by unsatisfied needs within an individual that inspire and define a course of action to satisfy those needs or
wants. This definition combines elements included in definitions offered by three
different theorists/authors, Maslow, Russel and Yorks (Maslow, 1954; Russel, 1971;
Yorks, 1976).

3. Tenured faculty - teaching and administrative staff of a university that have fulfilled
the length of time and conditions required to become permanent faculty (Braham, 2002).

4. Faculty - teaching and administrative staff of a universities (Braham, 2002).

5. Stressors-elements inside and outside the workplace that contribute to job
dissatisfaction (Tack & Patitu, 2000).

6. Recruitment-act or process of hiring new faculty (Braham, 2002; Tack & Patitu,
2000). This definition combines that furnished by Random House/Webster’s (2002) and
that used by Tack and Patitu (2000).

7. Retention-the act or process of keeping a worker in his/her job or the power or
capacity to keep an employee at his/her job (Braham 2002; Tack & Patitu, 2000). This
definition combines that furnished by Random House/Webster’s (2002) and that used by

8. Satisfaction-fulfillment of higher and lower order needs within the job context
(Hagedorn, 2000; Herzberg, 1966; Tack and Patitu, 2000). This definition combines
elements used in the definitions of Hagedorn (2000), Herzberg, (1966), and Tack and
Patitu (2000).

9. Job security-assurance of employment; a guarantee of freedom from possibility of
dismissal (Braham, 2002; Hagedorn, 2000). This definition combines elements of
definitions used by Random House/Webster’s (2002) and Hagedorn (2000).
10. Faculty rank—official grade or position of a faculty member within the university system; for example, the ranks among the professorate range from assistant and associate professor to full professor. This definition combines elements of those used by Random House/Webster’s (2002) and Hagedorn (2000).

11. Working conditions—extrinsic factors that modify or restrict the nature of work; environment or context within which an individual works (Herzberg, 1966). In Herzberg’s motivational theory, working conditions are referred to as dissatisfiers (Herzberg, 1966).

12. Satisfiers—aspects of employment that describe an individual’s relationship to his vocation in terms of personal and professional growth and self-actualization (Herzberg, 1966).

13. Dissatisfiers—aspects of employment that describe an individual’s relationship to the context or environment within which he works (Herzberg, 1966).

14. Motivators—aspects of a job effective in motivating an individual to superior performance and superlative effort, these elements occur as a result of an individual’s need for growth and self-actualization (Herzberg, 1966).

15. Hygiene factors (maintenance factors)—major preventative and environmental aspects of an individual’s vocation, factors that prevent a job from being unpleasant (Herzberg, 1966).
Methodologies

Twenty professors from the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman), a land grant, Doctoral II university, were interviewed in person one-on-one. Professors were selected purposefully from MSU-Bozeman liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education faculty that were tenured, had had at least ten years of experience at MSU-Bozeman, and were available to interview during the spring/summer semesters of 2004. Interviews lasted between thirty minutes and two hours. The qualitative data from interviews, field notes, and observations was organized and interpreted. The rationale for the conclusions and interpretations made from the qualitative data was based on the emergence of common themes.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

Assumptions

Assumptions of the study were that subjects interviewed were able to articulate their understanding of why they stayed in their jobs in an unbiased and truthful manner. A further assumption of the study was that the author was able to identify twenty participants that agreed to be interviewed and provided negative as well as positive information regarding their motives for remaining in their positions. Finally, it was an assumption of the study that the author was able to develop relationships with participants that resulted in trust facilitating freedom of expression by participants.
Limitations

Limitations of the study were that it was completed within a finite period of time from the perspective of the graduate program within which it was being conducted. Graduate policy dictated that doctoral research must be completed within ten years of the commencement of a doctoral candidate’s program. In this case the maximum time frame for completion of the study was winter semester of 2006. For this reason a sample population was used and the study was not exhaustive.

Delimitations

A delimitation of the study was the defined population that was limited to the liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education portion of Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman). The study was also delimited to tenured professors who had remained at MSU-Bozeman for at least ten years. The study was delimited to twenty participants.

Delimitations of the study included the gender and ethnicity of the participants. Life stressors typically had a more exaggerated effect on females than males as a result of societal mores regarding the priority women should place on their families. The variety of life-style stressors was vast, but concerns such issues as child-care, elder care, and physical, as well as mental health. Family and household responsibilities, marriage, children, dual-career/commuting marriages, and domestic duties significantly affected satisfaction and productivity of female faculty (Tack & Patitu, 2000). Job satisfaction was different for minority faculty. Minority faculty experience different stressors than do Caucasian faculty. Minority faculty were less likely to be tenured, were often concerned about lower salaries, felt isolated and unsupported at work, and were possibly the targets
of discrimination, prejudice, and racism (Tack & Patitu, 2000). Neither gender, cultural background, or race were considered in this study.

**Personal Statement**

The researcher was an Ed.D. Candidate at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman), with a bachelor’s degree in Political Science and a master’s degree in Public Administration from MSU-Bozeman. The researcher was interested in discovering what motivates professors that do achieve tenure and remain at MSU-Bozeman to do so. In the interest of collecting the information needed to build a strong and cohesive faculty, the researcher has chosen to examine this facet of retention among professors at MSU-Bozeman.

**Chapter Summary**

It was unknown why tenured faculty chose to remain in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education/education in higher education at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman). The information unearthed by this study will be useful in the retention of professors of higher education within the university system. Competition for eligible candidates for faculty positions will be more rigorous than ever with the industrial sector vying for new recruits to fill the many positions opened by the inception of the technological revolution. Current faculty and university officials must make it their goal to recognize, analyze, and eliminate factors that lead to job dissatisfaction. Conversely, they must recognize factors that do contribute to job satisfaction among the professorate and augment them (Tack & Patitu, 2000). They must
do this in order to keep the valuable resource of competent and experienced faculty in place in the university.

The results of this study provided a framework for the development of a theory that explains or provides insights about the reasons/forces that cause faculty to remain in tenure track positions in light of identified other opportunities both inside and outside of academia.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

It was not known what motivated tenured faculty to remain in their positions at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman). Not knowing why tenured faculty chose to remain in the field of higher education at MSU-Bozeman presented a problem for university faculty and university officials responsible for recruiting and retaining a stable professorate. Knowing why tenured faculty remained in their positions at MSU–Bozeman afforded strategic insight for those responsible for recruiting and retaining quality faculty. The purpose of this study was to explore the motivating forces causing tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions. Specifically, twenty tenured faculty members from the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman, a land-grant, Doctoral II university were asked why they chose to remain in their faculty positions. From their responses, a theory was developed to explain the motivation for remaining.

Literature used to support this study fell into six categories: (1) Organizational Theory, (2) Motivational Theory, (3) Job Satisfaction, (4) Faculty Job Satisfaction, (5) Faculty Retention, and (6) Higher Education. In some cases, such as motivational theory and organizational theory, there was overlap of content. The overlap was evidenced at points in presentation of the literature. In the literature review, works of organizational theorists were discussed. The author researched the work of motivational theorists and
their assertions regarding what motivates the behavior of individuals. Various studies regarding job satisfaction were discussed. In the review of faculty job satisfaction, a study conducted by the National Opinion Research Center and entitled *The American Faculty Poll* was reviewed (Sanderson, Phua, & Herda, 2000). Also, current essays and studies on job satisfaction among faculty, published by Jossey-Bass written and/or edited by Hagedorn (2000), and Tack and Patitu (2000) were used. Finally, the author discussed literature presented by researchers of higher education describing the field as the context of the study.

Criteria for selection of literature used, was that it provided a theoretical framework and context for the study. This literature was couched in organizational, motivational, and job satisfaction theory, and organizational processes, and explained, according to differing theories and models, why people behave in the way they do, and the causes underlying their actions. Additionally, literature exploring higher education as the context of the study was explored. The purpose of the selection of literature was to better understand the motivating forces responsible for the behavior of faculty at MSU-Bozeman.

Selecting literature that reported on organizational theory and processes, motivational theory, general job satisfaction, and then, specifically faculty job satisfaction and retention, was a leading criterian for additional research supporting this study. Initially, studies that examined job satisfaction in industry were examined to provide a general understanding of job satisfaction. Studies that investigated job satisfaction among faculty were then explored. In the new millennium, universities must provide a working environment satisfying to a population of women and minorities as well as the
conventional faculty workforce of white males. In compliance with affirmative action and equal opportunity legislation, future faculty must reflect the diversity and multicultural balance existing among the student populations to ensure that representation of minorities is equitable. Information regarding what higher education has done to retain faculty was used as well.

Montana State University-Bozeman

The Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) campus was the site of the study. Study participants were tenured faculty employed by MSU-Bozeman. The purpose of the study was to explore what motivated tenured faculty from the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions. The study site is located in the southwestern part of Montana in the Rocky Mountains, and is a land grant institution that was founded in 1893. MSU-Bozeman became one of two “umbrella universities” for the Montana State University System when the Board of Regents restructured the State’s university system in 1994. MSU-Bozeman is the home campus for Montana State University. There were three affiliate campuses: 1) MSU-Billings, 2) MSU-Northern (Havre), and 3) MSU-Great Falls College of Technology. Chancellors of the three affiliate campuses report to the President of MSU-Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman Website, December 2003).

Organizational Theory and Leadership Processes

Examining motives and motivational theory was not enough to understand the problem under consideration. A review of organizational theory and leadership processes was
necessary to understand what motivated employees within an organization, or in this case, tenured faculty within an institution such as Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman). As such, the author reviewed the work of organizational theorists. Although relying heavily upon the work of the motivational theorist, organizational theory is a science of its own. Once again, organizational theory and leadership processes were inextricably intertwined. The first referred to organizational theories relevant to higher education, and the second, to leadership processes essential to institutional effectiveness (Chance & Chance, 2002). The *inception* of organizational theory or the science of management was largely a twentieth century phenomenon, whereas the *process* of scientific management was as old as civilization (Shafritz & Hyde, 1992). In most of the pure sciences, a theory was formulated and later proven by decades of intensive research and experimentation. In the field of scientific management, practice has been far ahead of theory (Shafritz & Hyde, 1992).

In order to understand the systemic operations of organizations of higher education, specifically MSU-Bozeman, organizational theories relevant to institutions of higher education are examined in terms of fundamental components and structures of organizations. In order to understand the processes essential to effective leadership in an institution of higher education such as MSU-Bozeman, leadership theories were examined in terms of processes essential to effective organizational leadership, including communication, decision making, motivation, and guiding change. It was important to understand that larger cultural, social, and economic forces affect all organizations, particularly those of higher education, and specifically MSU-Bozeman. In this interest, theories and concepts were discussed in terms of their historical perspectives (Chance &
Organizational Theory: Three Periods

Just as higher education has evolved, so has organizational theory. Organizational theory can be examined in terms of three historical periods. Classical organizational thought was the precursor to the social sciences period. Respectively, the social sciences period of organizational theoretical thought was the precedent of the period referred to as that introducing open systems theory (Chance & Chance, 2002).

Classical Organizational Theory. Frederick Taylor is commonly known as the father of scientific management. He introduced tenets of management in 1911 that reflected a philosophy of leadership in which workers were considered with the same deference as that applied to machinery and the assembly process. Characteristic of scientific management was a hierarchical authority structure and prescribed division of labor. It was perceived at that time that these features created an optimally effective operational structure for an organization. Individual workers were assigned distinctly defined tasks. The efficient effective management of an organization was achieved through rules of conduct and prescribed punishments. Workers were recruited according to skills and abilities, and all jobs and procedures were standardized. Taylor’s paradigm of management was the product of an industrial era in which factories were the scene of mass production and embraced an assembly line approach to manufacturing (Chance & Chance, 2002).

Social Sciences Period. The period of classical organizational theory gave way to that of the social sciences period. The social sciences theorists humanized management
in that they were conscious of the goals, needs, and desires of the workers. This period
found its inception in the 1920s and was characterized by the consideration of human
dynamics, and the psychological and social factors impacting the work place. The
Hawthorne Studies, investigations framed in classical organizational thought and
scientific management, were conducted in the 1920s by Elton Mayo, a Harvard
University professor of industrial research. The Hawthorne Works of the Western
Electric Company in Chicago were studied to observe the effect of lighting on worker
productivity. The premise of the study was that productivity would increase with
illumination. Observing the control group, researchers observed that productivity
increased consistently despite physical surroundings of the workers. Subjects of the
study received significantly more attention than they had prior to the experiments, and it
was determined by the researchers that the increased productivity was the result of
psychological and social changes in the work environment. The increased recognition
given to the workers and their supervisors enhanced self-esteem and interpersonal
relationships. It was concluded that social and psychological variables were greater
determinants of productivity and more important to effective management than were
manipulation of economic and/or physical conditions (Pugh & Hickson, 1989).

During this period, two themes emerged: (1) the human relations approach, and (2)
the behavioral science approach. The human relations approach suggested that people
work harder when treated personably. The behavioral science approach focused on the
behavior of employees within the formal organizational structure. Chester Barnard
(1938) was cited as providing the precedential framework for the behavioral science
approach as a result of his studies analyzing formal and informal structures within an
organization, and defining the organization in relation to interactions between formal and informal structures. This approach combined tenets of classical organizational thought with doctrines of psychology, sociology, political science, and economics. In 1957, Herbert Simon introduced the rational or behavioral science approach. He defined organizations in terms of equilibrium. Through this approach, Simon balanced the needs of individuals with the goals of the organization. Simon hypothesized that when the needs of both were adequately met, the organization achieved equilibrium and experienced efficient and effective management (Simon, 1957).

**Open Systems Theory.** Although the transition of theory from classical organizational thought to the social sciences introduced the human factor into the management of organizations, it was not until the inception of open systems theory in the body of organizational theory, that, pressures and influences from the external environment were considered as significant factors to be considered in proper management of an organization. Beginning in the 1960s, scientists looked at organizations as analogous to living organisms (Chance & Chance, 2002).

The preceding historical overview of the evolution of organizational theory provided a framework for understanding the structure and operation of contemporary organizations of higher education. The following survey of thought illustrated the evolution of theoretical thought when applied to the organization at different points in time.

**Warren Bennis: Four Competencies of Leadership**

Warren Bennis was a leading organizational theorist and has written or co-authored over twenty-five books and dozens of articles on management. The theories generated by
Warren Bennis’ research on organizations inform what motivates employees within an organization, or in this case, tenured faculty within an institution. Once again, the concession is made that the experience of employees of industry is different than that of faculty in higher education. However, the basic organizational theory governing motivation of employees in an organization is applicable to both milieus. The motivational psychologist Douglas McGregor was the most important influence on Bennis. McGregor was president of Antioch College for six years during the term of Bennis’ attendance there and the two eventually co-authored a book entitled Douglas McGregor On Management. In his essay Managing The Dream he advocated the need for leaders rather than managers in a successful organization. He distinguished between the two in this way, “Leaders conquer the context-the volatile, turbulent, ambiguous surroundings that sometimes seem to conspire against us and will surely suffocate us if we let them-while managers surrender to it” (Bennis, 2000, p. 5). He then presented a litany of differences between the manager and the leader:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Bennis’ Differences Between Manager and Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.) The manager administers while the leader innovates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) The manager is a copy while the leader is an original.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) The manager maintains while the leader develops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.) The manager focuses on systems and structure while the leader focuses on people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.) The manager relies on control while the leader inspires trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.) The manager has a short-range view while the leader has a long-range perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.) The manager asks how and when while the leader asks what and why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.) The manager has his eye on the bottom line while the leader has his eye on the horizon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.) The manager accepts the status quo while the leader challenges it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.) The manager is the classic good soldier while the leader is his own person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.) The manager does things right while the leader does the right thing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Warren Bennis traveled throughout the United States observing, interacting with, and interviewing 90 of the most effective, successful leaders on the continent; 60 of them were from corporations and 30 from the public sector. He discovered certain areas of
Bennis contended that leadership, rather than management, could be felt throughout an organization. According to his research, the collective effect of leadership within an organization was empowerment for the work force. Bennis observed four themes through which this empowerment was evidenced: 1.) People felt significant. Employees felt that they made a difference. 2.) Learning and competence mattered. Leaders didn’t recognize failure, and saw unsuccessful attempts on the part of workers as mistakes that gave them feedback as a vehicle through which to know what the proper thing was to do. 3.) People were part of a community. Where there was leadership, people were part of a team or family. 4.) Work was exciting. Where there was leadership, work became stimulating and fun. The true leader embodied the objectives of the organization and was able to attract or “pull” rather than push people toward a goal (Bennis, 2000).

Bennis believed that bureaucracy was an institution whose time had passed and that democracy and federalism were inevitable paradigms for the successful organizations of the future (Bennis, 2000). Application of Bennis’ four competencies of leadership at Montana Sate University (MSU-Bozeman) required that faculty were made to feel significant, that learning and competence were made priority values, that faculty were treated as part of a community, and that managerial level administration made efforts to ensure that the work of faculty were exciting for them.

**Peter Drucker’s Theory of Business**

Peter F. Drucker’s theory of business was comprised of three sets of initial assumptions, followed by four sets of specifications which had to be fulfilled in order to have a valid theory of business. Drucker’s theory serves as a type of template which,
when applied to an individual company, will result in a theory of business unique to that company. According to Drucker, his theory of business was a blueprint, that, when followed, would yield an effective and valid theory of business for any organization, be that a company in industry or Montana State University-Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman). The first set of assumptions he presented in his theory was about the environment of the organization. These included society and its structure, the market, the customer, and technology. The second set of assumptions was about the specific mission of the organization. The third set of assumptions regarded the core competencies needed to accomplish the organization’s mission (Drucker, 1999).

What the organization was paid for was defined by the assumptions about the environment. What an organization considered to be meaningful results were defined by the assumptions about the mission. These same assumptions indicated the way in which the organization envisioned its effect upon the economy and society. Where an organization must excel in order to maintain leadership was defined by the assumptions about core competencies (Drucker, 1999).

Table 2. Drucker’s Specifications for a Valid Theory of Business.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.) The assumptions about environment, mission, and core competencies must conform to reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.) All three areas of assumptions must be compatible to interface with one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.) The organization as a whole must have an understanding of the theory of business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.) Constant testing of the theory of business must be effectuated. Built into the theory of business must be the ability for the business to change itself.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years of work, thought, and experimentation were required for the distillation of a valid theory of business. The valid theory of business was to conform to the following four specifications. Peter Drucker arrived at his theory of business through years of study of successful corporations and their evolutions. The two most predominate studies he
conducted were those of the policies, practices, and behaviors of IBM and General Motors (Drucker, 1999).

Formation of a valid theory of business for MSU-Bozeman, according to Drucker, would take years of work, thought, and experimentation. It would, however, follow the template of specifications provided by Drucker’s theory (Drucker, 1999).

**Maslow on Management**

Although most renowned for his research in the area of humanistic psychology, the legacy of Abraham Maslow extended far beyond these bounds. Maslow claimed that his theory of motivation was as viable when applied to an organization as it was to an individual. According to Maslow, his theory of motivation could be applied to tenured faculty at the institution of Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) and account for the behavior of tenured faculty employed there. Known best for his work on human behavior and motivation, Maslow has explored the relationships between these phenomena and the industrial milieu, publishing *Eupsychian Management*, his treatise on organizational theory, in 1965. *Eupsychian Management* was a collection of journal notes taken by Maslow during the summer of 1962 while he served as a “sort of Visiting Fellow” (p. xxi) (Maslow, 1998) at the Non-Linear Systems, Inc. plant in Del Mar, California. His first foray into the field of industrial psychology, Maslow researched the subject by reading books by Drucker (1954) and McGregor (1960) that were used as “textbooks” (Maslow, 1998, p.xxi) at the plant. *Eupsychian Management* barely sold its first printing and vanished from view. Republished in 1998 under the title *Maslow On Management*, the volume was hailed by some as the psychologist’s best book (1998). Reconfirming the validity of Maslow’s pioneering principles, *Maslow On Management*
illustrated the way in which these concepts have become the pillars of contemporary management practices (Maslow, 1998).

Maslow’s organizational theory was similar to his motivational theory. The essential difference between Maslow’s motivational theory and his organizational theory was the presence of the organization, rather than society, as the vehicle through which the hierarchical needs of the individual were to be gratified. He applied his need hierarchy to individuals within the context of an industrial organization and posited that different principles of management would apply to the different motivational levels. He saw no need to construct management principles for the lower levels in the motivational hierarchy. He observed that a high level of personal development was unconsciously assumed within the confines of the organizational paradigm (Maslow, 1998).

Maslow criticized Peter Drucker’s organizational theory in two ways. He felt that Drucker minimized the necessity of selecting uniquely evolved individuals, according to the needs hierarchy, to facilitate the successful use of his management principles; and that Drucker neglected the presence “of evil, of psychopathology, of general nastiness” (Maslow, 1998, p. 44) in some individuals which would render Drucker’s theories ineffective (Maslow, 1998).

The principles of management that Abraham Maslow promoted in *Maslow On Management* were: 1.) Managers needed to provide for the need of the employees to self-actualize. He espoused the philosophy that described the proclivity of self-actualizing people to be committed to work, duty, and mission. Allowing the freedom to effectuate one’s own ideas, experiment with new methods, participate in decision making, and make mistakes were all aspects of facilitating self-actualization among
workers (Maslow, 1998). 2.) Management needed to operate according to the concept of synergy, that was, what was beneficial for the individual was beneficial for the organization. In the interest of synergy within the company, individual goals had to be aligned with organizational goals. Individual success must not be attained at the expense of the organization as a whole (Maslow, 1998). 3.) Maslow endorsed the concept of enlightened management as promoted by Drucker and Bennis. The assumption that all individuals want to achieve, prefer to be active participants rather than passive observers, want to belong to, and be needed by, the organization, were all fundamental aspects of enlightened management (Maslow, 1998.) Peter Drucker’s response to the book was that it proved that he and Douglas McGregor were wrong in contending that there were only one or two right ways to manage people, and that Maslow showed conclusively in Maslow On Management that different people have to be managed differently (Drucker, 1999).

The implications of Maslow’s managerial theory for tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman were that, in addition to having both lower and higher order needs met through their jobs, tenured faculty would have to be treated personably and addressed individually by institutional leaders and upper level administrators to effectuate efficient and successful operation of the institution (Maslow, 1998).

William Ouchi and the Z Organization

In 1973 William Ouchi began to study the managerial practices of Japanese companies. Issues of Japanese productivity and quality were popular topics at the time. It soon became evident that Japanese managerial practices were superior to many of the conventional practices governing American companies. It remained to be seen whether
these practices would translate from the culture and society of Japan to that of the United States (Ouchi, 1981).

Ouchi then endeavored to separate universally applicable management principles from those that were culturally specific. He called companies displaying these characteristics Type Z companies and described their approach to management as Theory Z (Ouchi, 1981).

The greatest distinction between a bureaucracy and a Type Z organization was that Z organizations had achieved a “high state of consistency in their internal culture” (Ouchi, 1981, p. 81). Z organizations were clans, as opposed to hierarchies or markets. Clans were “intimate associations of people engaged in economic activity but tied together through a variety of bonds” (Ouchi, 1981, p. 83). The other two social mechanisms for governing transactions between individuals were hierarchies and markets (Ouchi, 1981).

In a hierarchy or bureaucracy, those engaged in economic activity had no clear concept of the value of their services. Individuals trusted outcomes to be equitable. Union representation was the result of learned mistrust on the part of the employees who had found through experience that outcomes were not always equitable in a hierarchy (Ouchi, 1981). On the other hand, a market incorporates competitive bidding for goods and services. Values for goods and services were established according to the terms the market sets (Ouchi, 1981).

Comparatively, clans succeeded when teamwork and evolution rendered individual performance ambiguous. An equitable balance was achieved within the organization by establishing long-term commitment accompanied by agreement regarding objectives and operating methods. Individual contribution was compensated equitably, resulting in a
balance within the community. Individuals were allowed to do just what they wanted (Ouchi, 1981).

Ouchi contended that increased productivity was the result of involved workers. He also contended that employee involvement was the essence of the Theory Z approach. His assertion was that what we had to learn from the Japanese was how to manage and organize people at work. Our deficiencies in production would be remedied only when we learned how to manage people in a manner that facilitated their working together more effectively. Increased productivity could not be achieved through harder work. It was a problem of social organization and could only be accomplished through the coordination of individual efforts in a productive manner. Managers could only motivate employees to coordinate efforts by assuming a cooperative, long-range view of management (Ouchi, 1981).

Ouchi’s research into Theory Z was initially funded by the National Commission on Productivity, which is no longer in existence. His initial research was done in collaboration with Richard Pascale. His study was based on hundreds of interviews with management in both the United States and Japan, and thousands of hours of collecting and analyzing data through the instrument of questionnaires (Ouchi, 1981).

Theory Z was a combination of trust, subtlety, and intimacy. In a Japanese company, willingness was cultivated as a function of managerial practices that fostered trust through the assurance that hard work and service on the part of the worker would be rewarded in the long run (Ouchi, 1981).

By subtlety, Ouchi meant finesse and insight on the part of the manager in knowing and managing the employees. It was the manager’s responsibility to get to know his
workers and their personalities, determine which personalities would be able to work well together, and assign teams accordingly in the interest of maximal effectiveness. Rules, policies, and union contracts could never take the place of subtlety as a factor in management of a company (Ouchi, 1981).

In his discussion of intimacy, Ouchi reflected on a healthy society. He maintained that sociologists resolutely affirmed that intimacy was a necessary component of a healthy society. By intimacy, Ouchi was referring to a sense of communal responsibility. He contended that people who had lost their sense of community within the industrial setting would lose their general sense of community. According to Ouchi, the outcome for a society that had lost this sense of community was a “dust heap of individuals without connections to one another” (p. 9). Japanese companies made the workers feel like one big family (Ouchi, 1981).

Japanese corporations subscribed to a participative decision making process. When an important decision needed to be made in a Japanese corporation, every individual that would be impacted by the decision was included in making it (Ouchi, 1981). According to Ouchi, for Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) to function optimally, this tenet would have to be incorporated into operation of the university.

**Daniel Goleman: Primal Leadership and Emotional Intelligence**

Although the model of emotional intelligence used by Daniel Goleman was first proposed by Peter Salovey and John Mayer in their article entitled “Emotional Intelligence” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990), Daniel Goleman was the psychologist, who, along with Richard Boyatzis and Annie McKee (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002) applied the concept to organizational theory. Recognized as a leading motivational and
organizational psychologist, Daniel Goleman has broken into the arena of leadership and its processes.

With the introduction of the concept of *primal leadership*, Goleman and his associates have promoted an organizational psychology in which the job of a leader is emotional. According to these authors, the effective leader created a phenomenon within an organization that they collectively termed *resonance*. *Resonance* occurred when a leader successfully unleashed a flow of “positivity” among individuals throughout an organization that motivated and/or “freed” them to experience emotional well-being, while delivering their optimum performance (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002, p. ix). In order to successfully create *resonance* within an organization, an effective leader had to be emotionally intelligent. The moods and reactions of leaders enormously impacted and motivated those they led. An emotionally intelligent leader possessed an actual power to inspire, motivate, and arouse enthusiasm, passion, and commitment among those they worked with. Conversely, a leader lacking in emotional intelligence would effectively pollute the emotional climate of an organization. According to these authors, leaders were found at every level in an organization, not just at the top of the organizational hierarchy. Their effectiveness depended upon their ability to use emotional intelligence, as described in the previous theme surveying motivational theories. According to the precepts of ‘primal leadership,’ training in emotional intelligence for all employees of Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman), and particularly tenured faculty and those in positions of upper-level administration would greatly facilitate the profitable operation of the learning institution (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002).
Summary

A review of organizational theory and leadership processes was necessary to understand what motivates employees to remain within an organization, or in this case, tenured faculty to remain at an institution such as Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman). Organizational theories relevant to higher education and leadership processes essential to institutional effectiveness were explored. Organizational theory has evolved through three periods: (1) that of classical organizational thought, beginning with Frederick Taylor’s scientific management in 1911, in which workers were treated like machinery, (2) the social sciences period, introduced in the 1920s, in which management was humanized and leaders became aware of the goals, needs, and desires of the workers, and, (3) the period of open systems theory that began in the 1960s in which scientists began to look at organizations as analogous to living organisms (Chance & Chance, 2002). The following theorists conducted research and developed some of the seminal theories contributing to the body of organizational theory and leadership processes relevant to higher education and essential for institutional effectiveness.

Warren Bennis developed an organizational theory that evolves around four competencies of leadership. The four competencies were: (1) that people feel significant, (2) that learning and competence matter, (3) that people are part of a community, and that (4) work is exciting. Bennis believed that bureaucracy was an institution whose time had passed and that democracy and federalism were inevitable paradigms for the development of successful organizations of the future (Bennis, 2000). Application of Bennis’ theory to the retention of tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman would
imply that those tenured faculty who remain in their positions do so as a result of the fulfillment of these four competencies

Peter Drucker promulgated a theory of business that operated on three sets of initial assumptions. Drucker’s theory served as a template which, when applied to individual organizations, would yield an effective and valid theory of business, unique to, but effective for, the operation of that organization. The sets of assumptions he presented in his theory were about: (1) the environment of an organization, (2) the specific mission of the organization, and (3) the core competencies needed to accomplish the organization’s mission. Drucker’s theory of business was predominantly developed through studies he conducted regarding the policies, practices, and behaviors of IBM and General Motors. Drucker contended that his theory was effective when applied to any organization (Drucker, 1999).

Abraham Maslow was an organizational theorist most renowned for his work in the field of humanistic psychology. In Eupsychian Management (1965), republished in 1998 as Maslow On Management, Maslow applied his celebrated theory of motivation to the organization rather than the individual. He asserted that his theory was equally as effective as an organizational theory when applied to the organization, as it was a motivational theory when applied to the individual. Maslow essentially substituted the presence of the organization for that of society as the vehicle through which the hierarchical needs of the individual were gratified. The needs, as posited in his motivational theory, were hierarchical and relatively “prepotent” in nature. The needs began at the bottom of the hierarchy with the physiological needs of the individual as the most fundamental, and progress upward in the hierarchy through the safety needs, the
love needs, the esteem needs, and the need for self-actualization, at the top of the hierarchy. Maslow’s theory stipulated that the lowest ranked unsatisfied need in the hierarchy would dominate the behavior of an individual and that it was in this respect that the needs were “relatively prepotent.” Only when the lower needs were fulfilled would a higher need emerge to dominate the behavior of the organism in place of the now fulfilled lower need. The principles of management that Abraham Maslow promoted in *Eupsychian Management* (1965) and *Maslow On Management* (1998), were: (1) managers needed to provide for the need of the employees to self-actualize, and (2) management needed to operate according to the concept of synergy, that is, what was good for the individual was beneficial for the organization (Maslow, 1998). Application of Maslow’s organizational theory to MSU-Bozeman would imply that professors and administrators responsible for retention of faculty needed to ensure that MSU-Bozeman operated on the assumption that what was good for the faculty was good for MSU-Bozeman, and that the faculty was able to fulfill essential needs, as well as self-actualize through their positions.

William Ouchi based his studies on the managerial practices of Japanese companies. He then distilled universally applicable management principles from those that were culturally specific, and designated companies displaying those characteristics as Type Z companies. Ouchi described the approach of these companies to management as Theory Z. The greatest distinction between a bureaucracy and a Type Z organization was that Z organizations were *clans*, as opposed to *hierarchies* or *markets*, which predominate in western organizations. Competitiveness was not a characteristic of the communal clan or Type Z organization. The clan was characterized as an “intimate association…of people
engaged in economic activity but tied together through a variety of bonds” (Ouchi, 1981, p. 83). Ouchi contended that increased productivity was not the result of increased effort, but the resolution of a problem of social organization. Japanese corporations made workers feel like a family and subscribed to a participative decision making process. Trust, subtlety, and intimacy in management were the hallmarks of Theory Z (Ouchi, 1981). Application of Theory Z to MSU-Bozeman would demand that all faculty affected by a decision be included in making it. It would also require that faculty be managed with trust, subtlety, and intimacy, as described in the preceding detailed review of Ouchi’s study.

Daniel Goleman was the motivational theorist and psychologist most celebrated for his work regarding emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1997). Goleman, along with co-authors Richard Boyatzis and Annie McKee (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002) applied the concept of emotional intelligence to organizational theory. In doing so, he introduced the concept of primal leadership, promoting an organizational psychology in which the job of a leader was emotional. According to Goleman and his associates, it was the job of a leader to create resonance within an organization. By this, he meant that it was the job of the leader to facilitate the unleashing of a flow of “positivity” among individuals throughout an organization, freeing them to experience emotional well being while delivering their optimum performance. The effective creation of resonance within an organization required emotional intelligence on the part of the leader/leaders. An emotionally intelligent leader possessed the power to inspire, motivate, and arouse enthusiasm, passion, and commitment among those they worked with (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002).
In order to understand the systemic operations of organizations of higher education, it was necessary to examine organizational theories relevant to institutions of higher education. In order to understand processes essential to effective leadership in an institution of higher education, it was necessary to understand leadership theories in terms of processes essential to effective organizational leadership, including communication, decision making, motivation, and guiding change (Chance & Chance, 2002). In order to understand systemic operations and processes essential to effective leadership at MSU-Bozeman, it was necessary to understand relevant organizational and leadership theories. The preceding review attempted to begin to facilitate such an understanding, in the interest of promoting insight into the way in which effective organizational and leadership processes implemented at MSU-Bozeman could enhance retention of faculty.

**Motivational Theory**

In order to fully understand what motivated tenured MSU-Bozeman faculty to remain in their positions, a thorough understanding of motivational theory was necessary. A survey of leading motivational theories and psychologists follows. Job satisfaction was necessary for faculty to be motivated to remain in their positions. A thorough understanding of motivational theory, as an element of organizational theory was necessary to understand job satisfaction theory. Ben-Porat (1981, p. 524) commented that "no single theory seems to give a satisfactory explanation" of job satisfaction.

Frederick Herzberg’s theory of job satisfaction was the theory cited with the most frequency in the industrial sector (Herzberg, 1966). Although there were marked
differences between the forces and influences motivating employees in industry as opposed to those motivating faculty in higher education, the fundamental theory behind job satisfaction in an organization informed both situations. Neither employees in industry or faculty in higher education would remain in their jobs if they were not satisfied. Established ideas regarding the topic of job satisfaction implied that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were simple opposites. Herzberg (Herzberg & Snyderman, 1959) stipulated that satisfaction and dissatisfaction were not on the same continuum, and as a consequence, were not opposites. He asserted that the factors that caused satisfaction versus no satisfaction were motivational factors, whereas, what he termed ‘hygiene factors,’ more commonly known as environmental factors, caused no dissatisfaction when present and dissatisfaction when absent. He operated on the premise that both motivational factors and hygiene factors had magnitudes of strength. His theory was generated in an industrial setting and its use has been questioned as to its viability outside of that arena. It was also posited that this theory may be ineffectual when applied without the use of the critical incident method of data collection (Herzberg & Snyderman, 1959).

Maslow's (1954) theory of motivation contended that individuals were motivated by unmet needs. This would imply that the needs of faculty who remained in their positions were met. Maslow ordered these needs in a hierarchy that precluded persons from motivation by any respective need area before all subordinate level needs had been fulfilled (Maslow, 1954).

McClelland's (1955) need for achievement provided the underpinnings for Maslow's theory of self-actualization. McClelland’s theory would imply that faculty who remained
in their positions were able to fulfill their need to achieve. McClelland's theory was comparable to Herzberg's in the respect that high achievers tended to be interested in Herzberg's motivators, while low achievers were more concerned about hygiene factors (McClelland, 1955).

McGregor (1960) examined theories regarding the behavior of individuals at work. He formulated two models he referred to as Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X referred to the conventional model of motivation first ascribed to Sigmund Freud. This model projected a negative image of man and his motives. In contrast, McGregor’s Theory Y coincided to a great degree with a majority of Maslow's ideas regarding the self-actualization level of motivation. McGregor's Theory Y was grounded on the assumption that self-direction, self-control, and maturity are the factors controlling motivation. McGregor’s Theory Y would suggest that, faculty who remain in their positions are fulfilling the needs for self-direction, self-control, and maturation (McGregor, 1960).

According to motivational theory, attempts to satisfy extrinsic factors in an effort to motivate workers were futile. The results of these theoretical studies revealed that effective reward systems had to correspond to intrinsic factors if employees were to be motivated (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). A detailed overview of these theories follows.

**Herzberg's Motivation Theory**

Referred to as the two-factor theory, Herzberg's motivation hygiene theory focused on those derivations of motivation that pertained to the completion of work (Hall & Williams, 1986). Herzberg interviewed a sample population of two hundred engineers and accountants representing industry in Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. Subjects were asked to
relate experiences at work that had led to either a significant increase in job satisfaction, or a significant decrease in job satisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

Interviews commenced with questions about the recollection on the part of the subjects regarding a time that they had felt good about their jobs. Recalling the time the subjects had experienced the good feelings, they were questioned about reasons why they had felt as they did. Subjects were also asked if the feelings of satisfaction that they had experienced had affected their performance, personal relationships, and general well being (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

The subjects were then questioned about the character of the chain of events that followed the satisfying period that had returned their feelings about their jobs to ‘normal.’ Following the response of the subjects to these inquiries, the interview was repeated. The second interview, in contrast to the first, inquired about a period of time in which the subjects had experienced negative feelings about their jobs (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

Criteria for job experiences that qualified as data for the study were as follows: 1.) experiences had to focus on an objective chain of events, as opposed to a subjective psychological reaction on the part of the respondent; 2.) the sequence of events were required to have a time frame, that is a beginning, middle, and ending; 3.) experiences had to have occurred during a period in which the subjects' feelings of job satisfaction were either good or bad; 4.) experiences had to have occurred at a time when the respondent’s job description met requirements for the sample to be used in the study; and 5.) experiences had to have focused on a situation in which the respondents' feelings about their jobs were specifically affected, rather than circumstances extrinsic to their
jobs which caused him to feel satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959).

In Herzberg's paradigm, job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were the products of two separate sets of factors. Those sets were comprised of motivating factors or satisfiers versus hygiene (environmental) factors or dissatisfiers.

Table 3. Herzberg’s Satisfiers/Dissatisfiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfiers</th>
<th>Dissatisfiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Achievement</td>
<td>1. Company policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Recognition</td>
<td>2. Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Work itself</td>
<td>3. Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Responsibility</td>
<td>4. Interpersonal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Advancement</td>
<td>5. Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Personal life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term hygiene was used as it is in the medical field. It described a phenomenon that operated to remove hazards from the environment (Duttweiler, 1986). Following are the properties of hygiene and motivation as defined and contrasted by Herzberg.

Table 4. Herzberg’s Dynamics of Hygiene.

* The psychological basis of hygiene needs is the ‘avoidance of pain from the environment’ (APE)
* There are infinite sources of pain in the environment
* Hygiene improvements have short-term effects
* Hygiene needs are cyclical in nature
* Hygiene needs have an escalating zero point
* There is no final answer to hygiene needs
Table 5. Herzberg’s Dynamics of Motivation

| * The psychological basis of motivation is the need for personal growth |
| * There are limited sources of motivator satisfaction |
| * Motivator improvements have long-term effects |
| * Motivators are additive in nature |
| * Motivator needs have a non-escalating zero point |
| * There are answers to motivator needs |

Herzberg contended that hygiene could not motivate. He asserted that, if used to achieve these ends, it would actually render negative effects in the final analysis. In his paradigm, an environment that prevented dissatisfaction with a job was a hygienic environment. However, the presence of this environment could do nothing further than to manifest the absence of dissatisfaction for a worker. To experience an actual positive happiness, well-being, or satisfaction in his job, some semblance of psychological growth was required from the worker himself (Herzberg, 1966). The motivators were more difficult to control, measure, and manipulate than the hygiene factors were. Motivators appeared as more complex and subjective in nature than were the hygiene factors. Frequently, motivators were not measurable. Workers would tend to aspire to more hygiene, to the extent that management focused on the hygiene factors, while neglecting the motivators (Hamner & Organ, 1978). This proclivity had negative effects on the development of a motivated workforce.

Conceptualizing job satisfaction as being composed of two uni-polar traits was difficult. In this scenario, the opposite of job satisfaction was not dissatisfaction, but a lack of job satisfaction. Additionally, the opposite of job dissatisfaction was not satisfaction with the job, but rather a manifestation of a lack of dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1976).
It is critical for this reason that hygiene be properly managed. The first step is achieved by applying Herzberg's two-factor theory. The application is illustrated by the five rule process represented adjacent: The proper management of hygiene.

1. Identify type of hygiene
2. Give hygiene for hygiene purposes
3. Give hygiene for what hurts
4. Keep hygiene administration simple
5. Give it and shut up about it

According to Herzberg, a deprivation in hygiene factors could lead to job dissatisfaction, but their amelioration did not lead to job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1976). By way of further definition, Hersey explained that hygiene factors, when satisfied, tended to eliminate dissatisfaction and work restriction, but did little to motivate an individual to superior performance or increased capacity (Hersey & Blanchard, 1982).

Worker satisfaction was most commonly altered by the following three psychological states: 1) experienced meaningfulness of the work itself; 2) experienced responsibility for the work and its outcomes; and 3) knowledge of results, or performance feedback. To the extent that the work was conceived in a fashion to augment these states, the more satisfying the worker's experience would be (Wallace, Goldstein, & Nathan, 1987; Burke, 1987).

Job dissatisfaction was psychologically different than job satisfaction. It was associated with an escalation process sometimes referred to as the principle of rising expectations. The principle of rising expectations contended that the more a worker received, the more a worker wanted (Burke, 1987). This principle served to elucidate Herzberg's escalating zero point statement. Mathis described the phenomenon as follows, "Hygiene factors provide a
base which must be carefully considered if dissatisfaction is to be avoided. But, even if all
of the maintenance needs are taken care of, the people will still not necessarily be motivated
to work harder" (Mathis, 1979).

Application of Herzberg’s theory to the retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman suggests
that both hygiene and motivational factors have to be considered if faculty are to be retained.
Environmental or extrinsic factors have to be acceptable, but faculty is not motivated
without the motivators, or aspects of their position which cause them to experience feelings
of self-actualization and well-being.

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs

Abraham Maslow’s contribution to motivational theory virtually reconstructed the field of
psychology. He rejected the traditional pessimism underlying Freudian psychology and
introduced an optimistic view of man and his motives. Maslow was a seminal founder of
the humanistic school of thought, also known as Third Force psychology, which contended
that man was inherently good and possessed all good characteristics at birth. The humanist
view then saw these characteristics as lost throughout the ensuing chain of events known as
life. Maslow’s most prominent works included the standard textbook written in
collaboration with Mittlemann, Principles Of Abnormal Psychology (1941), his paper on
motivational theory, ‘A Theory Of Human Motivation’ (1943), and his book of
organizational theory originally published in 1965 under the title Eupsychian Management.
An updated edition of this volume was published in 1998 under the title Maslow On
Management.

Maslow’s theory presented a paradigm of human motivation dominated by unsatisfied
needs. His paper, ‘A Theory Of Human Motivation,’ was an attempt to formulate a positive
theory of motivation which would satisfy the theoretical demands of his previous publication, ’A Preface To Motivation Theory’ (Maslow, 1943) while still conforming to “known facts, clinical and observational as well as experimental” (Maslow, 1943, p. 371).

The theoretical requirements of ‘A Preface To Motivation Theory’ included: 1.) The integrated wholeness of the organism was a fundamental assumption of motivation theory. 2.) Neither the hunger drive or any other physiological drive were accepted as a focal point for the theory. Somatically based and localizable drives were demonstrated to be atypical rather than typical in human motivation. 3.) A theory of motivation had to focus upon ultimate or basic goals, and ends rather than means to these ends. A focus on means would imply a more central place for unconscious than for conscious motivations. 4.) Commonly, most goals were accessible through various cultural paths. Conscious, specific, “local-cultural desires” (Maslow, 1943, p.42) were not as intrinsic to motivation theory as more fundamental, unconscious goals. 5.) It was assumed that motivated behavior was an avenue through which multiple basic needs could be concurrently fulfilled or articulated. A characteristic behavior had multiple motivations. 6.) Virtually all organismic states were to be understood as motivated and as motivating. 7.) Human needs arranged themselves in hierarchies of prepotency. In other words, the emergence of one need was dependent upon satisfaction of another pre-potent need. No drive was isolate; every need or drive was related to the state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of other needs or drives. 8.) Lists of drives were ineffective. Categorization of motivations had to deal with the problem of the levels of specificity or generalization of motives to be categorized. 9.) Classifications of motivations had to be based upon goals rather than upon instigating drives or motivated behavior. 10.) Motivation theory had to be human-centered rather than animal-centered.
11.) Circumstances or the field in which the organism reacts had to be taken into perspective, but the field alone could seldom represent the sole explanation for behavior. The field itself had to be interpreted in terms of the organism. Field theory could not be substituted for motivation theory. 12.) Not only the integration of the organism had to be taken into consideration, but also the prospect of isolated, specific, incomplete or segmented reactions. 13.) Motivation theory and behavior theory were not synonymous. The motivations were only one category of determinants of behavior. Behavior was almost always motivated, but biological, cultural, and situational determinants were at work, as well (Maslow, 1943).

Maslow arrived at his theory of human motivation “most directly through clinical experience” (Maslow, 1943, p.371). Maslow asserted at the time that the theory “…must be considered a suggested framework for future research and must stand or fall, not so much on facts available or evidence presented, as upon researches yet to be done, researches suggested perhaps, by the questions raised in this [‘A Theory Of Motivation’] paper” (Maslow, 1943, p. 371).

Maslow contended that the basic human needs were “organized into a hierarchy of relative prepotency” (Maslow, 1954, p. 83). In other words, the lowest ranked unsatisfied need in the hierarchy would dominate the behavior of a human. When lower needs were satisfied, higher needs emerged to dominate the behavior of the organism in place of the now satisfied lower, physiological needs. Gratified needs ceased to play an active determining or organizing role in the behavior of an individual. The basic human needs, according to Maslow (1954) were, beginning with the lowest and proceeding to the highest:
physiological needs, safety needs, love needs, esteem needs, and the need for self-actualization.

The physiological needs included, but were not limited to, hunger, sex, thirst, fatigue, sleepiness, and maternal responses. Maslow considered that the desires to know and understand were basic physiological needs as well, and reacted synergistically with the other basic or conative needs. In psychology, conative needs are defined as needs related to the act or faculty of impelling or directing muscular or mental effort. Fulfillment of conative need results in development of conative power (Webster, 2005). Maslow stressed recognition of two concepts fundamental in understanding the physiological needs, those of homeostasis and appetites. Physiological needs would be satisfied according to the need for a type of homeostasis or balance in the satiation of such needs, and the appetites of the individual organism. Unfulfilled physiological needs would dominate the behavior of an organism, leaving higher needs virtually nonexistent until lower needs were met (Maslow, 1954).

The second level of needs, the safety needs, was extremely important. When threatened, sick, frightened, or in pain, the human organism became a safety-seeking mechanism. Nothing was more important than safety at these times, sometimes even the physiological needs, which being satisfied now, seemed nonexistent. Safety needs surfaced rarely in isolate situations for the healthy human, whereas humans suffering from neurosis or obsessive compulsive disorders existed in a chronic state of unsatisfied safety needs (Maslow, 1954).

The love needs, or belongingness and love needs, as specified by Maslow, surfaced only when the physiological and safety needs were fairly well gratified. Companionship,
affection, and belonging become paramount needs for the individual whose lower needs were met. According to Maslow, the inability to fulfill these needs was the most common cause of maladjustment and even more severe psychopathology in society today. The love need was not to be confused with the need for sex, as the two were not synonymous. In Maslow’s hierarchy, sex was a purely physiological need (Maslow, 1954).

The need for self-actualization was the highest need in the hierarchy. Although the term self-actualization was first coined by Kurt Goldstein (1939), it was Abraham Maslow who pioneered the concept as we know it today. When most or all lower order needs were met, the human organism would experience still another source of discontent. Maslow explained that a “man must do what he is fitted for. A musician must make music, an artist must paint, a poet must write, if he is to be ultimately at peace with himself. What a man can be, he must be. This need we may call self-actualization,” (Maslow, 1954, p. 91). The term self-actualization, in Maslow’s paradigm, referred to man’s desire for self-fulfillment or his desire to become actualized in what he was potentially. This need would be manifest very differently in different individuals. The clear emergence of this need most commonly was dependant upon prior satisfaction of the physiological, safety, love, and esteem needs (Maslow, 1954).

Maslow’s theory was a synthesis of the divergent and prominent philosophies behind Marx’s theory of economic and physical needs (Marx, 1906); Freud’s theory of physical and love needs (Freud, 1924), Adler’s esteem needs (Adler, 1959), and Goldstein’s theory of self-actualization (Goldstein, 1939).
Application of Maslow’s theory to retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman suggested that it is necessary to see that both the lower and higher needs of faculty were fulfilled to a greater extent in order to motivate them to remain in their positions.

McClelland’s Achievement Motivation

In 1951 David McClelland conducted a study using personality tests to identify people he characterized as *achievement oriented*. He administered personality tests to an unidentified number of male college students that experimentally aroused the achievement motive. His basic approach was simple: McClelland attempted to alter the content of fantasy experimentally. The tests identified six different *arousal conditions*: 1.) the *relaxed condition* was one in which subjects executed projects that were introduced in an informal way as part of the blind investigation of some graduate students into a new problem; 2.) the *neutral condition* was one in which projects were seriously presented to subjects as ones in which the department of psychology wanted some norms; 3.) the *ego-involved condition* was one in which projects were described as measures of intelligence and leadership ability; 4.) the *success condition* was one in which subjects were permitted to excel on the ego-involved projects; 5.) the *failure condition* was one in which the subjects were caused to fall short on the ego involved projects; and 6.) the *success-failure condition* was one in which the subjects were initially successful but then failed on the ego-involved projects (McClelland, 1953).

McClelland’s studies distinguished a group of people who consistently demonstrated behavior designed to improve themselves through increased industriousness with which they sought to attain their goals. This need for achievement or accomplishment was inherent to the higher order needs described by Maslow in his hierarchy. McClelland described a
number of common characteristics found in *achievement oriented* subjects: 1.) Achievement oriented personalities preferred to carry out tasks for which they were exclusively accountable. 2.) High need achievers were moderate risk takers. Subjects tended to maximize their odds of success by establishing moderate goals. Short of avoiding challenging situations, high need achievers preferred to pursue goals that were within an attainable range. 3.) High need achievers derived satisfaction only from the *knowledge* of their success. By virtue of this characteristic, they were in constant need of reassurance regarding their success (McClelland, 1953).

The objective of McClelland’s research was to discover why some people were low achievers. His conclusions indicated that the dominating forces resulting in low achievement were parental influences, education level, cultural background, and dominant values in place in society (McClelland, 1953). McClelland’s results indicated that low achievers could increase their ability to achieve with the correct instruction and guidance. His conclusions indicated, as well, that organizations could benefit from selecting high achievers as managers. The relevance of McClelland’s theory to retention at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) was regarding the importance of selecting high achievers as upper level administration in the interest of benefiting the institution as a whole, as a vehicle through which faculty could be motivated to stay in their positions as employees of a successful organization (McClelland, 1953).

**McGregor’s X Y Theories**

Douglas McGregor was recognized as an organizational theorist with as great a frequency as he was acknowledged to be one of the leading motivational theorists in the field of psychology. His motivational theories were invariably formulated against the
organizational backdrop. McGregor drew upon the work of his predecessors in the field of motivational psychology to formulate a new theory of motivation known as McGregor’s X Y Theories. Theory X was the conventional theory best ascribed to Sigmund Freud (1924).

The following three tenets form the backbone of McGregor’s Theory X:

Table 8. McGregor’s Theory X.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise—money; materials; equipment; people—in the interest of economic needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>With respect to people, this is a process of directing their efforts, motivating them, controlling their actions, modifying their behavior to fit the needs of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Without this active intervention by management, people would be passive—even resistant—to organizational needs. They must therefore be persuaded, rewarded, punished, controlled; their activities must be directed. This is management’s task—in managing subordinate managers or workers. We often sum it up by saying that management consists of getting things done through other people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further assumptions that formed the foundation for the above propositions regarded the nature of man. Theory X depicted man as indolent and lazy by nature. In this paradigm, man was inherently void of ambition, irresponsible, and incapable of independent progress. Intrinsically selfish, the man of Theory X was insensitive to organizational needs. Recalcitrant in the face of change, this individual depicted by Theory X was intellectually mediocre and a ready victim for opportunists and demagogues (McGregor, 1960).

The policies, practices, and principles that composed the organization operated in accordance with Theory X and its assumptions about human nature and reflected the basic tenets and beliefs outlined above. McGregor was convinced that these assumptions regarding human nature were erroneous. It was McGregor’s belief that Theory X behavior was the product of the principles, practices, and policies in place in conventional organizations, rather than the result of man’s inherent nature. McGregor contended that Theory X was based on mistaken notions concerning cause and effect. Additionally, McGregor was not a proponent of the guiding principles of Theory X. In reference to these
he said, “Force breeds counter-forces: restriction of output, antagonism, militant unionism, subtle but effective sabotage of management objectives. This approach was especially difficult during times of full employment” (McGregor, 1960, p. 6). In sum, McGregor contended that traditional assumptions concerning the human side of enterprise were ineffective (McGregor, 1960).

These assumptions also provided the backdrop for the complete picture of the economic man described by Taylor in his theory of scientific management. His paradigm depicted money as the major motivator and as such, believed that the individual performance of employees could be controlled with incentive schemes (Taylor, 1991).

McGregor looked to motivational theory to explain why conventional managerial practices were inadequate. In doing so, he relied heavily upon the research of Abraham Maslow. He applied Maslow’s needs hierarchy to the organizational paradigm, calling this new application Theory Y. With very little variation in his relation of the hierarchy, McGregor listed four levels of human needs. He listed physiological and safety needs in the first category, social needs in the second, ego needs in the third, and self-fulfillment needs in the fourth. He explained the dynamics of motivation, need satisfaction, and synergy of needs in accordance with the precepts of Maslow’s theory (1960). McGregor noted that in the industrial setting, management had provided for physiological and safety needs, shifting the motivational emphasis to the social and egoistic needs. Unless management provided avenues of satiation for the higher level needs, workers would be deprived and would seek gratification of unmet needs through demands for additional money. Although money was insufficient to gratify many higher level needs, it became the focus of attention when it was the *only* existing means of need gratification (McGregor, 1960).
When industry sought to manage through provision for the lower level needs of the individual, which money provides for, they were using the ‘carrot and the stick’ theory of motivation. This theory of motivation, also known as Newtonian physical theory, was effective as long as lower level needs remained unmet. The theory became inadequate when lower needs were satiated and need gratification became focused on the higher level needs, such as respect and self-fulfillment. Management by direction and control was ineffective in motivating people whose physiological and safety needs were satisfied. Management had to attend to the dominating unmet social, egoistic, and self-fulfillment needs of these individuals in order to remain effective (McGregor, 1960). McGregor offered the following Theory Y in response to this management dilemma.

Application of McGregor’s XY Theories to retention of faculty at Montana State University indicated that, given the comparatively lower salaries offered, upper level administrators and management must ensure the facilitation of fulfillment of higher order social, egoistic, and self-fulfillment needs of faculty in order to motivate them to remain in their positions.

Table 9. McGregor’s Theory Y.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management is responsible for organizing the elements of productive enterprise, money, materials, equipment, and people, in the interest of economic ends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>People are not by nature passive or resistant to organizational needs. They have become so as a result of experience in organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The motivation, the potential for development, the capacity for assuming responsibility, the readiness to direct behavior toward organizational goals are all present in people. Management does not put them there. It is a responsibility of management to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The essential task of management is to arrange organizational conditions and methods of operation so that people can achieve their own goals best by directing their own efforts toward organizational objectives (McGregor, 1960).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivation: Psychobiological and Biobehavioral Approaches

In the decades of the 1930s and 1940s motivation was explained in terms of human needs. There were still theorists that believed that all human behavior was biologically motivated and that the ultimate goal directing human behavior was reproduction or survival. Roderick Wong (2000) proposed that when organisms were motivated to behave in specific ways, behavior was terminated when a goal was reached. He theorized that all human behavior was directed by its consequences and was related to some end point associated with the biological needs of the organism. He asserted, as the drive theorists did, that the functional significance of motivated activities had to be explained in terms of fitness maximization. His view hypothesized that all human behaviors occurred in an environmental context resulting in interactions between external stimuli, behavior, and physiology. According to Wong, control systems connected environmental events and internal conditions with the linkage made possible by learning. These systems adaptively arbitrated between environmental events and internal states by producing multiple reciprocally interacting motivated activities, all stimulated by sensory pleasure. Wong posited that sensory pleasure was a human reaction to all stimuli that were productive for the most favorable physiological functioning and survival of the organism. A reaction of sensory displeasure characterized harmful stimuli (Wong, 2000). According to Wong, professors who retained their positions at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) did so in the interest of the most efficient physiological functioning and survival.

Hugh Wagner (1999) explored the motivational processes that guided human behavior. In addition to affirming the motivational role of basic physiological needs, Wagner recognized the limitations of biological explanations and observed that humans could
manage basic physiological drives to produce behavior appropriate to a complex social environment. Wagner’s theory suggested that in addition to satisfying survival needs, a professorial position at MSU-Bozeman needed to satisfy social needs of individuals, as well, if they were to be retained as faculty.

Motivation and Curiosity

Prior to 1950, motivational theorists believed that individuals were motivated by external stimuli or internal physiological need. For example, it was believed that individuals were motivated to learn by the external stimulus of being taught or the internal need to survive. In the 1950s, a group of researchers produced evidence to suggest that individuals learned due to intrinsic motivators such as curiosity and exploratory behavior. Although individuals learned to do many things as a result of reinforcement, exploration and its related behavior was not one of them. Further experimentation revealed that individuals demonstrated this behavior out of curiosity and a reaction to novelty (Butler, 1953; Hutt, 1966). Further, it was demonstrated that humans showed a preference for complexity (Earl, 1957), and that interest in novel things diminishes with repeated exposure (Hutt, 1966). This evidence indicated that faculty at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) who retained their positions were able to satisfy the need to know and satisfy their preference for complexity.

Dember and Earl’s Theory of Exploratory Behavior. Dember and Earl (1957) generated a theory that was the prototype for many current theories of exploratory behavior. The theory was based on the premise that organisms were motivated to experience optimal complexity. Their research indicated that when an organism became used to a certain level of complexity, called an adaptation level, it was motivated to explore stimuli that were more
complex than this level. The purpose of the theory was to explain why curiosity, exploratory, and play behaviors were systematically directed at increasingly complex adaptation levels (Dember & Earl, 1957). Application of Dember and Earl’s theory of exploratory behavior to retention at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) suggested that in order for faculty to be motivated to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman, their work had to provide opportunities for increasing complexity as they incrementally adapted to subsequent levels of complexity in their roles as professors.

Motivation and Creativity

Current research indicated that people engaged in acts of creativity for at least three reasons: (1) to solve problems, (2) to enhance their ability to communicate values and ideas, and (3) to satiate the need for diverse and novel stimuli (Franken, 2002).

Edward Debono (e.g. 1970, 1987) has researched creativity extensively and theorized that the brain evolved to isolate predictability and consistency. According to Debono, creativity occurred when individuals recombined these predictable and consistent elements in new and different ways (DeBono, 1970, 1987). DeBono’s perspective dictated that retention of the professorate at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) was contingent upon faculty’s ability to fulfill their needs for creativity.

Motivation and Drives

In response to the earlier research of the 1950s and 1960s identifying human drives as the motivating factors behind human behavior, Paul Lawrence and Nitin Nohria, (2002) proposed the existence of four drives. The drives they hypothesized were: (1) the drive to acquire; (2) the drive to bond; (3) the drive to learn; and (4) the drive to defend. The
initial function of these drives was the initiation of goal-directed behavior, the provision of urge to action, and the intentionality and purpose behind all human behavior. Lawrence and Nohria believed that drive systems had existed in multi-celled animals since the central nervous system begin to develop. These systems, seated in the limbic region of the brain, have evolved to become more refined with the survival of the fittest. Even so, they retained their original functions. These researchers believed that each of the four specific drives were primary, that is, independent of the others in the respect that fulfillment of one drive did not equate fulfillment of another. Lawrence and Nohria hypothesized that, in combination with one another, these drives have provided humans with a significant increase in what evolutionary biologists have termed “inclusive fitness.” According to these researchers, these drives provided the ultimate motives for human behavior. As such, they served to act as a set of decision guides. The drives shaped and activated human reasoning and decision making, perceiving, remembering, and acting in individuals (Lawrence & Nohria, 2002). Drive theorists believed that retention of faculty at Montana State University-Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman) was a result of satisfaction of the aforementioned litany of drives among professors.

Motivation and Emotions

Currently, motivational psychologists are beginning to view emotions as the predominately motivating factor behind human behavior. According to this school of thought, faculty who remain at MSU-Bozeman must experience positive emotions in order to remain in their positions. In the past, psychologists treated emotions as distinct from motivation, but the contemporary perception is that emotions play a fundamental role in motivation. In the decades of the 1930s and 1940s motivation was explained in terms of
human needs. The following two decades saw researchers conceptualizing motivation as behavior resulting from the existence of human drives. In the late 1960s and 1970s, theorists described motivation in terms of action. The late 1980s and 1990s brought about the characterization of motivation in terms of goals (Franken, 2002).

Although goals and threats were found to account for immediate behavior, researchers noted that they did not explain long-term behavior (Locke & Latham, 1990; Pervin, 1989; Snyder et al., 1991). Individuals experiencing pessimism and self-doubt frequently gave up pursuit of their goals, whereas those who remained optimistic were persistent (Franken, 2002).

In recent years, research has indicated that we cannot consider emotions apart from motivation or motivation without consideration of emotions (Frijda, 1988; Lazarus, 1991, a, b). For example, researchers have found that emotions have prolonged and sabotaged goal-directed behavior (Franken, 2002). Ensuring that our emotions were congruent with our goals was necessary to the attainment of our goals. Negative emotions often rendered attainment of goals impossible. It has become apparent that in the interest of achieving our goals, it was necessary to learn to manage a variety of goal-incongruent emotions. Fear and anxiety undermined goal-directed behavior, and as such were categorized as goal-incongruent emotions. Fear and anxiety paralyzed individuals into inactivity. Pessimism and depression, as well, have been found to virtually eliminate motivation.

Recent research on guilt and shame revealed that these emotions were also goal-incongruent and, as such, damaging to goal-directed behavior (Franken, 2002). Emotional stress was conventionally accepted as a uniquely human negative emotion resulting from the way in which individuals perceived the world. It interfered with an individual’s ability to
focus and often became the individual’s sole focus. It has been linked to a plethora of health problems. When individuals experienced negative emotions, the immune system weakened (Salovey, Rothman, Detweiler & Steward, 2000). Learning to manage stress was accomplished through adequate relaxation. Daniel Goleman (1976) recommended the strategy of meditation. In his research, he noted that meditators typically recovered rapidly from stress. Goleman suggested that this is why meditators successfully resist the damaging effects of stress. If individuals can relax following each stressful event, the negative affects associated with stress are minimized. Individuals who allow themselves to recover from stressful experiences one at a time through meditation possess greater resources with which to deal with future stressful events. Goleman pointed out that research indicated that stress produced damaging effects only if prolonged. Meditators recovered rapidly from the effects of individual stressful events. Because of this, they did not experience the damaging cumulative effects of prolonged stress (Goleman, 1976).

Happiness, hope, optimism, attachment, belongingness, and empathy were the predominant goal-congruent emotions. Individuals that were hopeful, happy, or optimistic were industrious in the pursuit of their goals. Research revealed that happiness, hope, and optimism increased tenacity in individuals pursuing goals. It has been found that tenacity or a willingness to persist is the main antecedent of achievement and success. The presence of goal-congruent emotions resulted in behaviors of risk-taking and relatedness. Risk-taking behavior was a product of positive health and adjustment. The absence of risk-taking behavior indicated neuroticism. Relatedness or the willingness of individuals to interact and take part in interdependent relationships was a quality associated with success in achieving goals. Research revealed that people who developed their social skills were more
successful, and physically and psychologically healthier than those who did not (Franken, 2002).

Recent research revealed that humans have an inherent propensity to realize their potential and researchers have termed this tendency “growth motivation” (Franken, 2002, p. xiv). The other new focal point of motivational theory has been termed the “self-regulation of motivation” (Franken, 2002, p. xiv). The emphasis here was on the need for people to learn how to manage their emotions and set suitable goals. Research revealed that these skills could be learned. Growth motivation and self-regulation have become the two most recent areas of focus for many contemporary motivational theorists (Franken, 2002).

Regardless of differences in focus, there was consensus among the majority of current researchers concerning the critical role that emotions played in motivation. This understanding was responsible for psychologists who espoused the self-regulation of emotion. Albert Bandura advocated that people needed to learn to regulate their emotions, particularly self-doubt (Bandura, 1997). He asserted that, “Talent is only as good as its execution” (Bandura, 1991).

As a result of the complexity of emotions, numerous definitions have been offered over the course of time. A definition that incorporated the strategic elements of the previous definitions has been generated by Paul and Anne Kleinginna (1981). Striving to arrive at a consensual definition, they proposed the following: Emotions occur as a result of an interaction between subjective factors, environmental factors, and neural and hormonal processes (Kleinginna & Kleinginna, 1981). This definition recognized that emotions were the product of the interaction of biological, learned, and cognitive processes (Franken, 2002).
Emotions furnished a reward system for the reinforcement of behavior. This presented another important aspect of the way in which emotions interacted with motivation. Negative emotions tended to discourage the behavior that caused them, whereas positive emotions served as an incentive to repeat behavior that caused them (Thorndike, 1913). Emotions generated effective experiences, inspired the individual to produce cognitive explanations, activated a range of internal modifications, and produced expressive, goal-directed, and adaptive behaviors (Franken, 2002).

**Epstein’s Theory.** Epstein’s theory was categorized as a cognitive-experiential self-theory (CEST). It evolved out of his research on practical intelligence. He observed, as have others, that academic intelligence did not predict adjustment. Here, adjustment referred to mental and physical health, quality of family, social, and romantic relations, and/or achievement at work. Epstein posited that individuals have three semi-independent systems with which to negotiate life on a daily basis. According to Epstein’s theory people possessed: (1) a rational system which was comparable to academic intelligence, (2) an experiential system, (3) and an “associationistic” system which became visible in altered states of consciousness. Epstein’s theory asserted that the experiential system was responsible for mental and physical health, quality of relationships, and vocational achievement. Here it was important to note that, although academic intelligence was useful in predicting grades, and as such would appear to correspond to vocational success, many people who were successful at their jobs did not possess high intelligence quotients. Indicators of achievement, such as promotions and financial success, were not predictable through measures of academic intelligence (Epstein, 1990).
Epstein asserted that the way people thought was habitual. Epstein and Meier (1989) constructed an inventory with which to determine to what degree individuals are either constructive or destructive thinkers. The two modes of thinking differed most significantly in the reactions of the thinkers to negative outcomes. Both constructive and destructive thinkers reacted favorably to good outcomes, that is, they remained optimistic about future performance, but destructive thinkers tended to over generalize about the self after negative outcomes. As a result, they experienced a significant decrease in self-esteem, emotional depression, and assumed a helpless outlook regarding their future performances (Epstein & Meier, 1989). These were the same symptoms that characterized depressed individuals (Franken, 2002).

During laboratory studies where emotional stress was induced, destructive thinkers experienced more negative thoughts and more negative affects than did constructive thinkers (Katz & Epstein, 1991). Not all negative thought was related to the experiment. In addition, destructive thinkers experienced more emotional stress than did constructive thinkers. Epstein’s findings indicated that destructive thinkers spontaneously generated negative thoughts in the absence of external stressors and perceived external stressors as more destructive than did constructive thinkers. Epstein’s theory was important to stress management, management of negative emotions, and achievement of success (Franken, 2002).

and Psychodynamic Unconscious” (Epstein, 1994), and his book co-authored by Archie Brodsky entitled You’re Smarter Than You Think (Epstein & Brodsky, 1993). While Epstein’s model of the experiential mind informed Goleman’s model of the emotional mind, Goleman generated his own interpretation (Goleman, 1997, 2002).

Daniel Goleman made a powerful case for the importance of the relatively new concept of emotional intelligence. Goleman theorized that human beings possessed two types of intelligence: (1) academic intelligence, or the rational mind, and (2) emotional intelligence, or the emotional mind, which governs self-control, zeal, persistence, empathy, compassion, and the ability to motivate oneself. These two minds were inextricably intertwined and for the most part, operated in harmony. A balance existed between the emotional and the rational minds in which emotion fed into and informed the rational mind, while the rational mind filtered and sometimes rejected inputs of the emotions. Even so, the emotional and rational minds remained somewhat independent of one another and represented distinct, but interconnected circuitry in the brain. Goleman’s research indicated that when these two minds interacted, emotional intelligence appeared, as did intellectual ability. According to Goleman, our ability to apply intelligence to our emotional impulses was critical in determining our success in life (Goleman, 1997, 2002). The model of emotional intelligence used by Goleman was first proposed by Peter Salovey and John Mayer in their article entitled “Emotional Intelligence” (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). According to Salovey, emotional intelligence consisted of: (1) knowing one’s emotions, or possessing self-awareness; managing emotions, or handling feelings to see that they were appropriate; (3) motivating oneself, or marshalling emotions in pursuit of a goal; (4) recognizing emotions in others or displaying empathy; and (5) handling relationships, which involved managing
emotions in others (Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Goleman asserted that these skills could be learned (Goleman, 1997, 2002).

Summary

It was necessary to understand motivational theory in order to understand what motivated faculty at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) to remain in their positions. The preceding review informed the study regarding motivational theories relevant to higher education.

Frederick Herzberg was a motivational theorist who based his motivational theory on studies conducted in the industrial sector. Herzberg was another example of overlap between the themes of motivational and jobs satisfaction theory. Herzberg examined job satisfaction as the motivator for individuals to remain in their jobs. Herzberg asserted that principles contributing to job satisfaction in the industrial sector were applicable to the academic realm (Herzberg, 1976). According to Herzberg, factors that produced job satisfaction were fundamentally intrinsic, while factors that led to job dissatisfaction were fundamentally extrinsic. The constellation of intrinsic factors consisted of the work itself, achievement, advancement, recognition, and responsibility. The constellation of extrinsic factors was composed of supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, salary, company policies, and administration (Caston & Braoto, 1985).

Herzberg implied that when extrinsic factors were missing in the work environment, the presence of intrinsic factors did not lead to job satisfaction (Caston & Braoto, 1985). Employees experiencing intrinsic motivation exhibited commitment to the job and the achievement of satisfaction through the job (Aldag, 1979). When experiencing intrinsic
motivation, employees ascribed to results gleaned from the work itself. Employees experienced intrinsic outcomes without the involvement of others (Aldag, 1979).

In short, Herzberg’s theory was based on the absence or presence of two factors. He cited satisfaction and dissatisfaction as representing these two factors. The factors were two separate phenomena not found on the same continuum. He then proceeded to define the two factors in his own terms. In his paradigm, satisfaction or lack of satisfaction had to do with self-realization and fulfillment of higher order needs, whereas dissatisfaction or lack of dissatisfaction was derived from feelings that were products of the work environment, regarding surroundings, coworkers, supervisors, etc. Satisfiers were motivating, whereas, according to Herzberg’s theory, dissatisfiers cannot motivate, but only create displeasure (Herzberg, 1976). Application of Herzberg’s theory to the present study implied that professors at MSU-Bozeman remained in their positions as a result of self-realization and fulfillment of higher order needs.

Another motivational theorist, Abraham Maslow, wrapped his hypothesis around the existence of six fundamental human needs and the human tendency to strive to satisfy them. The theory organized the needs into a “hierarchy of relative prepotency” (Maslow, 1954, p. 83). The lowest ranked unsatisfied need in the hierarchy would dominate the behavior of a human. When lower needs were satisfied, higher needs emerged to dominate the behavior of the organism in place of the now satisfied lower, physiological needs. Gratified needs ceased to play an active determining or organizing role in the behavior of an individual (Maslow, 1954). Application of Maslow’s theory to retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman suggested that what motivated faculty who remain in their positions was a great degree of satisfaction of both lower and higher order needs.
David McClelland, a motivational theorist conducting his study in 1951, theorized that people were either high achievers or low achievers, and that people in these two categories could be distinguished between by a series of tests. He developed instruction and guidance to increase the ability of low achievers to achieve. His results indicated that organizations could benefit from selecting high achievers as managers (McClelland, 1953).

Application of his theory to the behavior of professor’s at MSU-Bozeman who chose to remain in their positions suggested that they were able to fulfill their need to achieve, and that employment of high achievers in upper level administrative positions motivated faculty to remain in their positions as an outcome of the way in which appointing high achievers to managerial positions benefits the organization as a whole.

In subsequent motivational studies, Douglas McGregor essentially appropriated Maslow’s theory and applied it to industry. He described ‘old school’ scientific management or the conventional theory of motivation initially espoused by Freud as Theory X. He characterized this theory of motivation as ineffective. He then described Maslow’s theory applied to industry as Theory Y, and promoted Theory Y as the framework upon which management needed to design avenues wherein employees would be directed to fulfill organizational goals during the course of recognizing and fulfilling fundamental human needs (McGregor, 1960). Application of his theory indicated simultaneous fulfillment of both organizational goals and basic human needs was present among faculty who chose to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman.

During the 1930s and 1940s the explanation of motivation as a response to human needs was the dominating canon of motivational theory. Some theorists still contended that all human behavior was biologically motivated and that the ultimate goal directing human
behavior was reproduction or survival. Publishing his theory in 2000, Roderick Wong theorized that all human behavior was consequence directed and was related to some goal or objective associated with the biological needs of the organism. He explained motivational activities in terms of fitness maximization (Wong, 2000). According to Wong, professors at MSU-Bozeman who retained their positions did so in the interest of the most efficient physiological functioning and survival.

Hugh Wagner (1999) was another motivational theorist whose studies affirmed the motivational role of basic physiological needs. Wagner, however, addressed the limitations of biological explanations and believed that humans could manage basic physiological drives to generate behavior appropriate to a complex social environment. Application of his theory to retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman suggested that in addition to satisfying survival needs, a professorial position at MSU-Bozeman needed to satisfy social needs of individuals, as well.

In the 1950s, a group of researchers introduced a new approach to motivational theory. They suggested that individuals were motivated by intrinsic factors such as curiosity and exploratory behavior. Although individuals were motivated to do many things as a result of reinforcement, exploration and its related behavior was not one of them. Individuals exhibited these behaviors out of curiosity and a reaction to novelty (Butler, 1953; Hutt, 1966). Additionally, people demonstrated a preference for complexity (Earl, 1957) and exhibited a diminished interest in novel things with repeated exposure. Evidence of this nature indicated that faculty at MSU-Bozeman who retained positions were able to satisfy the need to know and their preference for complexity while employed by MSU-Bozeman. The prototype for exploratory behavior theory was generated by Dember and Earl in 1957.
Their contention was that organisms were motivated to experience optimal complexity. They based this hypothesis on evidence that indicated that when organisms became accustomed to a certain level of complexity, they were motivated to explore stimuli that were more complex (Dember & Earl, 1957).

Another area of motivational theory relevant to higher education was that of motivation and creativity. This school of motivational thought indicated that individuals engaged in acts of creativity for three reasons, if not more. They engaged in creative acts to solve problems, to enhance their ability to communicate values and ideas, and to satiate the need for diverse and novel stimuli (Franken, 2002). The motivational theory promulgated by Edward DeBono (1970, 1987) contended that the brain had evolved to isolate predictability and consistency. According to his theory, creativity occurred when individuals recombined these predictable and consistent elements in innovative and diverse ways. DeBono’s theory suggested that retention of the professorate at MSU-Bozeman was contingent upon faculty’s ability to fulfill their needs for creativity.

The most recent wave of motivational theory contended that emotions were the predominating motivating factor behind human behavior. In the past, psychologists treated emotions as a phenomenon separate from motivation, but the prevailing view was that emotions played an essential role in motivation. In the 1930s and 1940s, researchers conceptualized motivation in terms of human needs. The 1950s and 1960s hailed the perception of human motivation as the result of existing human drives. In the late 1960s and 1970s, researchers explained motivation in terms of action. The late 1980s and 1990s revealed new evidence that defined motivation in terms of goals. Goals and threats were found to account for immediate behavior, but motivational theorists found that they failed to
explain long-term behavior (Locke & Latham, 1990; Snyder et al., 1991). Evidence revealed that individuals experiencing pessimism and self-doubt frequently abandoned pursuit of goals, whereas optimistic individuals exhibited tenacity and persistence (Franken, 2002).

The most celebrated researcher espousing emotions as the controlling force motivating human behavior was Daniel Goleman. Using the model of emotional intelligence first conceived by Peter Salovey and John Mayer (1990), Goleman has applied the model to organizational theory in addition to motivational theory, and made a powerful case for the new concept (Goleman, 1997, 2002). According to these theorists, application of their hypothesis indicated that faculty who remained at MSU-Bozeman experienced positive emotions in order to remain in their positions. An understanding of motivational theory was fundamental to any endeavor to understand what motivated faculty to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman.

**Job Satisfaction**

For faculty at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) to be motivated to remain in their positions, they must have experience job satisfaction. As mentioned earlier, a thorough understanding of motivational theory, as an element of organizational theory was necessary to understand job satisfaction theory. In this interest, the author has surveyed the areas of both motivational and organizational psychology. As was cited earlier by Ben-Porat (1981, p. 524), "no single theory seems to give a satisfactory explanation" of job satisfaction. Although Frederick Herzberg’ motivational theory was the theory of job satisfaction cited with the most frequency in the industrial sector (Herzberg, 1966), there were a number of more recent inquiries into job satisfaction that were relevant when asking what motivated
faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions. A survey of the following studies was presented in this interest.

**The Mercer Study**

A 1998 study conducted by William Mercer, Inc. reported that employee retention and turnover were the most accurate measures of employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction in organizations. In other words, the Mercer report claimed that rates of faculty turnover and retention would reflect most accurately the measure of satisfaction or dissatisfaction experienced by the professorate at MSU-Bozeman. The Mercer report found that retention of employees increased company revenues, whereas, the estimated costs of employee turnover, dependent upon position, ranged from $10,000 to $40,000 per individual (Mercer, 1998). The study reported that a five percent increase in retention resulted in a ten percent decrease in costs, while productivity increases ranged from twenty-five to sixty-five percent (Mercer, 1998).

A predominate misconception was that employee compensation was the motivating factor in employee satisfaction. Based upon this misconception, many employers tried to “buy” (Mercer, 1998, p. 1) employee satisfaction through greater compensation and benefits. This strategy proved to be minimally effective according to the present report (Mercer, 1998).

The Mercer study revealed that in 206 mid-size to large organizations with high turnover, the most common reason given for dissatisfaction was inadequate compensation. In contrast, in organizations reporting low turnover, forty percent of the respondents perceived that emotional aspects of their working environment, such as work satisfaction and relationships with colleagues and superiors, were entirely responsible for their retention,
in contrast to twenty-one percent of employees attributing compensatory issues as wholly responsible for their retention (Mercer, 1998). These findings confirmed the validity of the studies by Bennis, Drucker, Herzberg, Maslow, and McGregor reviewed earlier in this paper. Compensation and benefits satisfied the two lowest need levels of Maslow’s hierarchy, while the upper three were satisfied through emotional channels. If viewed from Herzberg’s perspective, inadequate compensation served as a dissatisfier, whereas the fulfilled higher order needs served as satisfiers (Bennis, 2000; Drucker, 1999; Herzberg, 1966; Maslow, 1998; McGregor, 1960). When applied to retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman, the findings of the Mercer study suggested that adequate remuneration, job satisfaction, and emotional aspects of the working environment such as relationships with co-workers, must all be adequate in order for faculty to be motivated to remain in their positions.

The Lucent Study

A more recent survey, the Network Professionals’ Job Satisfaction Survey, conducted by Lucent (2002) revealed some of the following findings. Since 1998, job satisfaction has been on the rise. In 1998, 56 percent of employees surveyed were satisfied with their jobs. Presently, it was reported that more than 75 percent of the employees were satisfied with their jobs. The percentage of respondents who reported the highest level of satisfaction with their jobs climbed from 16 percent last year to 23 percent in 2002 (Lucent, 2002).

According to Lucent, the predominating four factors affecting job satisfaction were: 1.) opportunity to learn new skills; 2.) type of work, 3.) achievement opportunities, and 4.) opportunity to assume responsibility. Compensation ranked at number seven among the 16
factors listed. The least important factor reportedly was the opportunity to telecommute at least part-time (Lucent, 2002).

Employees most likely to report satisfaction were those who had the opportunity for advancement. However, only half of those surveyed were satisfied with their opportunities for promotion (Lucent, 2002). Poor communication was the leading cause of job dissatisfaction. According to the survey, a majority of respondents were convinced that communications from senior management were inferior and that management was ineffective at motivating employees (Lucent, 2002).

Implications of the Lucent study regarding retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman were that faculty would not remain in their positions for the long-term in the absence of opportunity to learn new skills, perform appropriate types of work, achieve, and assume responsibility, or in other words advance.

The Conference Board Study

In contrast to the Lucent study which reported that job satisfaction was on the rise, a study by the Conference Board in New York released findings that suggested that job satisfaction in the American work force had been declining in many areas since 1995. The Conference Board was a nonprofit, nonpartisan resource to industry that was formed by business leaders in the midst of labor unrest in 1916. The organization implemented the study through a survey administered to 5,000 United States households. The study was part of the Conference Board’s consumer research program. The study was being compared to the 1995 study of job satisfaction conducted by the Conference Board (Anderson, 2000). The study was conducted for the Conference Board by NFO Research, Incorporated, an
NFO worldwide member company of the Inter-public Group of Companies. NFO Research, Inc. has offices in forty countries and ranks among the top three research organizations in the world. Lynn Franco, director of the consumer research center for the Conference Board, released the results of the study (Anderson, 2000).

Results of the study revealed that only 50.7 percent of respondents said that they were satisfied with their current jobs. This figure reflects a downward trend of 13.5 percent from 1995, at which time 58.6 percent of those asked said they were satisfied (Anderson, 2000).

In the Conference Board’s study, the only issues that respondents felt better about were job security and pension plans. In 1995, 48.6 percent were satisfied with their job security. In the face of the tight year 2000 job market, 50.2 percent of respondents reported satisfaction with their job security. Regarding pension plans, 40.8 percent were pleased with their plans, a 2.5 percent improvement over those who reported satisfaction in 1995 (Anderson, 2000).

Regarding the economic aspects of work, respondents were not as satisfied with wages in the 2000 study. The 1995 rating of 39.3 percent dropped by 9.4 percent resulting in a rating of 35.6 percent in the 2000 study. Another area included in economic aspects of work, companies’ promotion policies, waned in popularity by 5.1 percent as compared to sentiments regarding the same in 1995 (Anderson, 2000).

There were no inquiries regarding bonus plans and job training in the 1995 study, but the 2000 study found that only 20.5 percent of respondents were satisfied with their employer’s bonus plans and only 28.2 percent of the respondents were satisfied with the job training and education provided by their organization (Anderson, 2000).

Regarding the responses to questions about the economic aspects of employment, Franco
remarked that, “the sole focus of retaining and acquiring new employees can’t be built just around economic factors” (Anderson, 2000, p. 3). This observation was in agreement with findings of studies conducted by Bennis, Drucker, Herzberg, Maslow, and McGregor, reviewed earlier in this paper. Economic aspects of employment satisfied the two lowest need levels of Maslow’s hierarchy, while the upper three were satisfied through emotional channels (Bennis, 2000; Drucker, 1999; Herzberg, 1966; Maslow, 1998; McGregor, 1960).

Under the category of environment, a 3.8 percent drop was evidenced in the satisfaction of respondents with their supervisors between the 1995 and 2000 study. Satisfaction ratings dropped 10.8 percent in that same five-year span resulting in a 48.6 percent rating in 2000 with physical environment at work. Satisfaction with the quality of work equipment decreased in that same time interim, culminating in a 47.9 rating in the year 2000, a drop of 7.2 percent in respondents’ satisfaction (Anderson, 2000).

This study represents a gap in the literature, in that the findings were not consistent with those of similar studies. One possible reason for the disparity in findings was that respondents were surveyed at home rather than in their work environments. Possibly they were not motivated to feel as optimistic about their jobs as subjects responding to inquiries while actively engaged in their jobs.

**Faculty Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction was crucial in higher education. First, it has been found that satisfied workers realized their maximum work potential in the interest of the organization, whereas dissatisfied workers attempted to increase their satisfaction level by working to promote objectives of self-interest through the vehicle of their jobs. This was perceived to be
particularly dangerous in the milieu of higher education. Although this phenomenon posed little or no threat when evidenced in a structured working environment, when it occurred in higher education where faculty have considerable discretion over how they channel both time and energy, the outcome of job dissatisfaction was an immense decline in the quality of the work produced (Tack & Patitu, 2000). In light of this phenomenon, it would behoove those responsible for retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman to take steps to ensure that the faculty was satisfied.

It is projected that the new millennium has brought with it a critical scarcity of teachers to fill empty faculty positions in higher education. In anticipation of the forecast shortage, research priority should be given to the study of job satisfaction for faculty, and the retention of teachers of higher education (Tack & Patitu, 2000). In this interest, MSU-Bozeman needs to motivate faculty employed by the institution to remain in their jobs.

An understanding of why faculty remain in the academic realm would enable those in higher education to take the proper steps to ensure retention of the best and brightest professors in an effort to create an exceptional faculty for the upcoming millennium. It would also ensure quality of work amongst them (Tack & Patitu, 2000).

A significant factor affecting job satisfaction in higher education was an economic one. Faculty salaries were inferior to those available in other professions. No longer were faculty positions revered the way they once were. These problems have undeniably affected the ability of higher education to retain the faculty necessary to educate young Americans for the next millennium (Jones & Nowotny, 1990). Not only were salaries offered at MSU-Bozeman lower than those offered in other professions, they were lower than those offered
at comparable institutions nationally. This put MSU-Bozeman at risk for retaining their marketable workforce.

The American Faculty Poll

“The American Faculty Poll,” was a nationwide survey of college faculty and how they felt about their jobs. How the responses of faculty at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) compared to those of professors on a nationwide scale presented significant insights for the researcher. “The American Faculty Poll,” a nationwide survey of 1,511 full-time faculty members at two- and four-year institutions, reported that most faculty members (90%) would still choose to be faculty members if they had that decision to make again.

The survey was conducted by telephone in 1999 by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. This result in itself was positive, but doesn’t indicate that faculty members were completely satisfied with their jobs. The remarkable aspect of this outcome was that, regardless of the rapid changes occurring within the profession, technological and otherwise, professors were fundamentally satisfied with their jobs. This result in itself was uncharacteristic of a field undergoing such an accelerated evolution. Whether attitudes of faculty at MSU-Bozeman reflected this sentiment was of interest to the researcher (Sanderson, et al., 2000).

Faculty Retention

According to the results of “The American Faculty Poll,” the top four reasons that professors remained on the job were: an opportunity to educate students, the chance to work in an intellectually challenging environment, freedom to teach what interested them, and the freedom to spend time with their families. Among 17 factors included in the poll, the four
least important were: the reputations of their departments and institutions, the physical working conditions on campus, and the opportunity for professional recognition (Sanderson, et al., 2000). This information reflects the limited literature available regarding retention of faculty.

**Summary**

It was impossible to explore what motivated faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their jobs without first understanding job satisfaction, and specifically, faculty job satisfaction, as the dominant factor motivating faculty to remain in their positions. The campus of MSU-Bozeman exhibited a uniqueness of location and culture that contributed to its character and presented obstacles and issues distinct from those motivating employees of industry and even other faculty at other institutions in the field of higher education. A study of job satisfaction in industry informed us generally regarding the subject of job satisfaction.

In 1998, a study conducted by William Mercer, Inc. reported that employee retention and turnover were the most accurate measures of employee satisfaction or dissatisfaction in organizations. A high rate of employee retention resulted in increased revenues and productivity for the company. Compensatory issues played a minor role in the decision of employees to remain in their positions. Employees perceived that emotional aspects of their working environment were wholly responsible for their decisions to remain in their positions (Mercer, 1998). Implications of results of this study, when applied to MSU-Bozeman, indicated that salary was not the deciding factor motivating faculty to remain in their positions, but that emotional aspects of the working environment within the institution played a greater role in motivating professors to stay.
A more recent survey, the *Network Professionals’ Job Satisfaction Survey* conducted by Lucent in 2002, revealed findings similar to those of the Mercer study. The Lucent study indicated that job satisfaction was the product of the opportunity to learn new skills, the type of work, achievement opportunities, and the opportunity to assume responsibility. Poor communication was cited as the leading cause of job dissatisfaction. The Lucent study found job satisfaction to be on the rise (Lucent, 2002). In order to increase job satisfaction among faculty at MSU-Bozeman, the Lucent Study indicated that the above cited factors were important for retention of faculty.

In 2000, a study was conducted by the Conference Board in New York surveying job satisfaction in the American work force since 1995. In contrast to the Lucent Study, the Conference Board study found that job satisfaction was on the wane. The study did, however, corroborate the findings in both the Mercer and the Lucent Study which indicated that job satisfaction was not a product of economic factors. Study findings indicated that the sole focus of acquiring and retaining new employees can not be built around economic factors (Anderson, 2000). An interesting difference in the way the studies were administered was that in the Conference Board Study respondents were completing questionnaires within the privacy of their homes as opposed to in the workplace, as in the first two studies. Administration of the study through an instrument to be completed in the home rather than the work environment was the most apparent difference in the studies on job satisfaction. Being in the work environment during the course of responding to the inquiry was a motivating factor in the way employees responded could have contributed to disparities in responses. It is possible that employees were motivated to feel more optimistic about their jobs in their working environment, and felt a freedom to express negative
emotions regarding their employment within the privacy of their homes.

Although it was useful to understand job satisfaction in a general sense, it was necessary to understand faculty job satisfaction specifically in order to understand what motivated faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions. Higher education presented aspects of employment unique to the field. It has been demonstrated that satisfied workers will realize their maximum work potential in the interest of the organization, but dissatisfied workers will attempt to increase their satisfaction level by working to promote objectives of self-interest through the vehicle of their job. This tendency presented a real and present danger to the organizational health of the institution in higher education. This phenomena, although relatively harmless when evidenced within the confines of a structured working environment, poses a legitimate threat when occurring in higher education where faculty have considerable discretion over management of time and energy. In this milieu, the outcome of job dissatisfaction is an immense decline in the quality of the work produced (Tack & Patitu, 2000). In light of this phenomenon, it was imperative that administrators and faculty responsible for retention at MSU-Bozeman ensured that the faculty was satisfied in their positions. In this interest, those responsible for retention needed to know what resulted in job satisfaction. This knowledge was also critical in the exploration of why faculty remained in their positions.

It was projected that the new millennium would herald the event of a critical scarcity of teachers to fill empty faculty positions in higher education. As a proactive measure in prevention, research priority must be given to the study of faculty job satisfaction and the retention of teachers of higher education (Tack & Patitu, 2000). In this interest, it was beneficial for MSU-Bozeman to find out what motivated faculty to remain in their positions.
and initiate measures to ensure that MSU-Bozeman will not experience the imminent difficulties projected for those in charge of retention in higher education. Additionally, it would provide for quality of workforce.

In contradiction to every motivational theory promulgated in over more than eighty years, a significant factor affecting job satisfaction in contemporary higher education was an economic one. Faculty salaries were inferior to those available in other professions. These problems impaired the ability of higher education to retain faculty necessary to furnish young Americans with a quality education in the new millennium (Jones & Nowotny, 1990) (Tack & Patitu, 2000). Higher education as administered at MSU-Bozeman is not immune to these problems.

“The American Faculty Poll” was a nationwide study conducted in 1999 by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago. Responses of faculty at MSU-Bozeman compared to those received on a national scale to similar inquiries may provide valuable insight for the researcher. The results of the survey on a national scale reported that 90% of faculty members would still choose to be faculty members if they had that decision to make again. Although this response in itself was positive, it didn’t indicate that faculty members were completely satisfied with their jobs. The notable aspect of this report was that professors were fundamentally satisfied with their jobs regardless of the remarkable change, technologically and otherwise, occurring within the profession. This result in itself was uncharacteristic of a field experiencing the rapid changes evidenced in American higher education. It was of interest to the researcher to explore to what extent attitudes of faculty at MSU-Bozeman reflected this sentiment.

“The American Faculty Poll” reported that the four top reasons given by professors for
remaining on the job were: (1) the opportunity to educate students, (2) the opportunity to work in an intellectually stimulating environment, (3) freedom to teach subject matter that interested them, and (4) freedom to spend time with their families. Of the 17 factors included in the poll, the four least important were: (1) reputation of their departments, (2) reputation of their institutions, (3) physical working conditions on campus, and (4) opportunity for professional recognition (Sanderson, et al., 2000). This final information represented the extent of the literature available regarding retention of faculty in higher education. The preceding review of literature on job satisfaction informed the subject of why professors remained in their positions at MSU-Bozeman and was necessary in the interest of understanding what motivated faculty to remain in their positions.

Higher Education

Examining motivational, organizational, leadership, and job satisfaction theory was not enough to understand the problem under consideration. The field of higher education was the context for the study. Understanding how the theories applied to employees of higher education exclusively was essential in understanding their motives and behavior. Employees of higher education were subject to pressures and influences that differed from those acting on employees of industry (Guthrie, 2003). It is important to understand that larger cultural, social, and economic forces affect all organizations, particularly those of higher education. In this interest, theories and concepts were discussed in terms of their historical perspectives (Chance & Chance, 2002).

To set a context for the study, the author provided a brief history of higher education in the United States. The historical overview provided a framework for understanding the
structure and operation of contemporary higher education. The historical overview was followed by a description of the system under which higher education operates in the United States, the context within which higher education itself functions, and the role of faculty in higher education as a pivotal facet of the study.

**Relating the Past to the Present.** The role of higher education in America has evolved in response to changes in demographic, political, governmental, legal, religious, and societal forces acting upon it over the years. Different pressures and forces act upon the faculty of today than did on the professorate 300 years ago. It is important that we understand these forces and pressures and their evolution to understand what motivated the behavior of contemporary faculty. Higher education will continue to evolve in the future in respond to the same changing pressures. As education changes, the objectives of employees of higher education change. The role of faculty and what motivated their behavior as employees of the university has progressed and will continue to change and evolve in response to the transformations that have occurred in higher education. The pervasive theme defining the second half of the twentieth century in higher education will be managerial revolution. This change will be reflected in changes in the role of faculty and what motivates their behavior. The role of higher education has expanded to include the development of professional expertise in fund-raising as colleges and universities vie more competitively than ever for limited resources. Achieving both equality and excellence is the dilemma. Balancing the pursuit of both, while competing with various contending activities for a share of the public capital and private donations is the solution (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).
The System

In order to understand what motivated faculty at MSU-Bozeman, an understanding of what motivated faculty in higher education in general was necessary. In this interest, it was important to understand the systemic operations of organizations of higher education and how they affected employees and their behavior.

An informal configuration of varied institutions constituted the higher education system of the United States (U.S.). When compared with national postsecondary systems globally, the evolution of the American higher education system was unique. Thus, the role of faculty and what motivates their behavior was unique. State and local needs, demographics, religion, and changing social contexts have all played roles in the development of the U.S. system. American postsecondary institutions and the students they serve are diverse and not easily categorized. Individual institutional goals and missions, types of degrees offered, finance and governance structures, curricula, course content, and instructional methodologies characterize individual institutional goals and missions. Identification of the main features that define dominant types of institutions found in American higher education are necessary in order to understand how the loosely structured informal system serves the varying needs of society in America and affects the motivation for behavior among faculty in American higher education (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

Systemic Diversity. Differences in types of institutions in regard to their size and scope of missions are termed ‘systemic diversity.’ The size and scope of the mission at which a faculty member is employed will be reflected in goals and objectives motivating the behavior of the faculty member. Numerous attempts at developing classification systems for categorization of postsecondary institutions have been made since the 1970’s. Most
renowned is the classification system developed by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. It is known as the ‘Carnegie Classification.’ The system was developed in 1970 by Clark Kerr to serve research analysis needs of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. The functions of the institutions, as well as the characteristics of students and faculty members were examined in order to identify colleges and universities that would be relatively homogeneous (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 2000). The Carnegie Classification is most commonly used as the framework to describe institutional diversity in the United States. Researchers and educational leaders conventionally rely upon it to ensure appropriate comparisons between and among colleges and universities (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

The classification system is comprised of six major categories into which colleges and universities are divided: doctoral/research institutions, master’s colleges, associates colleges, specialized institutions, and tribal colleges. In addition, doctoral/research institutions are known to be either extensive or intensive offering a diversity of undergraduate degrees as well as master’s and doctoral level degrees. Intensive doctoral/research institutions award fewer doctorates in a smaller range of fields than do extensive institutions. Master’s institutions fall into one of two categories, master’s I or II, and most commonly offer a wide range of undergraduate programs as well as graduate education culminating in the master’s degree. Master’s I institutions award more master’s degrees in a wider range of disciplines than do master’s II institutions. Colleges that focus on undergraduate education are known as baccalaureate institutions. These institutions are divided into three categories: baccalaureate colleges; liberal arts, baccalaureate colleges; general, and baccalaureate associate’s colleges. Colleges that award more than half of their
degree in liberal arts fields are designated liberal arts institutions. Colleges that award less than half of their degrees in liberal arts fields are known as general colleges.

Baccalaureate/associate’s colleges award both associate and baccalaureate degrees.

Colleges awarding degrees ranging from Bachelor’s to the Doctorate, but awarding most of these degrees in a single field are known as specialized institutions within the Carnegie Classification system. Subcategories of specialized institutions include medical schools and centers, other health profession schools, theological seminaries and other specialized faith-related institutions, schools of engineering and technology, schools of business and management, fine arts schools, schools of law, teacher’s colleges, military institutes, and other types of specialized institutions. Tribal colleges are typically located on reservations and tribally controlled (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

The Carnegie commission denies that the classification’s purpose is making qualitative distinctions between institutions, although this is what it is commonly used for. Ernest Boyer, in his forward to the 1987 edition of the classification, insists that the classification “is not intended to establish a hierarchy among learning institutions. Rather, the aim is to group institutions according to their shared characteristics, and we oppose the use of the classification as a way of making qualitative distinctions among the separate sectors” (Carnegie Foundation, 2000, p.2). Be that as it may, the phenomenon of “institutional drift” which involves the attempt of a college to ascend the hierarchy by enhancing their established programs or increasing their funded research activities, is well documented in the literature. The Carnegie Foundation is in the process of redesigning the classification system and allowing multiple classifications of institutions. Reorganization of the system is expected to be complete in 2005 (Berger & Calkins, 2003).
Less celebrated classification systems exist for use in organizing and categorizing institutions of higher education. Classifying colleges and universities in several typologies, *U.S. News and World Report* divides institutions into categories dependent upon whether they serve a regional or national population, and then rank-sort the schools into four ‘tiers.’ Schools are also rank-sorted for best department for a particular major and best financial value (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

The true complexity of the higher education system in America is not accurately represented by schematic ranking systems such as the aforementioned, although they are useful in categorizing institutions in a system that includes tremendous institutional variety. In order to truly understand the nature of the diverse system of American higher education, other aspects of institutional diversity must be considered. Less apparent dimensions of institutional diversity such as ratios between part-time and full-time students, athletic division membership, location, historical roots, religious and/or ethnic affiliation, etc. may be determining factors in defining the character or nature of an institution of higher education in America. The character and nature of the institution employing faculty will be a defining element in the forces motivating the behavior of the faculty (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

**Structural Diversity.** Structural diversity describes the methods through which institutions are organized and controlled. Whether an institution is public or private is most often the defining factor in determining what constitutes the type of institutional control. Type of institutional control is fundamental to motivating forces determining behavior of faculty. Funded primarily by the state government, publicly controlled institutions are most commonly a part of a larger state system. Private institutions, on the other hand, are funded
by non-government sources, and are most frequently independent and have their own private
governing boards. In the United States, private institutions greatly outnumber public
institutions. Even so, it is significant that the number of American public institutions has
increased greatly since the 1960’s (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

There is no national system of higher education in the United States. Each state has
developed its own public postsecondary educational system. Systems are structured and
organized in a variety of ways. The public sector of postsecondary institutions differs in the
way in which it is governed and coordinated as a member of a larger state system. All states
operate public colleges and universities through the use of governing boards. Three types of
governing boards dominate: single-institution boards, segmental systems, and consolidated
governance systems. States employing single institution boards afford autonomy of
governance to each individual campus by allowing each to have its own board. Segmental
systems incorporate the use of various governing boards for varying types of campuses.
This may mean that in some states, while research universities are governed by one board,
comprehensive state colleges will be governed by another, and community colleges by yet a
third board. Consolidated boards hold responsibility for the entire state system of
postsecondary schools. In some states, this governance board oversees the operations of
four-year institutions only. All public boards display diversity to the degree to which they
have the power of formal governance and the point to which they only coordinate activities
across the public sector of the states’ postsecondary educational system, void of substantive
decision making powers (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

Public universities within state systems fall into three main categories: universities, state
colleges, and community colleges. Public universities have strong research emphases,
command large enrollments, and award a full range of graduate degrees, including the Master’s and the Doctorate. State colleges are generally smaller, serving a specific region of a state. Most commonly, they offer both Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. Community colleges have two-year programs. They grant associate degrees, provide technical and vocational training and education, prepare students for transfer/admission to four-year institutions, and provide a plethora of continuing education options. Public institutions that have been identified as land-grant institutions were initially established through the promulgation of the Morrill Act of 1862, which legislated the provision of federal funding to found universities that (1) were accessible to a diverse student population (specifically, women, minorities, and financially challenged students), (2) granted degrees in applied and practical fields, such as agriculture and engineering, and (3) shared knowledge with the lay population across the state (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

Private institutions portray the full scope of missions and structures possible in American higher education. For this reason they are far more difficult to define or characterize than their public counterparts. The private sector of institutions includes both the most prestigious and highly selective institutions, as well as the most obscure. One of the key distinctions between private colleges is whether or not they are religiously affiliated. Some affiliations represent direct control of an institution by a religious body or sponsor, whereas others suggest only a nominal relationship. Proprietary institutions offering specialized degrees and/or alternative modes of educational delivery, such as distance learning, are also among private institutions. Variations in institutional type will be reflected in variations in motivation for behavior of faculty. Public institutions tend to have a strong research emphasis, whereas community colleges emphasize teaching and technical
training. Land-grant institutions put a stronger emphasis on public service (Berger &
Calkins, 2003).

Constituent Diversity. Institutions are diversified in respect to their core constituency or
the specific types of students served. Institutional and student needs serve as motivational
factors affecting the behavior of their respective faculties. Institutions serving groups that
have been neglected by the higher education system in America in the past typically
represent this type of postsecondary institution. This type of institution includes, but is not
limited to, historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), Hispanic-serving
institutions (HSIs), tribal colleges, and women’s institutions (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

HBCUs exist primarily in the south, and though they enroll fewer than 20 percent of
African-American undergraduates, they are responsible for one-third of all bachelor’s
degrees awarded to African-Americans in the United States. HSIs are institutions where at
least one quarter of the undergraduate population is Hispanic. This group of institutions
evidences rapid growth, and there are now over 100 such colleges in the United States.
Tribal colleges are most commonly controlled by Native American tribes, and, to date there
are twenty of these in the United States. There are seventy-five institutions that serve an
exclusively female population, whereas in the past there were hundreds. There is a
modicum of male-only institutions. A composite view of these institutions reveals the
diversity that exists in American society and furnishes American higher education an
informal vehicle to serve the diverse groups that constitute a multicultural society (Berger &
Calkins, 2003).
Reputational Diversity. Reputational diversity is a key feature of American higher education. Reputational prestige represents a significant factor affecting the behavior of its faculty. Institutions of higher education in the United States are extremely stratified by reputation. Institutions at the top of the hierarchy serve as a model for other institutions to follow. A complex set of factors contributes to reputational status. It includes peer evaluations of graduate programs and undergraduate selectivity (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

Advantages of the U.S. System. The non-centralized approach evidenced in American higher education is advantageous in many ways. The non-centralized approach seen in American institutions represents a significant motivating factor affecting behavior of faculty. The extensive institutional diversity that has arisen from this decentralized approach has produced benefits for higher education on three levels: institutional, societal, and systemic. The benefits of diversity on the institutional level are evidenced in the variety of programs offered, academic standards, institutional size, and student body of the American institution. On a societal level, Birnbaum (1983) stated, “higher education is intimately connected to, and therefore interacts with, other societal systems” (p. 116). Society reaps the benefits of the diversity in American higher education, not only from the education and research, but from the economic, political, and social functions that higher education has long served. Social mobility and political concerns fuel an interest in diversity on a societal level. Higher education is viewed as an “open system” from a systems theory perspective. This open system is characterized by diverse inputs and outputs. Here it is evident that the effects of the diversity in the United States higher education system, whether on an institutional, societal, or systems level, are inextricably intertwined. For example, from a systems perspective, the admission of students with high levels of racial diversity, the input, will
impact society, the output, in a very different way than would the admission of a homogeneous student population. In this singular example it is evident that the beneficial effects of the diversity evidenced in the U.S. higher education system are synergistic in their impact on the United States at large. Birnbaum (1983) goes on to note that “differentiation of component units…leads to stability that protects the system itself” (p.121). Systems of this type are capable of detecting and reacting to external or environmental changes more rapidly and effectively as a product of their diversity. The diverse system of higher education in America mirrors the diverse composition and requirements of the population it serves, and, as such, serves as a motivating force to inspire faculty to behave in ways that compliment and enhance this diversity (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

Higher Education in Context

Higher education is subject to a plethora of external societal forces, pressures, and influences. Because of the importance of higher education to knowledge based economies, combined with the fact that over half of the college-aged population attends institutions of postsecondary learning, universities and colleges are subject more than ever to the external pressures of society. As such, faculty at these institutions is also subject to and must react to the same pressures. Funding for institutions of higher education comes from external sources such as students and their families, donors, and the government. External influences on higher education originate from one of two sources: (1) broad societal factors, and (2) specific requirements of government agencies, funding sources, and others to whom higher education is accountable. Examples of some of the societal factors that create pressure for higher education are economic trends and demographic factors affecting the directions of higher education. The second set of pressures is the charge to account for, and at times,
Economic Factors. All institutions of higher education depend on external sources of financial support. Variations in sources and amounts of financial support available to various institutions greatly affect motivation of faculty to perform. Some of these sources are funds from the government for operating expenses, grants and contracts for research and training from a wide scope of external agencies, tuition payment from students and their families, charitable donations from alumni, foundations, and independent entities and individuals, and income generating projects, such as intercollegiate athletics (Altbach, 2003).

Eighty percent of postsecondary students in the United States attend public universities and colleges. Public institutions depend on state governments for financial survival. Most institutions of public higher education rely on an amalgamation of student tuition and direct support from the state for their funding. Another mainstay of support for higher education is federally provided student loans. Grants and loans are furnished for qualifying students to use to attend accredited postsecondary institutions. Private institutions of higher education rely to a much lesser degree on public support. Although some states do provide for direct financial aid to private institutions, and may even supply government research funding, most are dependent upon private sources of support. Private institutions commonly qualify for federal student loan programs (Altbach, 2003).

The end of the twentieth century evidenced drastic changes in government policies regulating the funding of higher education in the United States. Prior to this period of time,
higher education was seen as promoting the public good. It was perceived to holistically benefit society in addition to benefiting the individual, and as such it was deemed worthy of public support. More recently, academia has begun to be seen as a pursuit benefiting the individual and his/her interests over those of society. As such, societal sentiments regarding assumption of the costs of education have shifted. The reigning sentiment is now one that suggests that these costs should be paid by the individual benefiting from the education. Generally, tuition has risen while most states are less willing to fund higher education. Students shoulder a far greater percentage of the cost of education than in the past. Public universities, and public research universities in particular, derive less than one-third of their funding from the states. Donations, research grants, income generation, and tuition now compose the bulk of income supporting public institutions of higher education (Altbach, 2003).

This philosophical shift, in combination with competing state priorities, and the desire to refrain from resorting to tax increases as a means of compensating for shortfalls in support has culminated in financial problems for institutions of higher education. Even private colleges and universities are subject to external financial pressures. Increases in tuition in the 1990s often exceeded the level of inflation. Prominent private institutions are more often than not run on endowments, which afford them a degree of stability. More obscure private institutions rely on tuition, and have been forced to limit increases. In the competitive academic milieu, this has frequently impacted the financial viability of these institutions and their ability to offer competitive remuneration to faculty. Financial issues are frequently motivating factors driving faculty behavior (Altbach, 2003).
Competition. Competition is a central driving force in the world of academia. Competition in higher education exists on a variety of different levels. Institutions compete with one another for prestige, students, donations, faculty, research grants, rankings, classifications, housing, sports facilities, technologies, libraries, and improved campus services. Faculty responds to the motivation of competition and their actions reflect this. Higher education has become a powerful business enterprise and students have become consumers. Production and promotion of a sophisticated educational product has become a major objective to survive in a highly competitive market. Institutions of higher education compete for the best faculty, while faculty competed for employment by the best institutions (Altbach, 2003).

Demographics. Changing demographics are responsible in large part for increased competition between institutions. Changing demographics present themselves as a factor motivating institutional choice and objectives of faculty. The number of traditional college-age students has decreased. The quantity of individuals enrolled in college increased from 20 percent following World War II to greater than 60 percent in the 1990s, but has since waned. According to Martin Trow (1972), higher education in the United States has arrived at what sociologists refer to as “universal access” (p. 62). Even so, the numbers of students continue to moderately decline (Altbach, 2003).

The increase in enrollment in higher education evidenced in the latter part of the twentieth century was in part a result of increased matriculation by students of nontraditional age commencing or returning to study with vocational objectives. Another subpopulation of students contributing to expanded enrollment at that time were those entering institutions of higher education who were not adequately prepared for a postsecondary education.
Remedial courses are provided by colleges and universities to meet this need. The American higher education system has displayed flexibility as it has adjusted to meet the demands of an increasingly diverse student body with an expanding scope of interests (Altbach, 2003).

Unprecedented diversity is visible among the 14 million students enrolled in the more than 3,000 colleges and universities in the United States today. The impact of the civil rights movement in the 1960s coupled with the passage of equal employment legislation resulted in greater involvement of women in the workforce. This resulted in an increase in the participation of women in higher education (Johnson & Scafide, 2003). A majority of the student population is now comprised of women, while significant growth in racial and ethnic diversity is evident. Present in large and growing numbers are African Americans, Latinos, and Asian Americans. Higher education is now accessible for working-class students. Statistically, individuals with bachelor’s degrees earn significantly more than those without academic credentials in the course of a lifetime. Also, today a majority of students study part-time. The preceding factors nullify the validity of the traditional student profile that typified the average student as a full-time traditional-aged student residing on campus (Altbach, 2003).

Shifts in the demography of higher education have changed academia significantly. The global increase in the student population, coupled with greater diversity among the student body, including increased differentiation in age, interests, and ability have changed higher education profoundly and permanently (Altbach, 2003).

Since the 1973 court decision of *Adams v. Richardson*, which mandated an increase in minority faculty at public institutions, significantly greater numbers of minority faculty have
been employed by predominantly white public institutions. As is evidenced by this fact alone, changing demographics have presented themselves as a motivating factor affecting faculty choices (Johnson & Scafide, 2003).

**Political, Governmental, and Legal Forces Affecting Higher Education.** The U.S. constitution provides that education is the responsibility of the states. As such, the fifty states are legally charged with the responsibility of higher education. Not only do the states furnish the majority of funding for public higher education, they must meet the challenge of the organization and regulation of the public university systems. Their responsibility includes the provision of a legal framework for these systems. This includes the provision of charters and legal recognition of all institutions of higher education, whether public or private. It is the states’ responsibility to establish tuition charges. In addition, the states determine admission policies while providing loan and grant programs. In most cases, governing boards are appointed by state authorities, although in some instances these boards are elected. The power of the states over higher education can present a significant pressure for faculty employed by both public and private institutions of higher education (Altbach, 2003).

States vary in the policies they establish for higher education. For example, there is generally less support for public higher education and tuition is higher in New England. States in the West and the Midwest have characteristically lent more support to establishing large and outstanding public higher education systems with comparatively low tuition. State policies also pertain to private institutions of higher education. In many states, provision is made for scholarships and other programs for private higher education. Some states have
the authority to approve degree programs and other proposals and programs in the private sector (Altbach, 2003).

The federal government plays a major role in the evolution of higher education. Following World War II, the federal government established the G.I. Bill, a federally sponsored scholarship program making higher education accessible to millions of returning veterans. This program resulted in significant expansion of the higher education system in the United States. Following the cold war, the federal government became the major source of funding for scientific research. The 1960s became the era of greatest growth for American higher education. At that time, federal funds were furnished to expand libraries and construct new facilities. Perhaps the most notable contribution the federal government has made in the interest of higher education is the financing of postsecondary education for millions of students through loan programs and Pell Grants (Altbach, 2003).

Federal government regulations control many facets of higher education, such as access to facilities through the Americans with Disabilities Act, gender equality, general access, athletic programs, the use of human subjects in research, and the treatment of laboratory animals. The federal government has also legislated regulatory requirements regarding faculty and student body composition, campus crime control, and other features of higher education (Altbach, 2003).

The American legal system represents an external societal force on higher education. Judicial rulings directly affect higher education. The court system has made rulings controlling affirmative action for students and faculty, issues of race and gender in university admissions and programs, academic hiring, promotion, and tenure. Academic policy is then determined by precedential court decisions (Altbach, 2003).
Religious Influences on Higher Education. Religion has historically been a force that has played a major role in shaping the evolution of higher education in the United States. The influence of religion on higher education has motivated decisions and actions of faculty. Many institutions of higher education were established and controlled by religious bodies. At the turn of the twentieth century, the number of religiously affiliated institutions waned with the proliferation of public institutions. The decreasing role of religion in higher education is reinforced by the constitutional provision regarding the separation of church and state. Private colleges and universities initially founded by religious bodies have become secularized. Still in existence are in excess of 200 Roman Catholic colleges and universities, and a significant number of Protestant institutions of higher education. Even so, religion is no longer a dominating influencing factor in higher education, and only a small faction of the population of students in higher education in America are educated by religiously affiliated schools today (Altbach, 2003).

Societal Pressures on Higher Education. Societal shifts and influences have historically shaped the evolution of higher education. Faculty is subject to influence by societal pressures. Beginning with religious groups whose objective was to educate theologians, evolving through the increase in women’s colleges in the nineteenth century to accommodate changing social conventions regarding the role of women in society, and including the integration of research into the higher education curricula at the culmination of the nineteenth century to provide for the needs of society, higher education has and continues to respond to social pressures. Institutions of higher education continue to change and expand to meet the demands of greater societal diversity. The conflict between the
autonomy enjoyed by institutions of higher education and the dictates of society culminate in an inevitable tension. However, external pressures of all kinds will continue to characterize the evolution of higher education in the twenty-first century (Altbach, 2003).

Faculty

The role of faculty is a pivotal facet of this study and higher education in general. What motivates faculty, why they make the choices they do, and ultimately, what motivates them to remain in their positions in higher education, and specifically, in higher education at MSU-Bozeman, represent the issues concerning the author. Understanding these issues may inform the inquiry of what motivates faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions in higher education. As such, it is important to provide the reader with a clear understanding of faculty, their history, their roles and responsibilities, and the motivating influences and forces they are subject to. The central functions of higher education are reflected in the roles and responsibilities of faculty. The roles of research, teaching, and service correspond to these functions. Faculty are expected to fulfill these roles (Hamrick, 2003). In 1915 the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was established by a group of full professors from Johns Hopkins University to assist university professors in ways corresponding to those in which the American Medical Association serves doctors and the American Bar Association serves lawyers. Concerned about the faculty role in institutional decision-making and academic freedom, the AAUP addressed many professorial concerns (Hutcheson, 2003). In 1915 the AAUP published the “Declaration of Principles” which defined the functions of higher education. The Declaration stated that the functions of colleges and universities are “to promote inquiry and advance the sum of human knowledge, to provide general instructions to the students, and to develop experts for various branches
of the public service” (Joughin, 1969, pp. 163-164). The roles of research, teaching, and service correspond to these functions and it is the responsibility of faculty to fulfill these roles as they perform their duties in the interest of fulfilling the academic mission of their respective institution. Each role serves as a vehicle through which faculty members create and dispense knowledge to peers, students, and external addressees. The emphasis on roles varies widely between institutions (Hamrick, 2003).

Teaching. The primary educational mission of higher education is reflected in the teaching role. Faculty members impart knowledge to students, as well as assist them in the processes of learning and applying the knowledge. The faculty member serves as the content expert, whereas students are learners and interns to their academic discipline. In fulfilling the teaching role, faculty members are expected to stay abreast of the evolution of knowledge in their field. Many institutions of higher education expect faculty to generate new knowledge in their field, as well as disseminate it to students, which is responsible for the presence of conflicts and tensions between the roles of research and teaching for faculty (Hamrick, 2003).

The teaching role is more widely shared by faculty members from varying institutional types than are the research and service roles. The teaching role takes precedence over the research and service roles at liberal arts colleges, regional universities, and community colleges. Most faculty members spend the bulk of their time teaching. However, at research universities, some faculty members hold research-only positions. To date the overwhelming majority of faculty were expected to teach courses in addition to executing the duties of the research role. Teaching is conventionally perceived to be less prestigious and well
compensated than successful conducting of research and procurement of outside funds (Hamrick, 2003).

**Research.** Many faculty members take part in research, contributing to the body of knowledge already existing in their academic field or discipline. The mission of the employing institution is largely responsible for the degree to which faculty become involved in research. Larger institutions of higher education more frequently see research and knowledge generation as an important part of their mission. Research is most often seen as the conducting of empirical studies, both confirmatory and exploratory. However, research often finds its place in highly theoretical studies. The primary audience for a majority of academic researchers is their national/international population of disciplinary cohorts. Faculty members with dominant research programs frequently exhibit greater loyalty to their discipline and disciplinary communities than to their employing institutions (Hamrick, 2003).

Large universities emphasize research more as an offshoot of the fact that they accommodate a large bulk of the graduate programs and furnish the means to conduct research. Also, internal and external support for the funding of laboratories and particular research projects is often generated by faculty members who conduct research. Oftentimes, recompense is determined based on the degree to which faculty members contribute to their academic fields through publication, presentation of research findings, representative performances, exhibits, or other dissemination of their research to external addressees. Remuneration may depend upon a faculty member’s ability to secure public grant monies (Hamrick, 2003).
The academic freedom to research and disseminate findings has come into conflict with the proprietary ownership of data and findings from externally funded research. As support from established funding sources for large institutions of higher education has declined, concerns regarding this conflict of interest have escalated. Faculty members rely more frequently on external funding sources, such as research contracts and grants, when faced with this reality (Hamrick, 2003).

Seldom, if ever, does research play an essential role in the missions of community colleges or virtual universities. It is rare to see faculty at these types of institutions participate in research. However, the research role does not exclude all faculty members not employed by research-oriented universities. Faculty members at many institutions that are not research-oriented pursue a research agenda. The agenda may be personal or encouraged by the institution. In the past twenty-five years, many institutions of higher education have augmented their missions to include research, as well as graduate education, often times in an effort to increase the prestige of the institutional profile (Hamrick, 2003).

**Service.** Serving on internal committees and advisory boards, assuming part-time administrative positions as program or unit leaders, and mentoring and advising students are all aspects of service performed by faculty. At times, faculty members assume mid- and senior-level full-time term appointments as institutional administrators. Some degree of service to the institution is expected of faculty members. Tenure-track faculty members are customarily exempted or discouraged from the assumption of heavy service commitments in favor of focus on research and teaching. Appointment to some service roles may be prestigious and financially rewarding, although generally, research and teaching are more highly regarded with respect to advancement through faculty ranks (Hamrick, 2003).
The service role finds its origins in the colonial period when colleges focused on the preparation of ministers and teachers to serve the polity. The service role became codified at the inception of the land-grant institution. Land-grant institutions are compelled by law to incorporate agricultural, mechanical, and practical subjects within their curriculums and then disseminate this practice and knowledge to the citizenry of their respective state. In this interest, extension services and satellite offices provide information to the public. Extension service roles are less highly regarded and remunerated than research and teaching positions in higher education. The service role has been looked to as a vehicle through which to revitalize society’s support for higher education (Hamrick, 2003).

The service role for faculty receives more emphasis in community colleges and regional institutions. In these institutions, teaching is still the primary role of faculty, but often their educational programs cater to the demands of local industry. Demonstrations of responsiveness to the community are highly rewarded at these institutions (Hamrick, 2003).

Role Integration and Collective Faculty. Conceptually and practically, the teaching, research, and service roles of faculty overlap. There is an implicit hierarchy among the roles granting the greatest prestige to research and the least to service. Institutional type, history, traditions, and the formal codifications of faculty authority and role determine the identity, authority, and functions of an institution’s faculty. The educational goals of the institution govern the curricula and instruction that faculty are responsible for planning and delivering. These goals also direct faculty selection and evaluation of probationary faculty members within respective colleges, departments, or units. Faculty may serve term appointments as administrative officers carrying out diverse functions within an institution. Faculty members serve on representative assemblies such as faculty senates. Here, representative
faculty members draft and pass senate resolutions. Although these resolutions don’t become university policy, they represent negotiations between faculty and administrators that do become university policy. These bodies also provide forums in which administrators can meet with faculty. Less commonly are faculty members involved in institution-level budget processes. They are involved in academic planning, curriculum planning, and degree program implications. Older and larger institutions allow faculty a more vital role in institutional governance (Hamrick, 2003).

Summary

In order to understand how higher education faculty at MSU-Bozeman were motivated, it is important to facilitate an understanding of higher education as the context of the study. Understanding how motivational theory applies to employees of a university exclusively is essential to understanding their behavior. Employees of higher education are subject to pressures and influences that differ from those acting on employees of industry (Guthrie, 2003). To set the context for the study, the author provides a brief history of higher education in the United States, a description of the system under which higher education operates in the United States, the context within which higher education itself functions, and a detailed description of the faculty role in higher education as a pivotal facet of the study.

Just as organizational, motivational, and job satisfaction theory have evolved, so has the field of higher education. Understanding the history and evolution of higher education provides a fundamental basis from which we can better understand the evolving pressures and forces contributing to the motivation of faculty in higher education. The evolution of higher education began before the United States was a country, over 300 years ago. The inception of higher education first manifest itself in seventeenth century Europe, and the
phenomenon of American higher education developed in the ensuing years (Edwards, Moyen, and Thelin). Today, higher education in the United States represents three percent of the gross national product, over 4,000 accredited institutions, and annually enrolls over fifteen million students and confers more than two million degrees (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).

During the Colonial Period, nine colleges and seminaries were chartered by the colonists. Although higher education represented one of the few institutional ventures to receive imperial and/or colonial government support and regulation, it was not a priority. Enrollment was limited to white Christian males. Women and minority ethnicities were denied access by statute and social convention (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003). Governance of colonial colleges fell exclusively to state and local systems of control. Following the founding of the United States, policies concerning English-chartered institutions became indistinct. The Supreme Court’s celebrated *Dartmouth* decision of 1819 directed the newly formed federal government to protect institutions of higher education from state intervention (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).

Over two hundred degree-granting institutions were created between 1800 and 1850. Although mostly liberal in nature, higher education began to include engineering and science. Participation in most vocations did not require a college degree (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).

The principle of primogeniture was passed forbidding landowners to divide estates between family members. As a result, college attendance became a popular alternative for those not inheriting land. Normal schools and female seminaries made higher education accessible to females (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).
The Morrill Act of 1862 decreed that states would receive an allotted portion of profits from the sale of western lands when used for development of agricultural, mechanical, and military sciences, accompanied by the conventional liberal arts. The introduction of land-grant colleges increased the definition and scope of college curricula. The Hatch Act and the “Second Morrill Act” of 1890 brought federal funding and projects to land-grant campuses. The “Second Morrill Act” also legislated funding for African-American education (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).

The Association of American Universities was established in 1900. A formal lack of academic standards for members spurred development of private agencies such as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Rockefeller General Education Board, who established criteria governing categorization and ranking of American universities (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).

In 1944 Congress passed the Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, commonly known as the ‘G.I. Bill.’ This increased college attendance by servicemen returning from World War II and integrating themselves back into American society (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).

Approximately 75 percent of American campus buildings were constructed between 1960 and 1985. The Education Amendment of 1972 established the Pell or Basic Education Opportunity Grant (BEOG) affording entitlements to enrolled students demonstrating financial need. In 1978, the grants were replaced by low-interest student loans. These developments stimulated dramatic growth in American higher education (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).

By the end of the twentieth century higher education was financially overextended. Although women represented one half of entering law students, forty percent of first year
medical students, and a majority of Ph.D. recipients in biology, literature, and humanities, they were underrepresented in graduate fields such as engineering and physical sciences (Edwards, Moyen, & Thelin, 2003).

In response to demographic, political, governmental, legal, religious, and societal forces shaping its form and direction, the role of higher education in America has evolved. The evolution of higher education will continue to evolve in the future in response to the changing forces working on it. Changes in higher education come with changes in the objectives of employees of higher education. The role of faculty and what motivates their behavior as employees of the university has progressed and will continue to change and evolve in response to the transformations occurring in higher education. These are the issues that concern the author in the present study. The motives of faculty at MSU-Bozeman are affected and will be affected in the future by the same changing forces shaping higher education in America today.

The pervasive theme defining higher education in the next millennium will be managerial revolution. Changes in the management of higher education will be reflected in changes in the role of faculty and what motivates their behavior. Achieving equilibrium in both equality and excellence in higher education is the challenge. Harmonizing the pursuit of both while still vying for a share of public capital and private donations is the solution (Edwards, Moyen, and Thelin, 2003).

American higher education consists of an informal configuration of varied institutions. The system of American higher education is unique, and as such, so is the role and motivation of faculty serving it. Systemic diversity is evidenced in the differences in the size and scope of missions of institutions. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of
Teaching developed a system through which to categorize different institution types. They developed six major categories into which American colleges and universities are divided. Variations in institution type are reflected in the objectives and motives of faculty employed by those institutions (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

Structural diversity describes the methods through which institutions are organized and controlled. Type of institutional control is fundamental to motivating forces determining behavior of faculty. Whether an institution is private or public is frequently the defining factor in determining type of institutional control. Private institutions are frequently relatively independent, whereas public institutions rely on governmental funding and are part of a larger public system. Within the subsystems of private and public higher education exist much diversity, as well. In addition, methods of governing account for variation between institutions. All of these factors contribute to shaping the motivation and behavior of faculty (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

Constituent diversity is a factor in determining what motivates faculty. Institutional and student needs affect the behavior of the faculty serving them (Berger & Calkins, 2003). Reputational diversity is a defining feature of many institutions of higher education in the United States. Institutional prestige or a lack thereof affects the behavior of faculty (Berger & Calkins, 2003).

The diverse system of higher education in America mirrors the diverse composition and requirements of the population it serves. The diversity of this system serves as a motivating force to inspire faculty to behave in ways that compliment and enhance this diversity (Berger & Calkins, 2003).
The context within which higher education functions is relevant as a factor motivating behavior of faculty employed by higher education. External societal forces, pressures, and influences play a part in motivating employees of higher education.

Economic factors, competition between institutions, and demographics affect the complexion of higher education. Political, governmental, and legal forces exert pressure on the nature of higher education. As well, religious and societal pressures play a role in shaping higher education in the United States. All of these factors combined contribute to the overall character of higher education in America and how it will motivate the actions and behaviors of faculty it employs. The conflict between the autonomy enjoyed by institutions of higher education and the dictates of society culminate in an inevitable tension. However, external pressures of all kinds will continue to characterize the evolution of higher education in the twenty-first century (Altbach, 2003).

A focus on faculty as an aspect of higher education is pivotal to this study. What motivates faculty, why they make the choices they do, and ultimately, what motivates them to remain in their positions in higher education, specifically higher education at MSU-Bozeman, represent the issues concerning the author. In this interest it is important to have a clear understanding of faculty, their history, their roles and responsibilities, and the motivating influences and forces they are subject to. The central functions of higher education are reflected in the roles and responsibilities of faculty. The roles of research, teaching, and service correspond to these functions. Faculty is expected to fulfill these roles. In 1915 the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was formed to assist university professors. At that time the AAUP published the “Declaration of Principles”
which defined the function of higher education, and in turn the roles of faculty. Emphasis on roles varies widely between institutions (Hamrick, 2003).

The primary educational mission of higher education is reflected in the teaching role. Many institutions expect faculty to generate new knowledge through research, as well as disseminate it to students. This tendency is responsible for conflicts and tensions between the roles of research and teaching for faculty. The teaching role is more widely shared by faculty members from varying institutional types than are the research and service roles (Hamrick, 2003).

Many faculty members take part in research, contributing to the body of knowledge already existing in their academic fields or discipline. Large universities emphasize research more as an offshoot of the fact that they accommodate a large bulk of the graduate programs and furnish the means to conduct research. Seldom, if ever, does research play an essential role in the missions of community colleges or virtual universities. The research agenda is the most prestigious of the roles and may be pursued by faculty on a personal basis or at the behest of the institution. Many institutions of higher education have augmented their missions to include research in an effort to increase the prestige of the institutional profile (Hamrick, 2003).

Service is the third of the fundamental roles that faculty of higher education are expected to fulfill. The service role finds its origins in the colonial period when colleges focused on the preparation of ministers and teachers to serve the polity. The service role became codified at the inception of the land-grant institution. Land-grant institutions are compelled by law to incorporate agricultural, mechanical, and practical subjects within their curriculums and then disseminate this practice and knowledge to the citizenry of their
respective state. The service role receives more emphasis in community colleges and regional institutions. Demonstrations of responsiveness to the community are highly rewarded at these types of institutions (Hamrick, 2003).

Conceptually and practically, the teaching, research, and service roles of faculty overlap. There is an implicit hierarchy among the roles granting the greatest prestige to research and the least to service. Role integration of the faculty will be largely dependent upon institution type, history, traditions, and the formal codifications of faculty authority and role. These different aspects of an institution of higher education will largely determine the identity, authority, and functions of an institution's faculty. In general, older and larger institutions allow faculty a more vital role in institutional governance (Hamrick, 2003).

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, the author set the context for the study. Literature was examined by theme. Beginning with organizational theory and leadership processes, the author then explored motivational theory, job satisfaction theory, the field of higher education, and finally, the subject of retention in higher education to facilitate the reader’s understanding of the problem under consideration, which was the motivation of faculty at Montana State University Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman) to remain in their jobs. In many areas, the themes were interdependent and overlapping. For example, organizational theory and job satisfaction theory rely heavily upon motivational theory.

A review of the literature has revealed that turnover and retention were the most objective measures of job satisfaction (Mercer, 1998). It has also explained how motives incited a particular behavior in an individual that resulted in his acting in a specific manner or beginning to acquire a proclivity for an express mode of action or behavior (Maslow,
Job satisfaction or lack of job satisfaction was the motivating factor behind the action of faculty leaving or remaining in their positions. Motivational theory attempted to explain how these motives produced action. Faculty job satisfaction was similar to job satisfaction in industry, with the exception of the autonomy those in academia experienced in their work (Tack & Patitu, 2000). There were multiple factors contributing to job satisfaction and faculty job satisfaction. According to the literature, those factors found in the lower echelons of Maslow’s hierarchy were not the motivating forces leading to faculty retention or attrition (Tack & Patitu, 2000).

A strength or saturation point appeared in the literature where nearly all of the literature reported that satisfaction of lower order needs, according to Maslow’s hierarchy, was not sufficient motivation to result in retention. Also, nearly all of the literature reported that the cause of turnover was invariably a result of unmet lower order needs, or in the vernacular of Herzberg, dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). Retention appeared only as the result of higher order needs that were met, or in Herzberg’s paradigm, satisfaction. This last phenomenon marked a weakness in the literature. According to Herzberg, only satisfaction could motivate, and dissatisfaction could not. Herzberg theorized that the only consequence of dissatisfaction was dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). This theory was in conflict with research findings that indicated that turnover was the result of dissatisfaction (Mercer, 1998). Plainly, dissatisfaction motivated employees to leave their jobs. A gap in the literature appeared when Tack and Patitu reported that there would be a significant shortage of individuals to fill faculty positions in the first few decades of the new millennium, while the American Faculty Poll reported 90 percent satisfaction among college faculty.

Retention and turnover have been defined as the most objective measures of job
satisfaction. Lack of job satisfaction resulted in a low rate of retention and a higher rate of attrition. Attrition or leaving appeared to be the product of unfulfilled lower order needs, while retention and the motivation for staying was cited most commonly as the result of satisfaction of higher order needs (Mercer, 1998).

Relevant facets of organizational theory and leadership processes, motivational theory, and job satisfaction theory provided a theoretical framework for the study. A review of the methodologies used in the research further informed the reader. Information on retention of faculty in higher education provided a current understanding of the problem. Relying upon the theoretical framework provided by the literature, the author explored the forces that motivated faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

It was not known why tenured faculty chose to remain in the field of higher education at Montana State University-Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman). Job satisfaction was the determining factor as to whether faculty would choose to stay or go (Hagedorn, 2000). The presence of a competent and experienced faculty was essential in the development of a stable and efficient professorate (Hagedorn, 2000). Not knowing why faculty chose to stay at the university presented itself as a problem to university faculty and officials responsible for recruiting and retaining a stable faculty. Knowing why faculty chose to remain in the field of higher education afforded strategic insight to those responsible for recruitment and retention of faculty.

The purpose of this grounded theory study was to explore why tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman chose to remain in their faculty positions. Knowing why faculty stayed could afford those responsible for retention in higher education insight and information that could increase retention and minimize turnover among faculty. Research has shown that is directly dependent upon faculty job satisfaction. Faculty job satisfaction was gratification derived by faculty as a result of their jobs. The predicted shortage of possible prospects to fill faculty vacancies in the future (Tack & Patitu, 2000) made the subjects of faculty job satisfaction and retention priority considerations.
Immediate consideration must be given to why faculty do remain in the arena of higher education to ensure that quality faculty are retained and that future recruits and prospective recruits will feel confident that they are assuming a position in which they will experience job satisfaction (Tack & Patitu, 2000).

As investigation of the motivation of faculty to remain proceeded, the following questions emerged. What motivated tenured faculty to remain at MSU-Bozeman? What was the theory that explained why tenured faculty members remained at MSU-Bozeman? How did the process of remaining as faculty at MSU-Bozeman unfold? What were the major events in the process of remaining as faculty at MSU-Bozeman? What were the obstacles to remaining as faculty at MSU-Bozeman? Who were the participants in the process of remaining as faculty at MSU-Bozeman? Were there consistent explanations by faculty for staying or remaining as faculty that a theory could be developed from?

Overview of Process

The theoretical population of the research was tenured professors who had remained for at least ten years in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education in the field of higher education globally. The population or sampling frame consisted of tenured professors having remained for at least ten years in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education positions at MSU-Bozeman. Twenty of these professors were purposefully selected to participate in the study. Dr. John W. Creswell recommended twenty to thirty interviews as necessary to “saturate” categories and detail a theory for a grounded theory study (1998, pp. 56, 65). Field sites for the conducted research were the campus office, home setting, or other location
designated by participating professors. Participants were professors employed by MSU-
Bozeman, a land grant, Doctoral II University in Bozeman, Montana. MSU-Bozeman is
part of a university system with campuses in Havre, Great Falls, and Billings, Montana.
Only professors from the Bozeman campus were interviewed.

The sampling strategy was taken from Creswell (1998, pp. 118-127). The first step
involved identifying the sampling strategy to be used to best answer the question or
questions being addressed by the study, as well as identifying interviewees based upon
that sampling strategy. The sampling strategy that was used by the researcher in
selecting participants for the study was a random purposeful sample. Random
purposeful sampling added credibility to the sample when a potential purposeful sample
was too large (Creswell, 1998, p. 119). Access to participants was achieved by
telephone or e-mail request. A non-probability purposeful sample was drawn from the
accessible population of professors meeting requirements for the study according to
definition and availability.

The one-on-one interview was chosen for the purposes of this study. Due to the
complex nature of the topic and the need to capture individual professor’s perceptions of
what motivated them to remain at MSU-Bozeman, one-on-one interviews appeared to be
the most useful approach. The interviews were taped by the researcher for accuracy.
All interviews were transcribed by the researcher and confidentiality was maintained.

The sites of the interviews were determined by the interviewees. The researcher
preferred to interview the participants privately, when possible, in settings in which the
participants felt comfortable. Any regulations required by the Human Subjects
Committee at MSU-Bozeman were strictly adhered to. Here, it may be noted that the
Human Subjects Committee waived the requirement for signed consent forms from the participants in favor of eliminating any link that could threaten the anonymity of the participants (see Appendix A). It was determined that because the study made inquiries regarding the employment of the participants, the information submitted by the participants would be more accurate the greater the anonymity afforded the participants. The interview protocol was outlined in writing and was utilized as a supplement to the taping of the interview.

Responses of twenty tenured professors to interview questions regarding why they chose to remain in their positions in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman were used to develop a hypothesis explaining the motivation of faculty to remain in higher education.

The Study Site: Montana State University-Bozeman

The study site of Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) was unique in a number of ways. Many of the responses to inquiries reflected this. The MSU-Bozeman campus is located in the southwestern part of Montana in the Rocky Mountains. It is a land grant institution that was founded in 1893. MSU-Bozeman became one of two “umbrella universities” for the Montana University System when the Board of Regents restructured the State’s university system in 1994. MSU-Bozeman is the home campus for Montana State University. There are three affiliate campuses. They are: 1) MSU-Billings, 2) MSU-Northern located in the city of Havre, and 3) MSU-Great Falls College of Technology (MSU-Bozeman Website, October 2004).

In the year 2000 a new vision and mission statement were collaboratively generated and promulgated for the university with the expectation that all affiliated with MSU-Bozeman
would have a guide to unite visions and create a cohesive view of mission. The Vision
Statement and Mission Statement are posted on MSU-Bozeman’s Website (October 2004)
and read as follows:

Vision Statement:

Montana State University will be the University of Choice for those
seeking a student centered learning environment distinguished by
innovation and discovery in a Rocky Mountain setting.

Mission Statement:

1. To provide a challenging and richly diverse learning environment in
which the entire university community is fully engaged in supporting
student success.

2. To provide an environment that promotes the exploration, discovery,
and dissemination of new knowledge.

3. To provide a collegial environment for faculty and students in which
discovery and learning are closely integrated and highly valued.

4. To serve the people and communities of Montana by sharing our
expertise and collaborating with others to improve the lives and prosperity
of Montanans.

In accomplishing our mission, we remain committed to the wise
stewardship of resources through meaningful assessment and public
accountability (MSU-Bozeman Website, October 1, 2004).

MSU-Bozeman was first accredited in 1932 by the Northwest Commission on Colleges
and Universities. MSU-Bozeman has undergone decennial reaccreditation with mid-
decade accreditation review. It offered undergraduate degrees in 51 different disciplines.
Master’s degrees were offered in 41 different disciplines and doctorates were awarded in
18. In addition, the “specialist degree” could be earned through the education department.
Enrollment for fall 2004 was 12,003 (MSU-Bozeman Website, January 23, 2005). MSU-
Bozeman employs 2,863 permanent faculty and staff according to statistics reported in fall
Governing System: Montana State University-Bozeman. The system of governance in place for the operation of MSU-Bozeman is set forth in the state’s constitution, Article X, Section 9 of the Constitution of Montana. It reads as follows:

Board of Regents

(2)(a) The government and control of the Montana University System is vested in a board of regents of higher education which shall have full power, responsibility, and authority to supervise, coordinate, manage and control the Montana University System and shall supervise and coordinate other public educational institutions assigned by law.

The board shall appoint a commissioner of higher education and prescribe his term and duties.

The appropriations under the control of the board of regents are subject to the same audit provisions as are all other state funds (Article X, Section 9 Reprint, no date).

The Montana Board of Regents adopted a “Resolution Regarding the Respective Role of the Board of Regents and University System Manager” (Attachment 1, Board of Regents Meeting, May 22, 2002) (Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education Website, 2002). Ten management statements and principles were adopted by the Montana Board of Regents. They reflect the current philosophy of operation. Statement number five appears in bold and reads as follows: “Academic governance in the United States is built on the principle that governing boards exercise their functions with and through the chief executive and his or her management team” (Attachment 1, May 22, 2002) (Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education Website, 2002).

The chief executive at MSU-Bozeman is the university president. His statement regarding governance of MSU-Bozeman is as follows:
At Montana State University-Bozeman, we recognize the important relationship between broad participative governance and the education of students that graduate with the knowledge and skills to be informed, productive, and contributing citizens of Montana and the Nation. Shared governance at our University is a dynamic set of processes, which provide a critical foundation that actively supports the University’s two primary functions: the creation and dissemination of knowledge. Input from all campus constituencies, the faculty (Faculty Council), professional employees (Professional Council), classified staff (CEPAC), and students (ASMSU), provides advice, direction, and perspective to the institution’s administrative leadership about issues, policies, and procedures that impact the direction and quality of the University’s instruction, research/creative activity, and service programs (MSU-Bozeman Website, October 1, 2004).

Faculty Council is the chief governance body of the faculty at MSU-Bozeman. The Council meets every Wednesday when school is in session. Faculty Council meets with the Professional Council as the University Governance Council the second Wednesday of each month. The By-Laws and Constitution of the Faculty Council are posted on the MSU-Bozeman Website. For more detailed information regarding policies, procedures, and governance of MSU-Bozeman, refer to Appendices C and D.

Montana State University-Bozeman: The Location. The location of MSU-Bozeman is unique and, as such, may serve as a motivating force, either positive or negative, influencing the decisions of tenured faculty to remain at MSU-Bozeman. The town of Bozeman is located in the heart of the Rocky Mountains at an elevation of 5,000 feet. The area of the municipality at large includes a population of over 50,000 individuals from varying backgrounds and cultures. Although Bozeman is more rural than metropolitan, it offers community activities typically only available in large cities (MSU-Bozeman Website, October 1, 2004). Bozeman has more annual days of sunshine than Houston, Texas (Bozeman, The Best-Kept Secret Website, October 4, 2004).
Located in southwestern Montana, Bozeman is surrounded by ski areas and within hours of the state's two national parks, Yellowstone and Glacier. An abundance of outdoor recreational opportunities present themselves. Montana’s network of rivers, streams, and mountain lakes accommodate those who enjoy water sports (MSU-Bozeman Website, October 1, 2004). With an annual precipitation of 18.61 inches, predominantly appearing as snow, residents of Bozeman experience an average of 83.5 inches of snow each winter, with much more at the nearby ski areas (MSU-Bozeman Website, October 4, 2004). For a more detailed description of the location, please refer to MSU-Bozeman Website.

Profile Of Accessible Population Or Sampling Frame

The accessible population or sampling frame consisted of tenured professors having remained for at least ten years in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education positions at MSU-Bozeman. The term liberal arts traditionally referred to a college or university curriculum aimed at imparting general knowledge and developing general intellectual capacities in contrast to a professional, vocational, or technical curriculum. In medieval European universities, the seven liberal arts were grammar, rhetoric, and logic (the trivium), and geometry, arithmetic, music and astronomy (the quadrivium). In modern colleges and universities the liberal arts included the study of literature, languages, philosophy, history, mathematics, and science as the basis of a general, or liberal education (The New Encyclopedia Britannica, 2002).

The term humanities traditionally referred to the branches of knowledge that concerned themselves with human beings and their culture or with analytical and critical methods of inquiry derived from an appreciation of human values and of the unique
ability of the human spirit to express itself. As a group of educational disciplines, the humanities were distinguished in content and method from the physical and biological sciences, and, somewhat less decisively, from the social sciences. The humanities included the study of all languages and literatures, the arts, history, and philosophy. The humanities were sometimes organized as a school or administrative division in many colleges and universities in the United States. The humanities were most commonly distinguished as areas of knowledge that lay outside of and beyond, the subject matter of the physical sciences. In contrast to this understanding of what distinguishes humanities, Heinrich Rickert defined the distinguishing characteristic setting humanities apart from other branches of knowledge as the methods of investigation. The humanities, according to Rickert, were devoted to “the unique values of the particular within its cultural and human contexts and [did] not seed general laws” (The New Encyclopedia Britannica, 2002, v. 6, p. 138:3a).

The term social sciences conventionally referred to any discipline or branch of science that dealt with the social and cultural aspects of human behavior. The social sciences generally included economics, political science, sociology, and social psychology. In the twentieth century, the term behavioral science had become more and more commonly used for the disciplines cited as social sciences. Those who favored the term did so in part because these disciplines were thus brought closer to some of the sciences, such as physical anthropology and linguistics, which also dealt with human behavior (The New Encyclopedia Britannica, 2002).

The term fine arts referred to any of the non-utilitarian visual arts, or arts concerned primarily with the creation of beauty and generally taken to include painting,
printmaking, sculpture, and architecture, with literature, music and dance sometimes being added. In its strict sense, fine art was to be distinguished from such decorative arts and crafts as wall painting, pottery, weaving, metalworking, and furniture making, all of which had utility as an end (the architect being differentiated from the builder in this respect) (The New Encyclopedia Britannica, 2002).

The term education was thought to refer to the discipline that was concerned, in this context, mainly with methods of teaching and learning in schools or “school-like” environments as opposed to various informal means of socialization (e.g. between parents and their children) (The New Encyclopedia Britannica, 2002, v. 4, p.73:1a).

For the purposes of this paper, the categories of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education included the following departments at MSU-Bozeman: the Departments of Architecture, Art, Media and Theater Arts, Music, Education, Health and Human Development, English, History and Philosophy, Native American Studies, Modern Languages, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology/Anthropology. A listing of the professors employed by these departments was broken down according to rank and whether or not they have remained in their positions for ten years or not. Assistant professors, instructors, and adjunct professors were not included in the profile, as they were generally not tenured, and as such, did not meet the criteria required for the sample.

Since conventional definitions of the areas of academia referred to as liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education were at once vague and overlapping, and in some instances inclusive of mathematics and the hard sciences, for the purpose of the study, liberal arts were defined as including English, History/Philosophy, and
Modern Languages; humanities as including Native American Studies; social sciences as including Sociology/Anthropology, Psychology, and Political Science; fine arts as including Architecture, Art, and Media/Theater Arts; and education as including Education as well as Health and Human Development. The total number of full professors employed in these academic areas at MSU-Bozeman was forty-seven. Of these, forty-six had remained in their positions over ten years. The total number of associate professors employed in these academic areas was fifty-six. Of these, only thirty-eight had remained in their positions over ten years.

The following comprised the profile of the accessible population or sampling frame. According to information disseminated by the Office of Planning and Analysis at MSU-Bozeman, individuals that comprised the accessible population or sampling frame followed this profile: Of the sixteen professors of Architecture, eight had remained in their positions over ten years. Five of the architecture professors were full professors, all had remained in their positions over ten years. Five architecture professors held the rank of associate professor. Of these five, two had remained in their positions over ten years.

The Art Department employed seven full professors, all of whom had remained in their jobs for a minimum of ten years. Of four associate professors of art, three had remained in their positions for at least ten years.

The Department of Media and Theater Arts employed six full professors. All of these professors had remained in their jobs over ten years. Four associate professors were employed by the Media and Theater Arts Department. Of the four, three had remained over ten years.

The Music Department employed seven full professors. All had remained in their
positions over ten years. The two associate professors employed by this department had both remained over ten years.

The Education Department employed four full professors, three of whom had remained in their positions over ten years. Seven associate professors were employed by this department. Of these, six had remained in their positions over ten years.

In the Department of Health and Human Development, three full professors were employed by the university. All of these professors had been in their positions over ten years. There were nine associate professors in this department, six of whom had remained in their positions over ten years.

The English Department employed five full professors. All had remained in their positions at least ten years. There were seven associate professors employed by this department, five of whom had remained in their positions over ten years.

In the History/Philosophy Department, four full professors, all remaining over ten years, were employed. This department employed seven associate professors, six of whom had remained in their positions over ten years.

The Department of Native American Studies employed no full professors and one associate professor who had remained in his position over ten years. The office of planning and analysis reported these statistics as a result of the fact that the Department Of Native American Studies had just recently become a department. Prior to this year, it was formally a center and as such employed no professors at any rank.

The Department of Modern Languages employed no full professors. Five associate professors were employed, four of who had remained over ten years.

There were two full professors employed by the Political Science Department. Both
professors had maintained their positions over ten years. The two associate professors employed by the Political Science Department had remained in their jobs over ten years.

The two full professors employed by the Psychology Department had both remained in their positions over ten years. Neither of the associate professors in this department had been in his/her position for ten years.

In the Department Of Sociology and Anthropology there were two full professors, both of whom had been employed ever ten years. Five associate professors taught in this department. Of these, only one had remained in this position over ten years.

Table 10. Profile of Accessible Population or Sampling Frame.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Humanities</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Fine Arts</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>9(9)</td>
<td>0(0)</td>
<td>6(6)</td>
<td>25(25)</td>
<td>7(6)</td>
<td>47(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Prof</td>
<td>19(15)</td>
<td>1(1)</td>
<td>9(3)</td>
<td>12(8)</td>
<td>16(12)</td>
<td>57(39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

Twenty tenured professors who had remained at least ten years in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) were purposefully selected and interviewed in person one-on-one. Seven females and thirteen males participated in the study. Gender was a delimitation of the study as it was not significant in the investigation of motivation of faculty to remain at MSU-Bozeman. The data consisted of taped interviews, in addition to field notes taken by the author at the time of the interview. Interviews were conducted in the campus office, home, or other place as requested by participating professors. Interviews were expected to last between thirty minutes and two hours. Interviews were conducted in the spring and summer of 2004. The instrument used in
the interview process incorporated the use of open-ended questions and statements. The data from interviews, field notes, and observations were compiled, organized, and interpreted. A letter of permission form The Human Subjects Committee of the Institutional Review Board at MSU-Bozeman can be referenced in Appendix A.

**Interview Protocol**

A form two pages in length with eight open-ended questions or statements was designed (see Appendix B). The following steps were followed to develop the interview protocol. Step one: a header was used to record essential information about the project and as a reminder to go over the purpose of the study with the interviewee. It also included information about the confidentiality of the study and addressed the fact that the requirement for the consent form had been waived by the Human Subjects Committee. Step two: space was placed between the questions in the protocol form to allow for note taking during the interviews. Step three: all the questions and responses were recorded as the interviewee was speaking. Step four: all the questions and their order were memorized to minimize loss of eye contact with the interviewees. Step five: the closing comments that thank the participants for the interviews, request follow-up information, if needed, and assure the participants of the confidentiality of their responses and future interviews were written out (Creswell, 1998, p. 126-127).

The questions used in the interview protocol were developed by referencing the American Faculty Poll (Sanderson, Phua, and Herda, 2000), and the motivational theories of Herzberg (1959), and Maslow (1954), and Goleman (Goleman, 1997, 2004). A pilot study was conducted during the spring semester 2001 as an assignment of EDCI 507, Qualitative Research Methods in Higher Education. The initial interview questions
were refined during the course of this study. Seven overarching questions were generated according to Creswell’s recommendations for interview design of a grounded theory study (Creswell, 1998, p. 127). The interview concluded with a question which was a standard aspect of the interview protocol design as recommended by Creswell (1998, p. 127).

The opening question was designed to define the participant, his/her origins, education, and job. It was:

1. Please provide a biographical description of yourself, including place of birth, education and employment history, and length of tenure at MSU-Bozeman.

Question two directly addressed the source affording the participant the most satisfaction in his job. It read:

2. From where do you derive the most satisfaction from/in your current position? (Ex: Teaching, research, etc.)

Question three was designed to examine the effect of hygiene factors on the participants and their level of job satisfaction. It was:

3. Describe the effect that external environmental aspects of your job at MSU-Bozeman, such as working conditions, competence of colleagues, interpersonal relationships with coworkers, quality of students, governing policies, administration, style of leadership and supervision, and institutional reputation has had upon the strength of your motivation to remain at MSU-Bozeman?

Question four examined aspects of lower order needs and to what extent the satisfaction thereof effected the overall job satisfaction of the participants. It was:

4. To what degrees do salary, tenure, and job security present themselves as motivating factors in determining your decision to remain at MSU-Bozeman?

Question five addressed the satisfaction or lack thereof of different higher order
needs and to what extent it affected overall job satisfaction. It appeared as follows:

5. To what extent does opportunity for achievement and recognition, promotion and growth, rank, autonomy of thought and action as a professor, and personal freedom affect your decision to remain at MSU-Bozeman?

Question six explored the effect of geographic location and family, and/or the possible interrelationship of the two on the job satisfaction of the participant. These factors defied categorization as a function of the fact that the motivating effects of both geographic location and/or family may interface with multiple need levels simultaneously. The question appeared as follows:

6. Are family and/or geographic location motivating factors for you in choosing to remain in your position at MSU-Bozeman?

Question seven dealt with the validity of prior responses, as searching for another job was potentially evidence of job dissatisfaction, whether or not perceived as such by the participant. The question read:

7. Have you at any time looked for another job since receiving tenure at MSU-Bozeman?

Question eight was simply a standard aspect of the protocol design as recommended by Creswell (1998, p. 127). It read:

8. Is there anything else related to your satisfaction with your job I have not covered?

Data Management and Analysis

Strategy for Analyzing Data

Data management was accomplished through the following process. Participants were interviewed by the author in the setting of their choice. Interviews were recorded
with the use of a tape recorder and field notes. Resulting taped interviews were transcribed. Both electronic and hard copies of data were generated. Field notes and transcripts of interviews were analyzed according to the classic content analysis strategy that identifies themes. Analysis of the data was accomplished through the use of standard procedures as set forth by Corbin and Strauss (1990) consisting of open, axial, and selective coding. Open coding was the procedure provided in grounded theory that was used to develop categories. Axial coding was used as a procedure for interconnecting the categories. Subsequently, selective coding was used to build a cohesive ‘story’ from the connections between categories. The procedures culminated in a discursive set of theoretical propositions (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

Data Analysis

The researcher initially examined the text, consisting of transcripts and field notes for relevant categories of information. Employing the constant comparative approach, the researcher attempted to saturate the categories by isolating incidences that represented the category. The researcher continued reviewing and unearthing information regarding the category until the new information gleaned no longer provided further insight into the category. Categories were then subdivided into properties, representing multiple perspectives from which each category could be perceived. Properties were dimensionalized and placed on a continuum for comparison. The entire database for the study was reduced to a small set of themes/categories that exemplified the process/action being examined by the grounded theory study (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

Following development of a fundamental set of categories or themes, the researcher
identified a single category as the central phenomenon of the study. At this point the researcher continued with axial coding isolating causal conditions that influenced the central phenomenon. Included in the axial coding were strategies for addressing the phenomenon. Axial coding also included the context and intervening conditions that developed the strategy. Completing the axial coding was an examination and analysis of the consequences of undertaking the strategies (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

A theoretical model or coding paradigm was created by the researcher during this phase of the axial coding. This model presented a visual exemplification of the interrelationship of these axial coding categories of information. With the use of the coding paradigm, a theory was generated or developed (Corbin & Strauss, 1990).

A conditional matrix was developed at the broadest level of analysis. This matrix appeared as a diagram to assist the researcher in visualizing the full gamut of consequences and conditions related to the central phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

Validation

Member checking and external auditing were strategies used by the researcher to validate or determine the accuracy or credibility of the findings in the study. Different qualitative researchers have used different terms in addressing the issue of validity. Lincoln and Guba (1985) described the same phenomenon in terms authenticity and trustworthiness.

Member Checking. Accuracy of data collected was confirmed through member checking. The participants were asked to review and confirm the accuracy of the
researcher’s account of what was said in the interview. Typed transcripts of interviews were returned to interview participants. Confirmation by interviewees was sought as to the accuracy of the information recorded in the interview. Interviewees were asked to report on whether the description of the account was accurate. At this time, interviewee participants made any corrections to the text of the interview transcripts that were needed (Creswell, 2002).

**External Audit.** The conclusions were reviewed in relation to the data by a third party outside the project who was thoroughly versed in the process of qualitative research. The purpose of the third party external audit was to ensure that the conclusions reached by the researcher could logically be tied to the data collected in the interviews.

**Ethical Concerns**

In accordance with the National Research Act of 1974 and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, more commonly referred to as the Buckley Amendment, this research has been reviewed and declared exempt of review by the Human Participants Committee of MSU-Bozeman. Protection of research by the Act required that participants not be harmed in any way, either physically or mentally, and that they participate only in the event for which their informed consent has been freely given. Underage participants must procure the informed consent of their parents or legal guardians.

The research in question was conducted through the use of human participants and the data collected regards their employment. As such the information was sensitive and it was necessary to protect the anonymity of participants. Revealing work related
experiences, feelings, or perceptions may be potentially damaging to the employment and/or employability of participants. For this reason numerical pseudonyms were used when conducting interviews, and all participants were referred to in the third person masculine throughout the study to avoid any identification related to gender, and no physical links to participants were evidenced, such as permission documents, etc. Seven females and thirteen males participated in the study. Gender was a delimitation of the study and was not considered in the study.

A proposal of the research, including a description of the research and the interview protocol were submitted to the Human Participants Committee (HSC) in the WWAMI Medical Program Office at MSU-Bozeman on March 17, 2003. The HSC declared the research in question exempt from the requirement of committee review in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46, section 101. Specifically, the designated paragraph determines “that research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior” is exempt from the requirement of review by the HSC committee.

Summary

It was not known why tenured faculty chose to remain in the field of higher education at MSU-Bozeman. The purpose of this grounded theory study was to investigate why tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman chose to remain in their faculty positions. Knowing why faculty stay could afford those responsible for retention in higher education insight and information that could increase retention and minimize turnover among faculty. A motivational study of faculty who remained proceeded.

A non-probability purposeful sample was drawn from the accessible population of
professors meeting requirements for the study according to definition and availability. Twenty tenured professors who had remained at least ten years in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, or education at MSU-Bozeman were purposefully selected and interviewed in person one-on-one. The instrument used in the interview process incorporated the use of open-ended questions and statements. A proposal was submitted to the Human Participants Committee of the Institutional Review Board at MSU-Bozeman and the proposed research was declared exempt of review.

Research validity was determined through member checking and external audit. Coding of the data was accomplished through the use of open, axial, and selective coding. The research was conducted throughout the spring/summer of 2004.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS AND RESULTS

Introduction

The quality of faculty is determined initially by the quality of people hired. Their performance is then influenced by articulated expectations and by what is observed as the patterns of success. As the faculty member continues to work, the fluctuating feeling of satisfaction and dissatisfaction influences morale and the quality of faculty’s work…in higher education, where faculty have considerable discretion over how they spend their time, job dissatisfaction can result in an enormous decrease in quality (Fife, 2000, p. xviii).

A limited body of literature regarding retention of faculty suggested the need for inquiry into the phenomena of faculty retention and the lack of related information available. The problem addressed in this study was that it was not known what motivated tenured faculty to remain in their positions in higher education at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman). The purpose of this grounded theory study was to explore what motivated faculty in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their faculty positions and generate a testable theory explaining why they remained. The study was grounded in motivational theory and sought to determine whether or not there was a select set of motivators that explained the decision of tenured faculty in the aforementioned disciplines to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman.

Because it was not known why faculty at MSU-Bozeman remained in their positions in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education, the
following questions were examined: Was there a select set of motivators that explained the decision of tenured faculty from disciplines in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education to remain in the professorate at MSU-Bozeman? If in fact there was, were they consistent with those that had been found to motivate workers in industry, or were they unique to the professorate? Comparison of findings of research conducted in higher education with those findings resulting from research conducted in the industrial sector was essential, as most existing motivational theory evolved from research conducted in industry.

The answers to these questions provided insights into the problem of not knowing why faculty remained in the field of higher education at MSU-Bozeman and fulfilled the purpose of this grounded theory study which was to examine what motivated faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions.

Data Collection and Analysis

Thirty-four tenured professors employed by MSU-Bozeman for a minimum of ten years in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education were purposefully selected and invited to participate in the study. Of the thirty-four professors contacted, eight failed to respond to the invitation, and one responded, but declined to participate in the study. This professor’s decision was motivated by a self-imposed personal philosophy preventing the professor from participating in “question and answer” interviews. The remaining twenty-five professors were interviewed in May, June, July, and August, 2004. Duration of interviews was from 30 to 120 minutes, with most lasting from 60 to 70 minutes. Interview locations were determined by participants. Four interviews
were conducted in a campus coffee shop, one professor was interviewed in an off-campus restaurant, two were interviewed in their homes, and the remaining participants were interviewed in their offices. The one-on-one interviews were tape recorded by the author. Four interviews were predominantly inaudible due to technical problems, and, as a result, eliminated from the study. A final interview was eliminated as not all questions were addressed by the participant.

The researcher contacted departmental secretaries to generate a list of professors that met the criteria for the study. The professors were invited to participate by phone. The professors responded, in general, differently to the invitation during the spring semester as opposed to the summer semester. During the spring semester, professors were more likely to respond to the telephone invitation and make appointments for interviews. During the summer session, the researcher enlisted an alternative strategy for setting up interviews. Although faculty was less likely to respond to telephone invitations during the summer session, they were more open to participating in interviews when approached personally by the researcher. All participants were adamant about the protection of their anonymity.

The interview protocol was a form two pages in length that focused on nine open-ended questions and statements designed to explore the motivation of the participants to remain in their jobs (see Appendix B). A proposal of the research, including a description of the research and the interview protocol were submitted to the Human Participants Committee (HSC) in the WWAMI Medical Program Office at MSU-Bozeman on March 17, 2003. The HSC declared the research in question exempt from the requirement of committee review in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46, section 101 and waived the requirement for permission forms in the interest of the preservation of the
anonymity of the participants. Identifying information such as age, ethnic background, state/country of origin, department, gender, or otherwise descriptive information that would jeopardize the anonymity of the participants has been deleted from the data/text by the author at the request of the participating professors and in compliance with the committee’s mandate requiring protection of the anonymity of the participants.

Description of Interview Experiences

Interview number one was conducted June 6, 2005, off-campus in the home of the participant at 5:00 p.m. The participant was contacted by phone and invited the researcher to conduct the interview at the home of the participant. He (the participant) was gracious and accommodating and appeared to be comfortable with his surroundings, the interview process, and the interviewer. He was generous with time. The atmosphere was relaxed. He was surrounded by work the participant had generated, both in the academic role and recreationally, indicative of prolific productivity in both realms. His spouse came and went through the course of the interview. He appeared to have enjoyed both his experience of tenure at MSU-Bozeman, and, retrospectively revisiting it, and relating it through the interview process. His spouse was also a professor at MSU-Bozeman. He related experiences and perceptions of tenure at MSU-Bozeman that had both contributed to and detracted from job satisfaction. He had felt compelled to retain an attorney during his tenure process to negotiate with the committee and administration responsible for awarding tenure. He experienced dissatisfaction with the system in place for tenure. He felt that the faculty was rewarded more for learning to maneuver on committees, than to discharge the duties described in the handbook. He was specific as to what motivators had been the decisive factors promoting retention. The primary factors were ideology, location, tenure,
and family, in descending order. Aside from the contributing factor of tenure, he had
chosen to remain at MSU-Bozeman for ideological reasons unrelated to his job.

Interview number two was conducted July 11, 2005, in the office of the participant on
the MSU-Bozeman campus at 2:00 p.m. He (the participant) was invited to participate in
the study by phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. He was gracious and
accommodating. He was generous with time. He appeared to enjoy the interview process.
The interviewee was relaxed and comfortable relating experiences regarding retention at
MSU-Bozeman. He seemed to enjoy the experience of retrospectively visiting the
experience of tenure at MSU-Bozeman. He related both positive and negative aspects of
employment. He had experienced the dissolution of a marriage as the result of the demands
of the tenure process. This participant had remarried an MSU-Bozeman professor. He
remained at MSU-Bozeman because of his job. Interaction with students, tenure, and
location were the primary motivating forces behind his decision to remain at MSU-
Bozeman. He experienced job satisfaction as senior faculty at MSU-Bozeman.

Interview number three was conducted on June 9, 2005 in a restaurant on the MSU-
Bozeman campus at 1:00 p.m. The professor was invited to participate in the study by
phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. The atmosphere was busy but relaxed.
The participant was gracious and accommodating. He was generous with time. He was
comfortable talking about life as a professor. He was both entertaining and informative as
an interviewee. He related both positive and negative aspects of remaining as faculty at
MSU-Bozeman. He had remained as a result of location, family, tenure, and ageism. The
spouse of the participant was also a professor at MSU-Bozeman. Because of these factors
the participant felt there had been no choice but to remain at MSU-Bozeman. He expressed
dissatisfaction with salary increases that led to the perception of being “trapped.”

Interview number four was conducted outside a coffee shop on the MSU-campus on August 5, 2005 at 10:00 a.m. The participant was invited to participate in the study by phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. He was gracious and accommodating, although working with limitations of time constraints, which included family responsibilities. His spouse was also an MSU-Bozeman professor. The interview was conducted with brevity by the interviewer in consideration of these factors. The primary motivators behind retention of this participant were location, family, tenure, and a perceived lack of marketability elsewhere in academia. He was a tenured full professor with a master’s degree in a discipline in which the master’s degree was not the terminal degree. He expressed optimism and “being lucky” in respect to his job, family, and location of employment. He experienced job satisfaction as a result of employment as faculty at MSU-Bozeman.

Interview number five was conducted in the office of the participant on the MSU-Bozeman campus at 9:20 a.m. on June 11, 2005. The participant was invited to participate in the study by phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. He was gracious and accommodating. He was generous with time. He was entertaining and informative, and appeared to enjoy the process of retrospectively reviewing reasons for remaining at MSU-Bozeman. He expressed having experienced both frustration and satisfaction as a result of remaining as faculty at MSU-Bozeman. He remained because of location, family, and tenure. He described the evolution of a personal and intellectual ideology with which he managed negative aspects of employment as faculty at MSU-Bozeman. He experienced job satisfaction as a tenured associate professor and was not motivated to become a full
Interview number six was conducted in the participant’s office on the MSU-Bozeman campus at 1:30 p.m. on June 19, 2005. The participant was invited to participate in the study by phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. The interviewee was gracious, accommodating, and generous with time. He was apathetic in response to rank or tenure, but experienced great job satisfaction, was passionate regarding the discipline, and loved working with students. He was motivated to remain at MSU-Bozeman by location and family.

Interview number seven was conducted on June 15, 2005 at a coffee shop on the MSU-Bozeman campus at 3:45 p.m. The participant was invited to participate in the study by phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. This interviewee was accessible, accommodating, gracious, and generous with time. He was passionate about the pursuit of the discipline in which he was engaged. This interviewee had completed a double terminal degree and achieved full rank and tenure as a single parent. He continued to evolve through the award of international teaching assignments and Fulbright projects while maintaining tenure at MSU-Bozeman. He made cognizant choices to remain at MSU-Bozeman despite frustration with salary, policies, procedures and university governance. He had consciously developed intellectual strategies to cope with negative aspects of employment at MSU-Bozeman. Much of this strategy evolved around a focus on the positive, and disregard for the negative aspects of the employment experience at MSU-Bozeman. He was motivated to remain at MSU-Bozeman out of deference to and decisions regarding age. He clarified the fact that he would not have made the decision to remain at MSU-Bozeman, had he been fifteen years younger. He experienced job satisfaction as a professor.
result of making a decision to experience job satisfaction. This professor felt that the salary provided by the state for university professors was a “crime.”

Interview number eight was conducted in the office of the participant on the MSU-Bozeman campus on May 20, 2004 at 10:45 a.m. He was invited to participate in the study by phone, and agreed to be interviewed on campus. He was accessible for interview, but appeared to be preoccupied by time constraints. Much of the interview was characterized by responses that appeared to be rushed and incomplete, to shorten the length of the interview. Although he did not appear to be uncomfortable with the process, his demeanor suggested that compliance with the request to participate in the study was a cursory task that was considered a mandatory aspect of his role. He was motivated to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman by location, family, and tenure. Even when prompted or encouraged by the interviewer to expound, the tone of this interviewee remained rushed and cursory throughout the interview. He exhibited little emotion regarding any aspect of the interview. He experienced job satisfaction as a tenured associate professor and was not motivated to become a full professor.

Interview number nine was conducted on June 9, 2004, in the office of the participant on the campus of MSU-Bozeman at 12:20 a.m. The participant was invited to participate in the study by phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. He was gregarious, enthusiastic, expressive, accommodating, and gracious. This individual was generous with time. He had participated professionally in the pursuit of the discipline prior to entering academia. He described the pros and cons of pursuit of the vocation as a professional in contrast to it as an academician. He elaborated on the positive and negative facets of both. He cited the strongest motivating factor to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman as salary
compression resulting in inability to leave. He expressed dissatisfaction about this and MSU-Bozeman as a university system. He felt that the only system on campus that functioned properly was the parking system. Although frustrated about this, and many other aspects of employment at the university, he described having developed strategies for coping with frustrations. He qualified the remarks regarding dissatisfaction, explaining that they did not translate to a willingness to remain at any cost. He explained that, although disillusioned with MSU-Bozeman, he had developed emotional strategies to feel satisfied in spite of MSU-Bozeman. He felt positive about location, and family, although did not see them as motivating factors to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman. He was the spouse of an MSU-Bozeman professor.

Interview number ten was conducted in a conference room in the participant’s department on the MSU-Bozeman campus on June 5, 2004 at 3:45 p.m. He, (the participant), was invited to participate in the study by phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. He was accommodating and accessible. His demeanor during the interview was initially combative, defensive, and rushed. He began to respond to the interview protocol by questioning the relevancy of the open-ended questions in the inquiry. After resolving questions regarding the research design, He became gracious, engaging, and informative. He was generous with time. He cited motivating factors to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman as location, family, and tenure. He perceived salary as a minor motivating factor, but qualified this response as “strictly when perceived in a comparative sense.” He explained that as a result of being a tenured full professor, he “couldn’t go anyplace.” This professor felt that MSU-Bozeman was ineffective in recruiting and retaining faculty at the assistant level because “we don’t pay them enough, we work them
too hard, we expect too much from them, they go someplace else…that’s your answer.” In spite of this dialogue, this participant experienced job satisfaction.

Interview number eleven was initially conducted in the lobby of a local hotel where the participant was attending a conference March 15, 2004. On June 2, 2004 at 4:25 p.m. the participant was contacted by the author and verified that there had been no change in the information submitted during the initial interview and that the data collected was still valid. The participant was invited to participate in the study by phone and requested to be interviewed at the hotel off-campus. He was accessible, gracious, congenial, enthusiastic about the interview, and generous with time. He, like participant number two, had experienced the dissolution of a marriage as a result of the demands of the tenure process. Like participant number two, he had remarried. Motivating factors for him to remain in the position at MSU-Bozeman were location, family, and tenure. He described the pros and cons of remaining at MSU-Bozeman. He described dissatisfaction and conflict with systems for promotion, tenure, administration, policies and governance of MSU-Bozeman. In the final analysis, despite frustrations and struggles with the system, he expressed feelings of gratitude and privilege as a consequence of his present position at MSU-Bozeman.

Interview number twelve took place in the office of the interviewee on the MSU-Bozeman campus on August 16, 2004 at 2:00 p.m. The participant was invited to participate in the study personally by the researcher. He agreed to schedule the interview for the end of the summer session. He was accessible and accommodating. He experienced feelings of uneasiness and discomfort as a result of the interview process, and the fact that it was taped. In the words of the participant, the participant expressed feeling
“somewhat uncomfortable just talking about myself to a machine.” After addressing this tension, the participant relaxed, was gracious, engaging, and charming. The participant expressed having been motivated by lower order needs to remain at MSU-Bozeman in spite of job dissatisfaction. This professor explained remaining because of location and family, but expressed being motivated to leave MSU-Bozeman as soon as possible, preferably before retirement, to return to the birthplace of the participant. He experienced extreme job dissatisfaction as senior faculty at MSU-Bozeman.

Interview number thirteen was conducted in a coffee shop on the campus of MSU-Bozeman on June 14, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. The participant was invited to participate in the study by phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. He was particularly accessible, accommodating, and engaging. This professor was particularly informative and generous with his time. He became hurried or pressured for time about half way through the interview making it difficult to address some questions as thoroughly as others. The researcher perceived that the interview process made this professor marginally uncomfortable and/or self-conscious. This participant had been motivated to accept the post at MSU-Bozeman by a spouse. The spouse had been motivated in response to the location. This participant, like participants two and eleven, had experienced the dissolution of a marriage as the result of demands of the tenure process. He was motivated to remain as a professor at MSU-Bozeman by tenure. He did not remarry.

Interview number fourteen was conducted in the office of the participant on August 6, 2004 at 2:30 p.m. The participant was invited in person to participate in the study by the researcher. Participant number fourteen was accessible gracious and cooperative. This professor felt that many aspects of employment as a professor were not unique to MSU-
Bozeman, but were fundamental to higher education, and as such could not be construed to be motivating factors in retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman. He was motivated to remain at MSU-Bozeman by location, working conditions, and interpersonal relationships with co-workers. He experienced grave dissatisfaction with salary, but was motivated to remain at MSU-Bozeman in spite of it in deference to positive motivators.

Interview number fifteen was conducted in the office of the participant on the campus at MSU-Bozeman on August 5, 2004, at 3:00 p.m. The participant was invited in person to participate in the study by the researcher. He was accessible, gracious, and cooperative. He was not motivated to remain at MSU-Bozeman by the external environmental aspects of the job. This participant was negatively motivated by the systems in place at MSU-Bozeman for governing, administration, and policy-making. He was motivated to remain at MSU-Bozeman by location, family, and tenure. Interaction with students positively contributed to the motivation of participant number fifteen to remain at MSU-Bozeman, but did not present itself as a controlling motivator.

Interview number sixteen was conducted in the office of the interviewee on the MSU-Campus on August 5, 2004 at 12:30 a.m. The participant was invited in person to participate in the study by the researcher. He was gracious, informal, and outspoken. He exhibited a degree of self-confidence that defied intimidation concerning any aspect of the interview regarding his employment. This was apparent in this interviewee more so than any other participant in the study. This participant was well informed and addressed all questions thoroughly. He was neither motivated to remain or to leave MSU-Bozeman by any aspect of the participant’s job. The controlling and only motivator for this participant to remain at MSU-Bozeman was family. He was negatively motivated by all external
environmental factors of his job and what he perceived to be an academic environment that
did not nurture freedom of inquiry or diverse thought. This professor is of the opinion that
retention of faculty in general at MSU-Bozeman is the product of location and family. He
described being motivated by an emotionally intelligent philosophy/ideology of life and its
meaning that preempted any negative effects of his employment or employing institution.
He boasted a resume of graduate degrees from, and employment history with, some of the
most prestigious universities in the world. He was motivated by a spouse to become and
remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman. The spouse was motivated by the location. This
professor did not perceive salary as a particularly negative facet of employment at MSU-
Bozeman. He felt that the issue was overplayed, and it was his opinion, that, although
admittedly low, there was very little ground for valid comparison when discussing
employment in higher education at MSU-Bozeman versus that in other locations.

Interview number seventeen was conducted on August 10, at 2:00 p.m. in the office of
the participant. He (the participant) was invited in person to participate in the study by the
researcher. The interview began with him taking issue with the interview protocol. After
offering advice and guidance regarding the protocol, he became concerned about the use of
pseudonyms and whether there would be gender identification of participants. The
researcher reassured him of absolute anonymity. He agreed to the interview on the
condition that numbers would be used to identify participants. The interview began and the
batteries failed in the recording device. The participant graciously offered replacement
batteries, only to find that they, too, were old and failed to power the recording device as
well. He graciously waited while the researcher procured new batteries from the campus
bookstore. The interview process resumed. Interviewee number seventeen was
accommodating and informative. He had two graduate degrees, one of them terminal, from one of the most expensive, prestigious, and exclusive universities in the world. His resume also included work as a researcher at another equally exclusive and prestigious university. He was motivated to come and remain at MSU-Bozeman by a philosophical commitment to, after having attended elite private schools, bring the best quality education to students who didn’t have such opportunity and may have been the first member of their family to attend college. For him, location and autonomy of thought and action as a professor were dominating motivators for retention. External environmental factors were not motivators for participant number seventeen to remain at MSU-Bozeman. In his words, the “real reason” for him to remain at MSU-Bozeman was that:

“…it is not at all clear that I could do better, on the whole, by going somewhere else…that I could do as well in all those areas if I went somewhere else, and second, someone else would have to hire me before I could go somewhere else, and I have had opportunities outside of Bozeman, but they have not been academic opportunities, and so part of the reason I’m still at MSU is, I have a job versus other places, and I suspect that that’s not the case for everyone you are going to talk to, but there is always that back there, that you have to get a job offer, and it has to be better than this, and this actually turns out to be not a bad place, all in all.”

Interview number eighteen was conducted in the office of the participant on the campus of MSU-Bozeman at 2:40 p.m. on August 3, 2004. The participant was invited in person to participate in the study by the researcher. This professor was very gracious and accommodating. He was the youngest participant in the study. He was one of the two professors who had looked for a job elsewhere after being tenured. This participant had made application to other universities four times. He was not offered another job. He used a philosophy of resignation combined with optimism in response to this. He was motivated to remain at MSU-Bozeman by location, family, and tenure. He felt that he could not
leave MSU-Bozeman now. This professor expressed needing administrative experience to
leave. His spouse’s job in Bozeman was also a great consideration. He also felt motivated
to remain at MSU-Bozeman by interpersonal relationships with co-workers and external
environmental aspects of the job.

Interview number nineteen was conducted at 3:30 p.m., on the same day, August 3,
2004, in a coffee shop on the MSU-Bozeman campus. The participant was invited to
participate in the study by phone and agreed to be interviewed on campus. This professor
was cooperative, gracious, and accessible. He had time restraints, and as such, provided
responses that were brief. He did, however, fully address each issue. He experienced the
greatest job satisfaction when working with people. He was philosophically optimistic, and
felt positive about all aspects of his position at MSU-Bozeman addressed by the interview
protocol. The controlling motivators causing him to remain in his position at MSU-
Bozeman were location, family, and tenure. He expressed the intention to remain in his
position at MSU-Bozeman “as long as possible.” He was married to another tenured full
professor at MSU-Bozeman.

Interview number 20 was conducted in the home of the professor on June 10, 2004,
near the MSU-Bozeman campus at 1:53 p.m. The participant was contacted by phone and
invited the researcher to conduct the interview at his home. He was accommodating and
gracious. He was generous with time. He felt positive about interaction with students,
interpersonal relationships with co-workers, competence of colleagues, opportunity to
achieve, and autonomy of thought and action as a professor. He had been motivated to
remain at MSU-Bozeman because of location, family, and tenure. He expressed the
intention to leave MSU-Bozeman in spite of all positive aspects of tenure at MSU-
Bozeman ending a successful sixteen-year academic career. He was motivated by a
negative interpersonal relationship with a co-worker who was the professor’s supervisor
and department head. He was frustrated and emotional about the relationship. He felt
negative about the style of leadership and governance, and administration and policies in
effect at MSU-Bozeman as a result. He appeared to be motivated by goal incongruent
emotions, as described by Daniel Goleman. To date, he continues as a tenured full
professor at MSU-Bozeman.

Analysis

Data management was accomplished through the following process. Participants were
interviewed by the author in the setting of their choice. Interviews were recorded with the
use of a tape recorder and field notes. Resulting taped interviews were transcribed by the
author and a professional transcriptionist. Transcripts were sent to each participant for
review. Field notes and transcripts of interviews were analyzed according to the classic
content analysis strategy that identifies themes. Both an analytical journal and a journal of
personal reflections were generated from field notes and personal observations made by the
author. Both electronic and hard copies of these journals were generated. Hard copies of
the journal data were sent to participants for their review. Data from field notes,
transcriptions, and journals were assigned a designated number, and stored in labeled
binders. Hard copies of interviews were initially reviewed and discussed using memos and
reflective notes. Each interview was placed in an electronic file. Twenty one additional
files, representative of emergent themes and sub-themes were generated. Interview files
were disaggregated by copying and pasting emergent themes and sub-themes in their
respective theme and sub-theme files. Analysis of the data was accomplished through the
use of standard procedures as set forth by Corbin and Strauss (1990) consisting of open, axial, and selective coding. Open coding is the procedure provided in grounded theory that was used to develop categories. Axial coding was then used as a procedure for interconnecting the categories. Subsequently, selective coding was used to build a cohesive ‘story’ or formulate a synthesis from the connections between the categories. The procedure culminated in a discursive set of theoretical propositions.

The researcher initially examined the text, consisting of transcripts and field notes, for relevant categories of information. Employing the constant comparative approach, the researcher attempted to saturate the categories by isolating incidences that represented the category under investigation. The researcher continued to review and unearth information regarding the category being analyzed until new information gleaned no longer provided further insight into the category. Categories were then subdivided into properties, representing multiple perspectives from which each category could be perceived. Properties were dimensionalized and placed on a continuum for comparison. The entire database for the study was then reduced to a small set of themes or categories that exemplified the process or action being examined by the grounded theory study.

Following development of the fundamental set of categories or themes, the researcher identified a single category as the central phenomenon of the study. At that point the researcher continued analysis with axial coding isolating causal conditions that influenced the central phenomenon. Axial coding included the context and intervening conditions that developed the strategy. Completion of the axial coding revealed the consequences of undertaking the strategies.
A theoretical model or coding paradigm was created by the researcher during this phase of the axial coding. The model presented a visual exemplification of the interrelationship of these axial coding categories of information. With the use of the model, or coding paradigm, the theories were generated.

A conditional matrix was developed at the broadest level of analysis. This matrix appeared as a diagram assisting the researcher in visualizing the full gamut of consequences and conditions related to the central phenomenon.

Member checking and external auditing were strategies used by the researcher to validate or determine the accuracy or credibility of the findings in the study. Participants were asked to review and confirm the accuracy of the researcher’s account of what was said in the interview. Interviewees were asked to report on whether the description of the account was accurate. At that time, interviewee participants were given the opportunity to make any corrections to the text of the interview transcripts that were needed.

The conclusions were reviewed in relation to the data by a third party not associated with the project who was thoroughly versed in the process of qualitative research. The purpose of the third party external audit was to ensure that the conclusions reached by the researcher could logically be tied to the data collected in the interviews.

**Findings**

It was not known by higher education leaders why tenured faculty chose to remain in the professorate. The purpose of this grounded theory study was to explore what motivated faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions. The author interviewed a unique group at MSU-Bozeman of professors who have remained in their positions in excess of ten years. Specifically, twenty tenured faculty members from disciplines in liberal arts,
humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman, a land grant, Doctoral II university were interviewed to explore what motivated them to remain in their positions. Aspects of the participants’ jobs that were expected to emerge as motivating influences promoting retention of faculty were external environmental aspects of the participants’ jobs such as working conditions, competence of colleagues, interpersonal relationships with coworkers, and quality of students. Other external environmental facets of faculty positions fundamental to institutional structure and milieu, such as governing policies, administration, style of leadership and supervision, and institutional reputation were also expected to play a role in the decision of participants to remain in their positions. Motivational factors representing the lower echelons of Maslow’s need hierarchy were expected to play significant parts in the decisions of faculty to remain in their positions. Aspects of employment such as salary and job security were anticipated to be fundamental to the retention of the participants. Opportunity for achievement and recognition, promotion and growth, and rank were expected to appear as motivators emerging in the pursuit of fulfillment of the participants’ higher order needs. The unique aspect of autonomy of thought and action, and personal freedom experienced as a member of the professorate was anticipated to function as a motivating factor for retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman. Personal external factors such as family and location may play roles, as well. The themes, categories, sub-themes, and sub-categories that surfaced in the responses are as follows.

Emergent Themes

Table 11 visually exemplifies the findings in the study. In differing responses, participants defined whether the question topic at issue motivated them not at all,
contributed to or diminished their feelings of job satisfaction and their desire to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman, or was the sole motivator behind their decision to remain in their position.

Table 11. Degree Of Motivation By Type Of Motivator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF MOTIVATOR</th>
<th>STUDY RESULTS/DEGREE OF MOTIVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controlling Motivators</strong></td>
<td>VI/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Internal Motivators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion for Vocational Activity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy of Thought</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other External Environmental Motivators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Reputation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence of Colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships with Coworkers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of Leadership/Supervision</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Policies/Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Achievement/Recognition</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Promotion/Growth</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unanticipated Motivators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy/ Ideology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageism/Marketability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Real” Reason</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Depression</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the following scale designations, responses of participants were presented as follows: [VI/P = Very Important/Positive; CF/P = Contributing Factor/Positive; NI = Not Important; VI/N = Very Important/Negative; NA = Not Addressed]. Categories of motivators designated as ‘other’ consist of motivators not included in the primary category of controlling motivators.
dependent upon disparities in causal conditions and context. Some participants reported that their retention at MSU-Bozeman was unrelated to their job satisfaction. Numbers in the cells indicate the number of participants motivated to the degree designated by the column heading for that motivator. Designations indicate how important the following career factors were to the participants as motivation to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman, and whether they were motivated positively, negatively, not at all, or refused/did not address the motivation factor.

The central question topic was the retention of participants who were tenured professors in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman and had remained in their academic positions for a minimum of ten years. Themes that emerged were the motivators causing the retention. Initially four groups of motivators emerged: (1) controlling motivators, (2) unanticipated emergent motivators, (3) other internal motivators, and (4) other external environmental motivators were the subjects that surfaced.

There were twenty one interrelated sub-themes that surfaced in the analysis. Responses were categorized according to the appearance of codes, key words and/or phrases, and topics or related topics. Some of the words appearing as codes for the controlling motivators were ‘location,’ ‘family,’ ‘tenure,’ and related words and their related topics. For example, regarding the appearance of the code ‘family’ led the author to watch for words such as ‘spouse,’ ‘children,’ ‘grandchildren,’ ‘parents,’ etc. The emergence of location as a controlling theme was evidenced by the codes ‘location,’ ‘geographic location,’ ‘mountains,’ ‘lakes,’ ‘skiing,’ ‘fishing,’ ‘hunting,’ and other related words. The code word ‘home’ was indicative, in most cases, of location and family
simultaneously. The remaining responses of participants to interview questions were categorized in much the same way, and words and phrases that predominated were recognized as themes, and explored for significance. The themes, with the exception of the unanticipated motivators, were then discussed in ascending order according to their strength of influence as a motivator for the participant to remain in his position. The unanticipated motivators were intentionally discussed last. Most of the theme/category titles are descriptive and the motivators they refer to are self-evident. The four theme titles that may merit definition follow: (1) ‘Philosophy/Ideology’ refers to a philosophy, either personal or conventional, or both, that motivated a participant to remain in his position. (2) ‘Ageism/Marketability’ referred to any characteristic, inherent or acquired, that the participant perceived as limiting his ability to acquire alternate, more desirable employment, and as such, motivated him to remain in his position. (3) “‘Real Reason’” was a category that emerged from the repeated expression by participant’s that there was a ‘real reason’ motivating their retention at MSU-Bozeman. Most of these ‘real reasons’ were described as the combined effect of various motivators, which, when occurring in combination, prevented the participant from leaving his job. (4) ‘Economic depression’ was a term coined by one of the participants, describing his belief that his salary was inadequate to enable him to move, and as such, motivated him to remain in his position as faculty at MSU-Bozeman. After initial examination of the data for salient categories supported by the text (transcripts, field notes, journals, and documents), the researcher used the constant comparative approach attempting to saturate the categories, and observed the emergence of the following categories and subcategories.
Controlling Motivators

Three major factors emerged as the controlling motivation for the twenty participants to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. The three primary motivators responsible for these tenured faculty remaining in their positions at MSU-Bozeman were, in order of strength, (1) geographic location, (2) family and personal motivators, and (3) tenure and job security.

Location. All twenty participants unanimously confirmed that the location of Montana State University-Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman) was one of the primary if not the sole motivation behind their tenure at MSU-Bozeman. When addressing the issue of location as a motivating factor for the retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman, Participant #11 declared, “Not only yes, but, hell yes…a major factor.” Participant #10 said, “Absolutely! That’s about 100 percent of it, right there! This is my home.”

Eight participants noted that Bozeman was a good place to raise children, as the community was safe, had good schools, and lots of opportunities for recreation. Four participants said they could not leave the mountains. Participant #10 said:

Wherever I go, it’s the Big Sky Country, right? …BIG. I remember when I first drove through Montana, I was still a student, and [I’d]…come to see the Crazies [Mountains]. That was two-lane road going that way, and then [I’d] turn[ed] around coming back, and [I was] saying, “Come on. That’s God. Isn’t it amazing?” Participant #15 remarked, “…even though MSU has not been a champion of faculty salaries, it’s been enough. You’ve probably heard the saying, ‘Eat the mountains.’”
Seven participants mentioned the recreational opportunities available as a result of the location. Sports facilitated by the geographic location, mentioned by participants were hunting, fishing, both downhill and cross country skiing, and hiking. Participant #11 said, “I would rather hunt than make money.” This participant also mentioned, “I’m skiing thirty-five days this season. [My spouse] is up there today skiing…[my spouse’s] fifty-fourth day of the season…”

Five of the participants specifically mentioned the beauty of the area. Participant #5 said, “It’s been the most visually satisfying and physically satisfying place that I’ve [ever] been…” Four of the participants felt that Bozeman was culturally developed for a rural town of its population. Participant #6 said:

“Bozeman is loaded with artistic people. The arts in Bozeman are as good as they are in San Francisco, as they are in New York. We may not have as many, but the people we have are top-notch…the Bozeman community, I don’t know what the draw is, but it sucks the artists in.”

Participant #10 described Bozeman in the following way: “…what’s interesting about…[Bozeman] is: I spent a lot of time…studying this, Bozeman, Bigfork, Flathead area[s]…these are kind of little enclaves of urban-ness and sophistication. Most of Montana isn’t, this is really unusual…” Seven of the participants talked about the lifestyle facilitated by the area. Participant #10 described this aspect of the location:

I get the environmental benefits, which we laugh about. Your salary isn’t much, but you get the mountains. That’s why a lot of quality people stay at MSU, despite all the things I’ve already touched upon--that this is a great place to live. It’s a great place to have a family. This is great! It’s worth it. Lifestyle, quality of life is probably the most important factor for most people staying here. You know, [as a result] the salary level is really tolerable…We’re not at the tipping point [at which Bozeman]…becomes a little L.A….yet. It’s not Aspen. It’s not a resort community for rich people. A lot of rich people [live] here, but MSU, as the dominant employer, is really a counter-balance [to prevent Bozeman from] tilting
into just a play land for the rich and the well-off, although God knows, we got a lot of those people here now.

Participant #12 perceived the location of Bozeman in the following way:

It’s a beautiful place to be. Um, it’s a healthy place to be, and it is a good place to raise a family…for my daughters to grow up. It is a healthy place, I think, in terms of…you know, physically, as well as in terms of psychic space…

Participant #1 said, in reference to the location:

I believe that a person should find a place that they like and stay there. That’s part of my whole philosophy that I got sort of validated…I had it all along, [but, the philosophy of] the poet and philosopher Gary Snyder, …the beat poet, the dharma bum guy, ha[s] come through [to me] quite a bit and ha[s] served as…[a] mentor for me, and…[his philosophy] basically said, that, one of the main moral choices a person can make is to stay in a place, and contribute to its community, and that one of the things that cause[s] a decline in society is mobility, where people move for salary….and that’s a big part of academia, where you’re supposed to play your place off against another university, and move for salary….so I found a place that I like, and stay here anyway, even though…it’s not necessarily because of the job security and tenure, it’s something deeper than that. It’s simply, find a place you like, stay there, and contribute to it.

Participant #9 said, “Location’s a big factor. You’ve got to have something to put up with the lack of everything else.” For a detailed description of the location, please refer to Appendix D.

Family. Eighteen of the twenty participants said that family and personal motivators were the major factors affecting their decisions to remain at MSU-Bozeman. Of the two participants that reported family was not a factor in their retention at MSU-Bozeman, one, Participant #17, had no family here at all, and the other, Participant #14, had parents a great distance from Bozeman and a spouse who found it difficult to find employment in the community. Sixteen of the eighteen participants for whom family was a motivating factor had spouses living in Bozeman. Twelve of these participants had spouses who worked in
Bozeman. Six of these same participants had spouses employed by MSU-Bozeman.

Fourteen of the participants who perceived family and personal motivators to have had a reigning significance had children who live, work, and attend school in Bozeman. Participant #15 reported having step-grandchildren in Bozeman.

Participant #8 was the offspring of a retired professor from MSU-Bozeman. His parents lived in Bozeman, and Bozeman was this participant’s home-town. Participant #1 was the offspring of a professor, in the same discipline as he, who retired as department head at his respective university after spending his entire career there. It is highly likely that this was an influential factor in this participant’s lifestyle choices, re. mobility versus a stationary academic career. Participant #13 accepted employment at MSU-Bozeman because of a spouse that wanted to live here. He was divorced at the end of the tenure process. While it is conjecture that this may have been to some extent cause and effect, the participant perceived and expressed that it was. He was unwilling to and/or was under the impression that he was unable to leave MSU-Bozeman as a result of, or in deference to tenure.

Tenure and Job Security. Sixteen of the twenty participants interviewed agreed that tenure and job security were powerful motivating factors for faculty to remain in their positions. Nine of the sixteen participants specifically cited job security as the reigning aspect of tenure that appealed positively to them. Six participants found the freedom afforded by tenure, both socially and academically indispensable. They mentioned freedom of speech, creative freedom, intellectual freedom, and social freedom. Three professors said that they would not have come or stayed at MSU-Bozeman without tenure. One professor said that this participant would not leave without promise of tenure
elsewhere. Three professors referred to protection afforded by tenure for individuals with differing political views. Participant #16 observed that, “…if you did not have tenure and job security… the truth is, you might be gouged because of an ineffectual and corrupt administration.” Three participants did not like the aspect of tenure that allowed professors who were no longer effective to stay in their jobs. Two professors said that they did not like the system in place but did not see a viable alternative to the traditional practice. Participant #16 did not like the system in place and suggested long-term contracts as an alternative. Participant #5 had considered the option of long-term contracts, but felt, in practice it would be less effective than the tenure system that is in place. This professor said:

I object to the notion of periodic tenure. I think that’s much less satisfying. Currently, once you’re tenured there are very few circumstances under which you would be required or asked to leave. You’d have to be guilty of something like violations of moral turpitude. There have been suggestions that you have what’s known as periodic review, or terminal tenure, where… you would essentially get a five year contract, and you would be tenured or contracted for those five years. Then you go through another review at the end of those [years]. While I appreciate the desire for both accountability, and to make sure that people are doing their job, the amount of energy that goes into putting together a tenure portfolio, having external reviewers, of having to put together [records documenting] how much you have done in the last five years, beyond annual review statements, is pretty onerous… It also defeats all purpose of tenure, if tenure was put in place to promote the notion of academic freedom, because then it’s very easy at the end of that five years to say, “Well you’re not really teaching the kind of thing...(then, that can become very political)...that we want taught, therefore you can no longer do that,” and I think that would cause a lot of problems.

Four professors talked about the fact that tenure had the effect of keeping professors in their positions for reasons that were not always positive. For example, Participant #17 explained:
Tenure has a huge impact, and it may not be the impact that you’re thinking of. It is much harder to move to another institution once you are tenured. You may have heard that from some other people. I don’t know if you’re heard that from others, but once you are an associate professor and you have tenure it is a lot harder to move, because, to move they have to at least bring you in as an associate professor, and the expectation is they will bring you in with tenure, and that’s a real commitment to ask a university to make up front. Universities typically make that commitment after they’ve known you for five or six years. So, it’s actually harder to move once you have tenure, and that means it’s more likely that you will remain at your institution, once you get tenure, unless you’re spectacularly productive…or even just very productive. Then it’s a little different.

Four professors said that they would not leave this institution because they were unwilling to put themselves through the tenure process again. Three participants reported that they had achieved tenure at the expense of their marriages. According to them, the process had been so all consuming it had left them without the resources to maintain their family relationships. Participant #13’s spouse had left the area and he was unable to follow as a result of tenure, he said.

Of the four participant’s reporting that tenure was not the motivation for their retention at MSU-Bozeman, all reported that they stayed because of their families. In addition to family, three of these participants reported that location was a motivating factor for them to remain at MSU-Bozeman. One of these participants reported that he stayed, in addition to the aforementioned factors, because he was happy and he could not afford to move due to his low salary at MSU-Bozeman.

Only four of the twenty participants in the study had looked for a job after receiving tenure. None of the four felt tenure was not a motivating reason to stay in their jobs. Two of the four had been motivated to look for alternate positions by life circumstances unrelated to employment. One participant had looked for another job between marriages to
be near a significant other, at that time. This participant expressed having been emotionally motivated. Participant #15 recalled:

In between lives, there was an event and a person that was worth following, and so I thought about doing that, and actually applied for a job, and didn’t get the job….I think I was probably a little out of my mind, not seriously, but I just wanted thinking about it. I think I already knew that I wasn’t going to get anything better than tenure at MSU…

One participant had looked for another job following divorce, in an attempt not to be near the ex-spouse. This decision appeared to have been emotionally motivated, as well.

Participant #18 was motivated to apply for the following jobs:

…the only two jobs I’ve applied for post-tenure…one was a program that had a master’s degree with three other people who specialized in my area of research, and they were looking for a fourth member of a kind of a the team to do…[my specific] research, and so that would have been…it wasn’t more prestigious right now, it was just the opportunity to work with others who were doing exactly what I’m interested in doing, but I didn’t get that, which was fine. And then the other time was last year. There was a job that came open at a larger school in the mid-west, and I would have [had] a lower teaching load [and] better pay than [I have] here, but the big benefit was the education for children [of faculty] that all faculty members would receive—their children would receive free education at, basically, any…[specifically religiously denominational] school in the United States. You know, we were sitting there thinking, …in the future when you have a six and a two-year old, you’re thinking, ”Okay, how much will it cost me in twelve or eighteen years to pay for these educations?” That’s a pretty sizeable benefit, and so, I thought it was at least worth throwing my hat in the ring for that one. I didn’t get that one either, so…that’s fine, too.

Participant #19 reported having looked for another job post-tenure, but not very seriously.

Internal Motivators

Passion for Vocational Activity. All participants enjoyed their vocational activity to one degree or another, but only three participants expressed having a passion for their
activity that motivated them to remain in their jobs. Participant #6 said in response to the question regarding tenure as a motivation for retention:

No. Tenure is nice, but it’s not [the reason I remain in my job]… so it’s not important. What is important is how and what I teach every day, and the growth of the [program], and the [program projects], that’s what’s important to me. If I didn’t have tenure, I would work just as hard as I work now. I have the best job in the world, and I get paid for it. I have to apologize to people for what I do and get paid for it…that’s the way I feel about it.

Participant #7 said:

I do [orchestrate] good [projects]. I’m a good…[professional], and I’m a great teacher, and that’s what gives me…happiness in my job…a lot of other things don’t. That’s what does…because I love what I’m doing, or rather I love most of what I’m doing. I mean… I really love it, really.

Participant #16 said:

I think I’ve given a lot to this university and the…department over many years, …but it was a commitment to…ideas, and it was…a commitment to students, and a great and abiding belief that the purpose of education is to help people find their signature strengths…to nurture and develop them, and to not have a very controlling idea about who or what people should become. That’s my belief in education…on a scale of one to ten, ten being the best, I rate Montana State about a two, as an institution…but I’d rate my own teaching about an eight, and my research/creativity somewhere about the same rank, so it doesn’t matter too much that it’s a deeply flawed institution….at the end of the day, it’s finally about doing work well, pursuing ideas honestly, believing that there is truth, and that the pursuit of it, even to its innermost parts, is a valuable and necessary part of the human condition.

Autonomy of Thought and Action, and Personal Freedom as a Professor. All twenty participants reported experiencing autonomy of thought and action and personal freedom as a professor. All twenty participants perceived it as an important part of their position and necessary to the effectiveness of their performance. Eighteen participants experienced the autonomy and freedom afforded to them in their positions positively. The issue elicited
negative reactions from two professors. Only three professors perceived that autonomy
was a contributing motivation to keep them in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. Seventeen
professors agreed that autonomy of thought and personal freedom as a professor was not
unique to MSU-Bozeman, but was a fundamental facet of academia or higher education
that they would experience at any institution. Participant #14 remarked:

Autonomy of thought and action: As a professor, yeah, it’s very
important. I mean, I don’t know that I could be a professor without that,
actually. I think autonomy of thought and action, and personal freedom
[is] something that [is] present in all universities in the United States. I
don’t think that it’s particular to MSU-Bozeman, so that’s not something
that keeps me here, because I take it for granted that it should done like
that in other universities, as well. I don’t feel like I’m getting something
special here by getting that.

Participant #17, regarding the same subject, said:

As long as your department finds you productive, and useful, and you’re
producing something for the university, you get to pretty much define your
own job, and that’s incredibly rewarding, and it’s the same…I know a lot
of people who wouldn’t leave academia because somebody would tell
them what to do. And we don’t like being told what to do, we like
deciding what we’re going to do. There is a balance. You have to think
about what the institution needs, and you have to find ways to meet those
institutional needs, you may have to convince people there’s an
institutional need for whatever you’re doing, but you do get all of this
autonomy, all of this freedom to define your own job, to go the directions
you want to go in without people reining you in, as long as you are
meeting kinds of basic requirements of your job. I would say that’s a huge
part, not necessarily keeping me at MSU, but keeping me in academia.
And I have to say, also, that the lower the status of the institution, the less
likely that stuff is to come into play. And MSU, because it’s one of
these…it’s not a major university in the United States, but it is a flagship
state university that does serious research, and because of that it is able to
offer faculty that kind of autonomy… If I were at a community college,
they would give me a list of courses to teach, and they might even tell me
what textbooks to use. It would be very different. But MSU can offer
[autonomy, etc.]…to people, and I actually think, that to a large extent this
is what a school like this relies on to keep good faculty here. Even though
salaries aren’t great, the institutional recognition isn’t great, the
infrastructure to support your research isn’t terrific, necessarily, …they act
like a real university, and they treat us like real faculty, and that’s really important.

Two participants offered negative responses regarding autonomy of thought and action and personal freedom as a professor at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #7 expressed dissatisfaction at having no choice regarding assignments of committee service, and felt that many of these assignments were made with either a gender or rank bias.

Participant #16 had different views regarding autonomy of thought and action, and personal freedom as a professor at MSU-Bozeman. Having taught at four other institutions, he had some very specific ideas about what constituted autonomy of thought and personal freedom as a professor. This participant said:

I’m a pretty thick-skinned…[guy], in a lot of ways, …so I don’t think there’s an imposition on my thought and/or action as professor. Nonetheless, it’s very present, and no one should make a mistake, and believe that this is a nurturing environment for free inquiry and diverse thought. The university’s commitment to diversity is an utter sham! It may have some commitment to diversity in the sense that it pays lip service in certain areas and in certain ways to some unique interests and causes, but this is not an inquiring campus where diversity of thought and opinion is supported and nurtured. This is a repressive campus for students, and I know plenty of anecdotes and plenty of students who would attest to that. They get around it, they get around the kind of rote sort of biases that so many faculty display so often, and they succeed, in part because they ignore it, and I think the truth is, I ignore it, as well. Ah, it strikes me that, at least in the arts, the humanities and the social sciences, Montana State University is sorely pressed to call itself a center of free and diverse inquiry.

Rank. Rank was another subject that was almost universally insignificant for the participants of the study, they reported. In contrast to the majority of testimonies, Participant #10 offered a qualified observation:

I’ve been teaching at MSU for thirty-one years. I was tenured… twenty-five years [ago]. I am a full professor. I was department head for thirteen years until two years ago. [Am I affected by]…interpersonal relationships
with coworkers…very little, since I’m not a department head anymore, it doesn’t have any effect. A department head of any department faces interpersonal issues. I always thought there were two things that are a source of—in any department at the university—two things that are a source of tremendous anxiety. One is pay. No matter how laughably small, no matter how small a distance between pay B and C on the faculty, it’s a big source of stress. And secondly, promotion and rank, I think, is part of it. As department head or administrator you have to deal with trying to juggle those positions, because you get to decide what people get paid, and you’re a very influential cog in whether you get promoted or not.

This testimony would indicate that rank does have importance as a measure of job satisfaction. Why the majority of subjective perceptions regarding the issue would conflict with this observation is of interest to the author. Thirteen of the study participants were full professors, three were associate professors, one was an assistant professor, and one was ranked as an instructor, although he has been tenured for thirty years and has taught at MSU-Bozeman for thirty-seven years. Sixteen of the twenty participants reported that rank was neither a negative or positive motivation for their remaining at MSU-Bozeman.

Participant #9 felt that rank “…had nothing to do with anything different in professional relations, but it is that game of…which comes with promotion and tenure and hierarchy in a system that really shouldn’t have a hierarchy.” Participant #3 reiterated this sentiment as the participant stated, “Rank…not at all important, interesting that in Europe there’s one rank, you’re hired and you’re a professor. That seems like a good approach.”

Participant #5, one of the associate professors said, felt rank was unimportant for other reasons. He said:

Rank…actually, not very important. I’ve made some decisions, again, based on some personal issues, about how much I [am] willing to do certain kinds of things, and as a result, once you tenure, you pretty much tenure to an associate, and to go to full, I may or may not choose to do that, in thinking about it, so, the rank is not an issue. You’d probably have to do a lot more publication of a sustained level, and by sustained I mean, probably a book, or maybe two books, and right now that’s not where my
interests lie particularly, so while I remain active in terms of research, and
do present papers, and do write articles, I’m not particularly interested
personally in doing some of the other things.

Participant #2, however, experienced positive feelings in reference to rank, and felt that
it was a factor contributing to his decision to remain at MSU-Bozeman. He said:

I love being a Full Professor. There are only two of us in the department,
maybe three. I don’t know who the third one is though, I do know who
the second one is, …so its kind of cool to be on the top of the pile like
that, but, I don’t think much about it…I’m happy with my rank. I feel
secure, and all that stuff. …For me rank has been great. I’ve been
promoted and things have worked out well. …obviously, if I hadn’t been
promoted, I remember when [I was going through the tenure
process]...when you go through those things, and you’re facing
rejection...those are the only times that I’ve actually looked for other jobs
since I’ve been here, during my review periods, because if they had said
“no”, I think it would have been a decision time...if you’re going to be
rejected by your home institution for whatever reason, then you have to
start facing the question, “Do you really want to be here, too?” …even
though they allow you to stay…I mean once you get the tenure, but they
don’t give you a promotion, although they allow you to stay, (and I
already said it didn’t mean anything to me), …it becomes a personal thing
of...you’re told that you’re not good enough to get a new title. (That
doesn’t mean anything financially, and I don’t know that it means
anything...). I’m a full professor, but I don’t know what it’s ever meant,
except that it’s on paper.

To whatever extent this professor experienced positive emotions and motivation for
retention as a result of his faculty rank, he expressed these sentiments later in the same
interview:

…promotion at MSU is a farce and it’s a joke, and I would just refer us to
the policies at other universities. …I’ll use the University of California
system as an example, that there is assistant, associate, and full, just like
we have here, but when you’re hired at the University of California at any
campus as an assistant professor you’re salary fits within the salary low
and high for that rank, …so you can’t make less or more than the limits,
…so when you go [from assistant to]…associate, …it isn’t like there is an
overlapping of the three [ranks], such that when you get your promotion,
you automatically are entitled to the minimum associate professor salary,
whether it be one thousand dollars more, or fifteen thousand dollars more
than you’re making…and the same for full, once you make full professor.
You can’t be paid less than a certain amount…whereas, at MSU you can move to full professor and get no raise, and get no raise. They just say, “Congratulations!” and they try to make you think you’re special, and as a full professor, I feel privileged, and yet there is no salary connection to your rank at this institution, um, which I think makes it a joke, so…

Participant #7 also experienced rank as a positively motivating factor contributing to job satisfaction. He offered the following response describing his feelings about rank.

Rank …I’m as far as you can go. I’m at the top. …I already had tenure when I went up for full professor, so I didn’t have to go up, but, I got paid so little, and if I went up I was going to get paid about fifteen hundred dollars more a year, and with my small salary as it was, fifteen hundred dollars went a long way in raising my kids. I guess there’s some amount of satisfaction in knowing I’m a full professor.

Only two participants reported negative feelings and demotivation to remain at MSU-Bozeman as a result of rank. One of these, participant #11, is an assistant professor in spite of being hired with a doctoral degree and having taught at MSU-Bozeman for the last twenty-five years. He has been tenured for eighteen years. He commented, “Rank…well, like I say, about three or four hours a semester, it bugs me.” Traditionally, the award of tenure carries with it the promotion in rank from assistant to associate professor. This professor’s doctorate was earned in a different discipline than that in which he teaches. He reflected that, “My Ph.D. is not in…[the discipline I teach], and I’ll never be full professor in…[this discipline] unless I was to really fight that law—really work a lot harder at it than I’m willing to do.”

The other, Participant #6, has been a tenured instructor at MSU-Bozeman for the past 32 years. He said:

Promotion and growth…it’s a real sore spot, but when we start talking about promotion and tenure, the documents that we have are so specific to itemize every little movement, that I feel we’re getting caught in a bean counting situation and that there is not the ability to just do our jobs for the love of doing our jobs and for the desire to do it, well, now, it’s that you
have to do it. These many papers you have to print out...these many products you have to do this, this, and this. It almost reminds me of working in a factory where you have a quota that you have to have, you are working in a sewing factory, you have to make so many curves on this armhole per day, and that I feel is a detriment to being here. It’s something that I can work around, and have chosen to. I do not set my daily goals based upon that document. If what I do happens to fall within our promotion and tenure document, great, fine, but if it doesn’t, that’s too bad, because I have other goals that I wish to accomplish, and I think that’s what I’m doing, which is why I’m still an instructor. I can choose to make decisions that affect me, that are still not going to affect other people, but...there are people on campus who are struggling because of the commotion of documents.

Salary. It has been argued that salary is an external environmental motivator. Herzberg (1959) tagged it as such, and labeled it a ‘dissatisfier’ because he saw it as a factor that more closely defined the work environment than the work itself. Also, since salary is representative of money, and traditionally, in the motivational paradigms of Maslow (1943), and other early motivational theorists, money satisfied lower order needs, salary was considered a lower-order motivator, facilitating satisfaction of lower order needs. As such it was traditionally classified as an external motivator. This categorization has been challenged by more contemporary researchers (Bellot & Tutor, 1990). These authors contend that since the early research was not conducted in the context of higher education and the participants were not professors, this author interprets the effect of salary as a motivator differently. As the responses of the participants’ evidence, salary in this case affected participants’ emotions, sense of achievement and self-actualization, and self-image, which would indicate that salary is: (1) a motivator effectively fulfilling higher order needs, and (2) a motivator effecting the emotional, esteem, and self-realization needs of the participants. In light of this effect, the author has categorized salary as an internal motivator for the purposes of this study. All participants reported perceptions of their
salaries being comparatively low on a national scale. Eighteen participants agreed that salary was not a motivating factor for retention. Eighteen participants agreed that they were not remaining at MSU-Bozeman because of their salary. Participant #14 remarked, “The salary? I have to say that I am staying here despite, in spite of the salary.” Participant #14 went on to report experiencing negative emotions in relation to salary. He reported:

I feel disrespected in regard to the salaries. Because it’s not so much the amount of money we make, which is adequate, it’s not great, but it’s adequate. It’s adequate for me, because I’ve been here for thirteen years, and I bought a home ten years ago, but I would not stay here if my salary was what it is today and I had to buy a house here today. But it’s particularly disconcerting to have this kind of salary because I feel like I’ve been working harder, have more experience, I produce more…and for the last four years, I have actually had no raises, none at all, and everything, insurance and everything costs more, so I feel that I am constantly asked to produce more, but being paid less, and I can actually understand that when the economy is bad that that would be something that would happen, but I feel that, as a faculty member, I haven’t been consulted about it…I haven’t been told, “Would you agree to work more and get paid less so that we can have this university function? I mean, basically, would you agree, you know, to do some volunteer work, basically, for the university?” I think if we had been asked, and if it had been addressed on a regular basis, that we do deserve just a cost of living increase, it would have to be more than that, and that we’re not getting it, I think a lot of the faculty members would feel better, including me. I know a lot of faculty members, who are in the job market, and want to get out of here and they love working here, but they just cannot make ends meet on the salaries. So, it’s a really important point.

Participant #1 remarked, “…from a professional standpoint, [it’s]…a little bit insulting, [it] say[s], ‘We really value you, but not financially.’

Participant #3 reported:

Um, I’ve kind of looked [for another position], yes, I haven’t looked real hard, but there have been times when I felt that I should go elsewhere, largely because it’s the only way to get a raise in my business, but, um, one of the things that is a factor in staying here is the fact that my…[spouse] is employed here, no matter how minimally, it was difficult
to find a situation in which both of us could be hired, and in going elsewhere, we wouldn’t have that situation once again to look in the face. It would be very difficult and I don’t know that it’s a possibility. One of us would have to find a really good job and the other find something in the community as a…teacher, even in a college, you’re not going to make enough money to support a family anymore…

This professor’s situation is a graphic illustration of the interrelatedness of motivators, both external environmental and personal, affecting retention. This also illustrates the manner in which lower order needs (food, shelter, safety, and sex) interrelate to, affect, and compete with higher order needs (love, self realization).

Participant #9 pointed out how salary has contributed to retention at MSU-Bozeman in a negative light creating extremely negative emotions of anxiety, frustration, anger, and stress. These emotions are extremely destructive and detrimental to productivity and emotional and physical health, according to motivational and psychological studies regarding emotions and motivation (Franken, 2000). Participant #9 described salary as, “Ludicrous!” He said, “Salary is nothing. This is so depressed, we’re forty thousand dollars under the average salary for my position around the country.” He went on to expound:

… I stayed in the beginning, and then we get back to the thing, after you’ve been here, if you’re really worried about what makes you stay here, ah…then the economic depression part becomes a thing where you can’t afford to leave. No, it’s the truth. And it also goes with the thing that, the older you get, why should anybody else hire you, because they can get somebody right out of school with no background and pay less. All right, now this university has gone through the thing …[in which] they are finally facing the fact that in some departments they are having to hire people right in the beginning and pay them more than the department head. It’s just barely catching up to this university, but that’s how suppressed, depressed, compressed is the best word, that the salary structure of this place has been, and what a ludicrous system they’ve worked on here, and I’m totally amazed that the whole thing hasn’t just dissolved. There still is this school…at Missoula and…it’s amazing. Because they have outreached/outgrown the thing of, well, ten thousand of
your salary is the priceless-ness of living in Bozeman. That’s no longer applicable.

Here, this professor attempts to refute the widespread perception that it is implicit that those who want to live and work in this state/geographic location must accept substantially lower salaries than they would demand in many other areas. In short, he says he is staying at MSU-Bozeman because he cannot afford to move due to his low salary.

Participants reported varying degrees of motivation, satisfaction, and dissatisfaction as a result of salary. Respondents also reported salary as generating both positive and negative emotions dependent upon causal conditions and the context within which salary was discussed. For example, although initially Participant #11 remarked:

Salary…well, you know, we’re underpaid, and certainly across…when compared to other institutions, ah, around the country…there’s a theory in psychology and in business called the equity theory…and basically you’re satisfied in your job position as long as you feel that you are being treated equitably. Well, all the professors that have been hired in the [my department] since I’ve been hired, especially the last four or five years, have salaries 20 to 25 percent above mine…and that’s what we had to pay to get them here. So they are working less than I am because they have off-loads to do research, and they’re getting paid 25 percent more. Furthermore, the full professors are getting paid 50 percent more than I am. So there’s a time, about two or three hours every semester or so, I start thinking about my salary. And sometime I actually go and do something about it.

Later, in the same discussion, in a contrasting context, he commented:

…but I feel very fortunate. One [reason], is I’m a…[ethnic background and gender]… with a Ph.D., and I come from very modest farming backgrounds in [home state], and so whenever I’m off the record I am very gracious and have a great deal of gratitude to the citizens of the State of Montana for paying me as well as they do.

Participant #10 noted that faculty salaries were higher than the average income in Montana. Participants #16 and #17 were the more optimistic of the professors regarding
salary. Although Participant #16 reported being motivated, neither, to stay, or, to leave MSU-Bozeman in reaction to salary, he offered an insightful analysis:

…my salary is probably, for someone of my rank and years of experience, my salary is probably fifteen to twenty-thousand dollars a year less than it would be, say had I stayed at the University of Texas, or went to some sort of other peer institution. It doesn’t particularly bother me—I mean, I think, in truth the salary issue is over-played a lot. I mean, your economic needs have so much to do—when did you move here, how much did you invest in your house, what is your mortgage payment, do you have children, are you saving for their college? You know, it’s a very great thing. It doesn’t matter much to me, in terms of staying here, but it is low, and there’s not doubt it’s low. But how to get really valid comparisons…I mean, compare what? If I want to go teach at San Francisco State, well, I mean, if I’m paid fifteen thousand dollars a year more, does that mean I can buy an equivalent property in San Francisco? No. You know, I mean all kinds of things…so it’s very complicated, and by and large, the attempt may be to use these comparative and peer figures, and so forth, but they generalize out so much, that there’s really very little specific validity in them…but that’s not a big issue [determining]…whether I stay here, or not.

Participant #17 said:

I make enough money—I don’t make a lot of money—but I make enough money to live on, and I will say that the cost of living, although I know that Bozeman seems expensive to people who are Montanans…Bozeman is so cheap to live in. I’ve lived San Francisco, Washington DC, Philadelphia…um, I have friends who live around the country. On my salary…I have a really nice quality of life here, so the salary here is adequate.

Participant #2 added an appreciation of the availability of opportunities due to geographic location and culture of the area:

I’ve got other things going on besides salary that kept me here…and the life-style issue, I think a lot of people might tend to refer to life-style, it is true for me as well. I take advantage of the things that are available to this area, and I do see it as the last frontier.

In contrast, there were two participants that felt that their salary alone was a motivation to remain at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #4 is a tenured full professor with a master’s
degree. This professor felt that “having a university position, in general, provides…a great deal of security, and yeah, that motivates me to stay at MSU.” Participant #19 had been promoted to a position in central administration within the past year. It should be noted that, although this type of promotion within the institution is available for application by all professors, it is rare that a professor will be hired from within the institution. This promotion is exceptional and indicative of an exceptional candidate for the position. This participant is a full professor with a doctorate who has taught at MSU-Bozeman for the past sixteen years, having been tenured the last nine, and as such, fulfills the criteria for the study. He remarked that:

Salary had been a problem when I was an assistant professor, and I kept getting floor raises, so I was always on the salary floor for my particular rank. Job security is great, that’s a good motivating factor, um, and my salary now is fine, so that will help to keep me here.

External Environmental Motivators

These motivators were categorized by Herzberg in 1959 as ‘dissatisfiers’ because they more closely defined the external environment of the work, rather than the work itself.

Institutional Reputation. Eighteen of the twenty participants reported that institutional reputation affected them not at all, neither positively nor negatively. Only one participant felt that the reputation of MSU-Bozeman appeared as a positive motivator for remaining in his position at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #2 responded by saying:

Absolutely, um, you know based on my background and where I went to school and what my aspirations were I would have thought that I would have stayed at M.S.U. or at U. of M., but I wouldn’t have stayed at any of the other institutions, not to berate them, just personal goals.” In reference to the same subject, Participant #11 commented, “I like to think that I add reputation to Montana State University. And one of the things that’s nice
about Montana, is there are so few of us, that you can have an impact, and I am proud to tell people that I belong to Montana State University.

The “pride” this participant experienced in relationship to the institutional reputation of MSU-Bozeman and his affiliation with it would indicate that institutional reputation was a positive motivating factor contributing to his retention at MSU-Bozeman.

**Working Conditions.** In discussing working conditions, a lower order external environmental motivator, participants had widely varying responses. One participant viewed working conditions as one of the major contributing factors behind his motivation to remain at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #14 said:

> Working conditions: Um, I’m not sure what you mean by that. You mean like office space…okay…I love. Actually, it may sound really weird, but my office space means a lot to me. I have a beautiful office, I have big windows, and it means so much to me that actually when I came to MSU-Bozeman, the only place I would have liked to live beside Bozeman would have been the Bay area. After two years of a job here, I applied for a job in the Bay area, and I was offered a position in San Francisco, and when I was… I remembered that the faculty offices were tiny, and had no windows, and I just…I was torn. I couldn’t decide whether I was going to accept that position or stay here. I was really torn in half, and I remember negotiating with that university saying, “Can you get me an office with a window? I cannot imagine spending the next twenty years of my life (because I work in my office) in a window-less office.” And they were saying, “Oh, it would be hard for me, for us to offer you one since we have faculty members who have been working for twenty years here and don’t have one.” So, it’s strange, but I think that was one of the reasons I decided not to take that job, and it was actually $10,000 more a year pay than it was here and as much of a teaching load, so it was comparable. But it is very important for me to have a pleasant office—pleasant just means with windows and quiet enough where I could work.

Seven participants perceived working conditions as good, and although not a motivation to remain in itself, a positive motivating factor, in that the working conditions created positive emotions and did not impede the participant’s ability to carry out their duties in any way. Participant #17 commented, “Working conditions…working conditions
here are fine, but I don’t know that they vary that much from what they would be at another institution, so I don’t know that that’s a strong factor.” Two participants were apathetic about working conditions and said that they affected them not at all. Nine participants said that working conditions were acceptable, but reported an inadequacy in their working conditions. Inadequacies varied and reflected disparities in funding between departments and differences in building age housing the departments. Different participants focused on different facets of inadequacies depending upon department, and at times, personal preferences and needs. No participant perceived working conditions as a reason to leave his/her position at MSU-Bozeman.

Inadequacies reported by participants included inadequate space, inadequate or faulty equipment, insufficient technical and clerical support, problems with the age and quality of facilities, inadequate heat, and inadequate library and sabbatical systems. One participant felt that the institutions working conditions were inadequate as a result of skewed policy priorities on campus. He perceived that the parking facility and system took deference over academic working conditions. This perception generated negative emotions. Participant #9 commented:

Working conditions…my working conditions aren’t bad, except for that foolish parking system that functions better than the rest of the university. There’s been, I swear, more time, more man hours, more money per capita, let’s say, in what goes into giving out parking tickets; in ratio, there’s more to that than what goes into running the university and all the aspects of keeping it a viable institution…oh yeah, I mean, that’s the only thing that functions at full speed, as far as I’m concerned…which is a reflection upon the school.

Competence of Colleagues. Competence of colleagues was an external environmental motivator that was often interrelated to and confused with interpersonal relationships with
Six participants reported positive feelings about the competence of their colleagues. Participant #8 defined the importance of competence of colleagues:

Competence of colleagues…that competence of colleagues is very critical, and I’m always excited by interacting with colleagues and learning what they’re doing and learning about their training and their approach and how they’re interacting with students and what kinds of things they’re accomplishing in research and service. I think it’s a very important part and really critical to be…and helpful to be surrounded by high-quality engaged people.

Not all participants perceived competence of colleagues as integral to their performance. They described competence of colleagues as “stimulating,” “motivating,” “stimulating to productivity,” and a source of “satisfaction.” Competence of colleagues appeared in the higher order needs, as it may affect self-esteem, ability to self-realize, and emotional equilibrium. As described by Participants #2 and #3, incompetent colleagues could present themselves as sources of negative emotions, such as anxiety, frustration, poor self-esteem, and general cognitive dissonance. Since it also affected the individual’s work, it was connected to lower order needs. Participants #2 and #3 commented on this aspect of the issue. Participant #2 said:

Competence of colleagues…I think it’s always a factor, um, I don’t know, college professors are a different type of persons generally, uh, being, all of us in our own world to some sense because we have our own specialty fields, it’s always good to have competent coworkers, um, generally I feel that most of my coworkers do a quite a good job…that’s not universal in a sense that I don’t feel that way it bothers me, [it bothers me] because it affects the program’s delivery and credibility, so, that’s it on that one. Usually, by the time you figure this out they’re already tenured so they’re here forever if they choose to be, you know, and nobody likes to hear, just, chi-chat that certain parts of the program are not very good while you’re part of the program doing your part.

Participant #3 confirmed this aspect of the importance of competent colleagues:

Competence of colleagues…that’s a good question. I don’t know that that has a lot to do with it, except that there are a couple of people in my
department that don’t do what they’re supposed to do, and they’re a frustration, but most of the people are very competent and enjoyable to work with. To a certain extent, I guess I stay because of them.

With the exception of one professor, no participants reported that competence of colleagues motivated them positively or negatively to leave their job. For example, Participant #1 explained, “If I hadn’t had that, I probably would have stayed here anyway because I like fishing, but I wouldn’t have been as stimulated to be as productive as I’ve been.”

The participants in general, however, did report that competence of colleagues was an important aspect of the work environment. Participant #16 was the one professor who perceived competence of colleagues as representative of a facet of the participant’s employment presenting a potential motivating reason to remain in, or leave his position. He commented:

Competence of colleagues: I think it varies a great deal at Montana State. I think one of the real realities of Montana State, is it has some very good faculty, and some marginal faculty, and this is probably true, ah, in almost every department on campus, although I think there are some campus departments which may be uniformly stronger. I think in the arts, the humanities, and the social sciences—from my perspective, and I’ve been at four universities—it’s a much more mixed bag. I think that mixture is not positive. I don’t think it’s [a] positive [influence] on one’s career, and I think, if I would say I see flaws at MSU, and elements that would make me consider leaving here, it would be the inability of the university on the whole to uphold standards of teaching/research/creativity and to differentiate marginal or inadequate performance from that which meets expectations or goes beyond. So that is my read on that.

This reported cross-institutional variation coupled with subjective perceptions of competence in colleagues accounted for the difference in reports regarding the competence of colleagues. Participants in the study reported diametrically opposed experiences with and perceptions of the competence of colleagues. Personal outlook also reflected upon the
perception of participants. Participants that tended to be optimistic and positive experienced their surroundings in a different way than those that tended to be pessimistic. Participant #20 reported, “Ah, in terms of competence of colleagues, my colleagues in administration are fantastic—my colleagues in the faculty are great, too, and I’m constantly humbled by the qualifications of… especially new faculty that who get hired here.”

Interpersonal Relationships with Co-Workers. ‘Interpersonal relationships with co-workers’ was an external environmental aspect of employment that affected the satisfaction of both lower and higher order needs. It was interrelated to competence of colleagues and tenure, rank, promotion, and salary, in that these four factors are affected by interpersonal relationships with co-workers. This was attested to by Participant #10, as he observed:

I’ve been teaching at MSU for thirty-one years. I was tenured…thirty-one minus six is twenty-seven years…okay…no, wait, twenty-five years. I am a full professor. I was department head for thirteen years until two years ago…[To what degree do] Interpersonal relationships with coworkers [affect my motivation to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman]…very little…since I’m not a department head anymore, it doesn’t have any effect. A department head of any department has interpersonal issues. I always thought there were two things that are a source of—these two things that are a source of tremendous anxiety. One is pay. No matter how laughably small, no matter how small a distance between pay B and C on the faculty, it’s a big source of stress. And secondly, promotion and rank, I think, is part of it. As department head or administrator you have to deal with trying to juggle those positions, because you get to decide what people get paid, and you’re a very influential cog in whether they get promoted or not.

Further, Participant #1 felt that interpersonal relationships with co-workers were often misused or abused by faculty for personal gain. This professor expressed the negative emotions he experienced as a result of the tendency when this participant reflected:

Interpersonal relationships with co-workers may come close to balancing each other out because over the years I’ve had very negative feelings about some of my colleagues, but others I’ve gotten along with fairly
Well...[however]...that’s probably one thing that truly irks me, though, I look at the way that some of my colleagues have gotten rank and promotion and salary over the years and I’ve noticed one draw-back to the chair system is that the department makes those decisions on the departmental advisory council as far as salary goes, and basically, the people on the council over the years (and I’ve been on it too), I’ve noticed a propensity for people there to feather their own nests and put down people who aren’t on the council...it’s not supposed to be that way, but it is, and the department’s sort of legitimized that recently by saying it was within our departmental guidelines for people on the council to take their own case before the council that’s it’s on, and complain if they don’t feel they’ve been treated fairly, so people on the departmental advisory council have an advantage, and it seems that over the years the same people try to get on it, and they have published less, in general, than people who aren’t on it, but done better, so, I’ve gone into that long-winded thing because if anything drove me away from a place like this, it might be that tendency to see that people get rewarded more for maneuvering on committees than for doing the actual things that we’re supposed to do according to the faculty handbook.

Eighteen of the twenty participants reported that although interpersonal relationships with co-workers were important, they were not the determining factor governing their retention as faculty members at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #2 and Participant #13 reported that they avoided interpersonal relationships with coworkers because they were potentially destructive, possibly becoming sources of contention and negative feelings. Participant #2 said:

Interpersonal relationships with coworkers...oh, I’d say [their effect is] marginal, I always enjoy positive relationships with my coworkers, that’s not always the case, um, but it doesn’t make me want to leave. I’d imagine that if you had a supervisor who was a real jerk... that could make you want to leave, because they tend to make your life miserable, but that hasn’t been the case.

This supposition was illustrated graphically by the response of Participant #20 when asked about the effect of interpersonal relationships with co-workers. He felt positive about every aspect of the faculty tenure experience at MSU-Bozeman, with the exception of this one. This participant experienced such an extreme degree of dissatisfaction as the
result of an interpersonal relationship with a co-worker/supervisor that he was motivated to leave MSU-Bozeman after a sixteen-year career. Participant #20 reported:

I think that my department head is condescending and paternalistic and arrogant and I don’t feel that...although...[he] has...I don’t trust [him], although at times...[he] has done things that have been very helpful to me, for which I am grateful, ...I don’t owe [him] loyalty for the rest of my life. [He] has also done things that have been very damaging to me, that are inappropriate... Well, I have to live with it, and I’ve been content to live with it, because like I said, the good has out-weighed the bad—the job security, and the beautiful place to live, and the great colleagues to work with.... I’m ready to move on. It may be selfish, but I’m not...I don’t want to fight it out anymore... What are we going to do? Are we going to wait for them to die or retire? I don’t want to...I’m just going to get out!

The foregoing scenario is a graphic illustration of the kind of emotional motivation referred to in Goleman’s research about “destructive emotions” (1997, 2002). In the foregoing scenario, a “goal-incongruent” emotion has taken precedence over the positive motivators of working conditions, salary, tenure, promotion, rank, competent colleagues, and good interpersonal relationships with other colleagues, among other things, to remain in a faculty position at MSU-Bozeman. The negative emotion has motivated him to sacrifice all the tangible and intangible positive aspects of faculty employment at MSU-Bozeman that serve to satisfy both his higher and lower order needs and those of his family. The participant was motivated to sacrifice all the benefits that he had worked for years to secure, in deference to a negative emotion. This action is irrational, and according to Daniel Goleman, can be managed by learning techniques for emotion management or developing “emotional intelligence” (Goleman, 2002). This participant’s experience serves as evidence to support Goleman’s theories about motivating emotions (2002). When used as evidence to support the hypothesis behind Herzberg’s (1959) theory of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the workplace, Goleman’s response serves to point out that, in
contradiction to Herzberg’s assertion that dissatisfaction can never motivate, only
dissatisfy, he was, in fact, motivated to quit a successful career as a tenured full professor at
MSU-Bozeman in response to dissatisfaction. When evaluated through Maslow’s
hierarchy, this participant was motivated to quit a job that satisfied all of his higher and
lower order needs in deference to a negative emotion. This confirms the contention of
researchers who believe that we cannot think about emotions without considering
motivation and that we cannot think about motivation without considering emotion (Frijda,
1988).

Only one participant in the study reported that ‘interpersonal relationships with co-
workers’ was one of the primary motivators for his retention at MSU-Bozeman.
Participant #14 said:

‘Interpersonal relations with coworkers’ is so important to me. When I
interviewed for the job, actually I told the committee…I told them that I
needed supportive relationships with my coworkers, and that if this
department was not an environment like that, it did not have support, if
this department was actually fighting, if the professors were fighting
among themselves, I told them that they should not hire me, because I
would not be happy, so that is really important to me, because when I was
a grad. student and an undergrad., I saw that faculty members could really
make their lives absolutely miserable. I function, and I thrive with
supportive…in a supportive environment. This environment has been
extremely supportive. It has…I mean my coworkers have met and way
exceeded my expectations of support.

The remaining participants in the study felt that ‘interpersonal relationships with
coworkers’was a positive factor, and although it did not serve as the primary motivation for
them to remain in their jobs, it was a contributing factor and a source of satisfaction.

**Student Quality.** Student quality was another external environmental motivator.
Student quality was not a motivating factor for eighteen of the twenty participants in the
study to remain in their jobs. Eleven of the participants felt positive about the quality of students, but felt that the quality of students at MSU-Bozeman was as good as, or comparable to, the student quality a professor would encounter at any institution of higher education. In light of this perception, student quality did not represent a reason for these participants to remain at MSU-Bozeman. Four participants were disappointed with the quality of students. Participant #19 said:

Quality of students is of concern to me. I probably wouldn’t have gone into administration if I’d had the kind of quality students that I wanted, because part of the frustration with teaching has been the lack of quality of some of the students. We have a great range here at MSU, from excellent students to very marginal students, and the marginal students do cause frustration for faculty members, including myself.

Participant #5 felt that the quality of the student at MSU-Bozeman was inferior because many of the students came from lower middle class backgrounds and had to work.

One of the difficulties, and I’m not, trying to…[argue] with people, but a lot of students get so caught up in having to keep their job that they lose focus of why they have the job, in other words, if the job is to get you through school, it doesn’t do you any good to get through school and not learn the things you need to learn because you’re too busy working. I know that there’s a monetary value to a degree and an educational value to what you learn, and sometimes they get a little confused I think.

Participant #15 said that student quality was a primary motivator for him to remain at MSU-Bozeman, and not particularly because the quality was so good, but because it was unique, and it enabled him to make a contribution he perceived as meaningful. Participant #15 explained:

Quality of students: Um, the students are a reason to stay. I wouldn’t say necessarily the quality, although we have good students here, and actually in addition to…aside from the quality of the students, I actually have a philosophical commitment to teaching students at a state university like this. I went to elite private schools as an undergraduate, and as a graduate student. You can get a fabulous education in those places, but very few people get to get such an education, and so I actually am very committed
to bringing the very best quality education you can to MSU students who are more likely to be from the state or from this region, less likely to have even thought about going to one of the top colleges or universities…and that’s actually a reason to stay, because I could probably go elsewhere, but I would not be teaching students who may be the first one in their family to go to college. A college degree really matters to these students, and I like teaching to students to whom a college degree is not something they take for granted. So that’s probably a fairly important factor that keeps me around here.

*Style of Leadership and Supervision.* Although participants had a broad range of opinions and diverse reactions regarding style of leadership and supervision, no participants perceived this facet of their job as a motivating factor in their retention. Six of the participants liked the style of leadership and supervision. Participants addressed differing levels of leadership and supervision within the institution. Participants were often vague in their references and responses regarding leadership and supervision and most seemed minimally informed, if not somewhat apathetic. For example, eight participants were optimistic about the direction in which leadership and supervision were evolving, but qualified these comments by stating that it had no bearing on their decision to remain. Participant #5 felt that there had been too much turnover in the principle central leadership positions within the last ten years for the leadership to have been effective. Participant #6 noted that there had been a lot of change, and this participant expected that more change was impending. This participant, however, remarked, “…and change is not bad.” One characteristic that participants had was a tendency to be optimistic in their outlook and projection for the future. Participants predominantly responded with remarks such as “it’s getting better,” and “it’s going to be okay.” Participants #3, #9 and #16 were negative about the style of leadership and supervision. Participant #3 said:
Style of leadership and supervision—I’ve been fairly involved in faculty governance recently, for the last ten years, probably. I’m the person responsible for writing the new faculty council constitution and professional council constitution, organizing the supposed campus governance, and of course, we don’t have much to say about governance at all. With the newest president, it looks like we may have something more to offer and actually be listened to…we always had the perception we were really being listened to in the past, but I don’t think that’s always true. Over the last five or six years it’s pretty obvious that there’s been some poor fiscal management. Putting together the budgets each year has not been run very well, so the last three or four years, the set of vice presidents we have had were mostly temporary, not very good managers…they managed to fritter away money so that we haven’t even seen any faculty raises for a couple of years just because that’s what they considered the least important…paying the faculty. So if I were to plan to go anywhere else, it would probably be because of the leadership and supervision at MSU.

Participant #9 was not positive about the style of leadership and supervision, but was not descriptive or specific about his dissatisfaction. Participant #16 said:

Style of leadership and supervision: Well, I guess that’s already been said. I think it’s bad, and I really think that the terms I would use is—the way this university is run and administered cannot serve the legitimate interests of tuition payers or taxpayers. Okay. It is a black hole.

Participant #20 reported extreme dissatisfaction with the style of leadership and supervision at MSU-Bozeman, although the dissatisfaction reported here was a product of problems and isolated experiences and events evolving around his with his department head, rather than a pervasive style seen throughout the institution.

Governing Policies and Administration. All twenty participants reported that governing policies and administration had no affect whatsoever on their motivation to remain at MSU-Bozeman. Fifteen participants expressed feelings of frustration when confronted with the issue. Eleven participants were not aware or informed regarding governing policies and administration. Participant #6 attributed the longevity of his tenure to the fact
that he avoids involvement of any kind with the governing process, policies, or administration. Participant #11 reported governing policies and administration at MSU-Bozeman were “not extraordinary,” and that the policies were “pretty standard boiler plate policies” executed in an institution built on the “classic pyramid structure” of administration. Four participants perceived that governing policies and administration did not affect them. Participant #13 reported consciously “ignoring governing policies.” Three participants reported having been involved with the governing process in the past. They all felt that their contributions had been a waste of time and that they were powerless to invoke change in this area. Two participants focused on the high turnover in governing administration at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #2 described the history of governing administration at MSU-Bozeman over the past decade in the following way:

Regarding governing policies and administration…they obviously work from policies, so, I’m not really sure that everybody operates at their own level. The regents operate at their level, and they perceive what’s going on, which might or might not be accurate, and then you’ve got Montana Hall doing the same thing, trying to relate up to the regents and the legislature, and down to the colleges and the deans, and then you’ve got the deans who are either attached or detached from reality, and then the faculty, and at times it seems like all of that can just go on and on and you just keep doing the same things down here, and they all talk about how they’re restructuring this and restructuring that and making it better, and we all do the same thing with the presidents, so we have a lot of turnover, I mean if you look at the history of MSU recently, Malone dying, and all the interims, and we finally have a president after a long time, but he comes in with an acting Provost and before that, there was a Provost who stayed here two years, took the place of another actor who took the place of another actor, and so your top leadership…there’s a big vacuum in place that will take years [to fill] because presidents…the new president’s training while they’re hiring a new Provost [who needs] a couple of years to get a grip, and it will be years and years from now ‘till anybody really gets a handle on what’s going on at MSU…so…that’s where it is…and so just about anything can keep on happening, or not happening, nobody knows.
Five participants were optimistic about governing policies and administration under the new president. Six participants reported extremely negative feelings about the governing policies and administration at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #1 felt that inadequacies in the governing policies and administration should be attributed to the state. In his perception, problems in governing policies and administration “came basically from a state that considers higher education more the enemy than something to be valued.” In his opinion, his perception is evidenced as a phenomenon that “you can see…in the decisions by the legislature.” Of the two participants expressing the most negative sentiments regarding governing policies and administration at MSU-Bozeman, Participant #15 said that he had participated in faculty council for two or three terms and that “it was a joke!” He continued by observing:

…it’s representation that’s fairly equitable, but not governance, really. I don’t think we have a chance to…I don’t think we have much of a say. I may be wrong now, and haven’t been involved lately, but that’s what I think.

Participant #16 expressed the following sentiments regarding the governing policies and administration at MSU-Bozeman:

Governing policies…the university, quite frankly, simply ignores the governing policies it doesn’t like. It simply bends most to its own whim of particular administrators, and, ah, it’s actually…this is a very mal-governed university. And again, I say that on the basis of comparison, having been at four other universities, and also, being in professional organizations and having other contacts. This [institution] is mal-administered and mal-governed as a university. The administration, unlike the students who have improved, the administration has gone almost year by year, downhill….when I came to Montana State the [central administration] were wonderfully talented men, very committed to education and ideas, and if you compare the present administration of 2004, you have something that is light-years away from that quality and that commitment to educational ideas. The administration of this university, in my view, is grossly corrupt, ah, ineffectual, ah… except
insofar as they wish to manipulate things to their own rather silly ideas. So I am very negative about the administration of this university.

Only one participant voiced grievances against the governing policies and administration of the university that were more extreme than these. The grievances Participant #20 expressed were more appropriately categorized as dissatisfaction resulting from an interpersonal relationship with a coworker. The problems occurred within the context of a relationship between him and his department head. The views he expressed were not representative of governing policies and administration across the institution, but of isolate incidents and interpersonal problems between him and his department head.

**Opportunity for Achievement and Recognition.** All participants reported that opportunity for achievement and recognition were not their motivating factors for remaining at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #1 remarked that, “…because of its [MSU-Bozeman’s] low population and its low priority for higher education, I think that a person here just automatically has to look for other…[sources of satisfaction] besides being rewarded for their achievements.” Six participants felt that, since achievement and recognition at MSU-Bozeman represented no monetary advantage, there was little or no motivation to remain in their positions out of consideration for opportunities for achievement and recognition. Three participants in twenty perceived that there were opportunities and recognition afforded them as a product of being tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman.

Participant #20 expressed intentions to leave MSU-Bozeman despite what he perceived as plenty of opportunity to achieve and be recognized as a motivating factor behind the his tenure at MSU-Bozeman. The motivating power of problems encountered by him as a
result of an interpersonal relationship with his supervisor took precedence over a position offering all the opportunity he described. Three participants said they had created their own opportunities for achievement and recognition. One of these participants said, that, in spite of his personal prowess in this area, MSU-Bozeman had neither afforded him these opportunities, and had become a great source of frustration as he manufactured these opportunities independently. Participant #17 said these opportunities motivated him to remain in higher education, but not specifically in a position at MSU-Bozeman. He did qualify the response, and allowed that, MSU-Bozeman did not prevent professors from taking advantage of opportunities of this type available to faculty in higher education, and to a degree, even facilitated them more than some institutions would. He said:

I would say that’s a huge part [motivation]—not necessarily keeping me at MSU—but keeping me in academia. And I have to say, also, that the lower the status of the institution, the less likely that stuff [opportunities for achievement and recognition] is to come into play. And MSU, because it’s one of these…it’s not a major university in the United States, but it is a flagship state university that does serious research, and because of that, it is able to offer faculty that kind of autonomy…if I were at a community college, they would give me a list of courses to teach and they might even tell me what textbooks to use. It would be very different. But MSU can offer that to people, and I actually think, that to a large extent this is what a school like this relies on to keep good faculty here. …even though salaries aren’t great, the institutional recognition isn’t great, the infrastructure to support your research isn’t terrific, necessarily, … they act like a real university, and they treat us like real faculty, and that’s really important.

Participant #15 had a diametrically opposed perception of what Participant #17 described. He felt that opportunity for achievement and recognition “was kind of limited…because of the strong teaching commitment required,” and “although it seemed like [this participant] got access to things that [the participant] wouldn’t own…[and that]
that could increase possibilities for [the participant], …it didn’t really work that way very well.

Participants #6 and #7 both said that opportunity for achievement and recognition motivated them not at all to remain in their positions, as they were looking for opportunities for achievement and recognition for their students, their departments, and their institution, but not for themselves.

**Opportunity for Promotion and Growth.** Participants were in unanimous agreement that opportunities for promotion and growth were not a motivating factor for their tenure. Participant #1 said, “…if anything drove me away from a place like this, it might be that tendency to see that people get rewarded more for maneuvering on committees than for doing the actual things that we’re supposed to do according to the faculty handbook.” Two participants, including Participant #1, went on to say that they thought opportunities for promotion and growth at other universities were no different than those offered at MSU-Bozeman. Eighteen of the twenty participants expressed varying degrees of dissatisfaction with the opportunities for promotion and growth. Two participants said teaching loads for assistant and associate professors were too heavy to facilitate promotion and growth. Participant #10 said:

For an assistant professor at MSU, at least in this college, (I can’t speak for the other ones) the teaching load is much too heavy compared to the expectations to do publishing and do research, and the pay scale is way too low given those expectations. It is very hard, at least in the areas I’m familiar with, to recruit, hire, and retain quality faculty at the assistant level. We’ve lost a lot of good people at the lower levels. We don’t pay them enough, we work them too hard, we expect too much from them. They go someplace else.
Participant #4 was disillusioned at the lack of funds for professional development. Two participants felt the system for promotion and growth was so inefficient and detrimental to their performance and emotional equilibrium that they chose not to engage in it. As a result of these choices, although both are tenured, one has remained an instructor for 32 years, and the other an associate professor for 25. Two participants did not like the system, but admittedly did not have a better idea. Participant #9 saw the system in place for promotion and growth as a “negative situation” and noted that the inefficiency of the system, if used in the private sector “would cause industry to go bankrupt.” Two participants felt that the opportunities for promotion and growth at MSU-Bozeman were “unfair.” Participants #1, #2, and #14 felt that opportunities for promotion and growth were not equitably reflected by salary increases or monetary compensation, and as such meant nothing. Participant #1 perceived promotion without salary increase to be “insulting.” Participant #2 described the discrepancies in the system as follows:

…promotion at MSU is a farce and it’s a joke, and I would just refer us to the policies at other universities, and I’ll use the University of California system as an example, that there is assistant, associate, and full, just like we have here, but when you’re hired at the University of California at any campus as an assistant professor, your salary fits within the salary low and high for that rank, and so you can’t make less or more than the limits, and so, when you go, and then the next level is associate, but it isn’t like there is an overlapping of the three, such that when you get your promotion, you automatically are entitled to the minimum associate professor salary, whether it be one thousand dollars more, or fifteen thousand dollars more than you’re making…and the same for full, once you make full professor, you can’t be paid less than a certain amount…whereas, at MSU you can move to full professor and get no raise…and get no raise. They just say, “Congratulations!” and they try to make you think you’re special, and as a full professor, I feel privileged, and yet there is no salary connection to your rank at this institution, which I think makes it a joke…
Two participants felt that there was “plenty of opportunity” for promotion and growth at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #19 was one of these participants, and he had been recently promoted to an administrative position. The other responses were not made in consideration of promotion and growth to administrative positions, but rather, within the respective disciplines of the participants.

Unanticipated Emergent Themes as Motivators

Sense of Responsibility. Fifteen of the twenty participants exhibited a sense of responsibility as motivation for their retention. Fourteen of the participants evidenced a motivating sense of responsibility in relation to their families. One of these participants expressed a sense of responsibility to MSU-Bozeman in addition to the responsibility he felt for his family. One participant expressed a sense of responsibility to the students he taught. This sense of responsibility appeared frequently to involve family and personal emotional needs of the participants. It appeared to be generated as a product of both emotion and intellect, in which case it may reflect to one degree or another personal philosophy and/or ideology. The sense of responsibility seemed to have foundations in both the lower and higher echelons of Maslow’s needs hierarchy. It may find its roots in the physiological, safety, emotional, and self-actualization needs. It seemed to reflect intellectual decisions made by the participants, as well.

Evidencing a sense of responsibility in reference to his family, Participant #3 said:

I’ve stayed here for my children being born and raised and my son, now a freshman in college, not here, my daughter didn’t go here either, but this is a wonderful place to raise the kids and we like Montana a lot and just in that situation…public schools in Bozeman have been very good, and very supportive of our kids, they’ve done extremely well academically and been able to pretty much write their tickets when they’ve gone away, so
that’s had something to do with it. I’m involved in the Boy Scout Program, and I’m still involved in it even though my son is out of it, in fact, he’s involved, too, so in fact this weekend we’re both driving up to Kalispell to be trainers in a Boy Scout Program, so, we’re still involved in that…so I guess the location is a factor. I don’t know that I quite believe the fact that it’s worth several thousand dollars of my salary, as people keep telling me. I could use the money, too.

Voicing a similar sentiment, Participant #4 said:

I do have a family and it’s a good place to raise a family. My …[spouse] is employed here, so um, yeah, we’re…I’m happy here, but it’s also I’m sort of tied here because of my …[spouse’s] position here.

Participant #6 said:

My …[spouse] is here with …[my spouse’s] business, and…[my spouse] likes it here…that probably plays a big role in my reason to stay. [My spouse] could move, and I could move, easily, but…[my spouse] chooses to stay. My family plays a big part in the decision…children in Bozeman, what a great place to raise children…you could not have designed a better place.

Participant #7 expressed a tremendous feeling of responsibility for his family:

The reasons for me going back to graduate school were quite different than [motives of self realization]. They were a means to an end and the end was getting my children back, so I had to go back, I had to be the best. I had to get the degree, and I did the whole program and got a four point. It was crazy. I’ve had to fight for a lot by myself and having the recognition that, yes, I can provide for myself and my children and yes, I am a good teacher, and yes, I am a full professor has, I’m sure as I went through the process it aided me as a total person, not just an instructor or a teacher or an associate or assistant professor. I have a lot of pride in my life. I thought I’d be here two or three years and here I am seventeen years later…I’ve raised my kids here. But, being a single…[parent] with two children to raise, having tenure, having proven myself, and having that job security was absolutely…so, yes, to answer your initial question, tenure is important to me because I’m a single parent.

Participant #8 reiterated this sentiment:

I think we’ve probably covered what I think is important—…the idea of living in a place that is important for family and lifestyle reasons… I have family here and fairly deep connections, and that’s one of the reasons to
stay here,…[it’s] because of the home-town feeling and family connections… For me family has been one major reason to stay at MSU.

Participant #10 said:

I have looked for another job. But I haven’t ever applied for any. I looked for…yeah, maybe that’s a good idea, but invariably the family replies, “You can go, but I’m not going with you,” so end of that one. That’s why a lot of quality people stay at MSU, despite all the things I’ve already touched upon--that this is a great place to live. It’s a great place to have a family.

Participant #11 expressed similar feelings:

My family loves Bozeman, Montana, and I think that if I wanted to go somewhere else, I’d have to divorce them and leave them here—so, a huge impact.

Participant #12 said:

It’s a good place to live both for me and my family…I think that’s very important. It’s a beautiful place to be. Um, it’s a healthy place to be, and it is a good place to raise a family, for my daughters to grow up. It is a healthy place, I think, in terms of…you know, physically, as well as in terms of psychic space and so forth, you know, not…I wouldn’t say spiritually, but you know, for the mind as well as for the body, this is a healthy place. Yet it has been frustrating, also, in that it is, as I said, isolated and does not present the kinds of opportunities to my children that a larger urban area would have presented. So, it’s not unequivocal…that is not the only reason that I’m here, but is it a factor? Yes. If I had left, it was…it would have been because I was so dissatisfied, I was so frustrated with the working conditions here that I couldn’t take it any more, and I would have sought another opportunity, because that has certainly happened to me at many times during the last twenty years. Somehow, however, other factors unrelated to my work really, I think, prevailed and convinced me to stay here, not the least of which, I think, were the opportunities for employment for my…[spouse], a healthy environment for my…[children].

Participant #15 recognized the fact that he felt responsible to remain in consideration of his family:

Now, I have married, and my second…[spouse’s] family is here. [My spouse]… grew up here, worked away and came back, and both [of my spouse’s]…children live here, and now they’re both married, and we have
one grand-child—my step grand-child, but then location remains a factor, although it happened probably after I chose to remain.

Participant #16 remained exclusively out of responsibility for his family. He said:

I remain at MSU because my...[spouse] likes living in Montana, so that makes it very simple...yeah, it’s far more for my...[spouse], than for me.

Participant #18 expressed his feelings of responsibility for his family:

We got married and started having kids, and so, it’s like, get done with the degree and move on and get a job... my...[spouse is] a school teacher in the school system, so...[my spouse] found the job in a pretty tight education market here. That’s a factor that keeps us here, because it’s not good to be moving somewhere else, you know, it’s redoing...[my spouse’s] career, starting again on another school system, so that keeps us here...Bozeman is a good city safety-wise. The schools are really good, so that is in favor [of remaining], and with the children, we like the environmental stuff—we can ski, and hike and that kind of stuff, so I think those are factors that keep us here...you know, we were sitting there thinking, you know, in the future when you have a six and a two-year, old you’re thinking, “Okay, how much will it cost me in twelve or eighteen years to pay for these educations—that’s a pretty sizeable benefit... Probably what would hold me is if they had a decent program that covered your child’s college tuition, the big benefit that we don’t have here.

Participant #19 exhibited feelings of responsibility for his family in the following way:

With respect to family, my...[spouse is] a full professor here, too, so basically that is a major factor in choosing to remain at MSU...Bozeman is a great place to raise kids, and since I have two young...[children], that is very important for me in staying here at MSU, and they’re increasingly growing roots here, and they don’t want to move, either, so family is a major factor...

Participant #20 expressed a similar feeling of responsibility in reference to his family:

I feel this is a very special, beautiful, wonderful place, and a safe place to raise a child—as safe as any place in the country.

Participant #5 expressed a sense of responsibility to both family and MSU-Bozeman in the following way:
…I’m here and… I’m established in my life which includes other people, a partner and stuff, so staying at MSU is certainly partly based on that personal choice for a lot of reasons… Family is largely related to my motivation to stay at MSU. Once you move as either a couple or as a family, subsequent moves have to be made in consideration of more than one person, in other words, if you move on your own or you say, “Gee, I can go somewhere else for five thousand dollars more or because I like that place more, the other thing you always have to think of with a partner or family is, “Will that person find a job, or will they be happy in that kind of place, so I think there’s always that kind of juggling and that’s important. I do have a two-income family, so that does make a difference somewhat in making those choices. On the other hand, I think that for me the most likely time to have moved would have been about the first three years, because at that point your commitment’s not that strong either to the institution or your students, in a way, as a long term, to a particular type of student, and you probably haven’t set down as strong of roots yet in a type of community. Once you’ve established relationships that affect friends and family…it becomes less interesting to move.

Participant #17 felt no responsibility toward his family, but a paramount responsibility for his students. He said:

Um, the students are a reason to stay. I wouldn’t say necessarily the quality, although we have good students here, and actually in addition to…aside from the quality of the students, I actually have a philosophical commitment to teaching students at a state university like this. I went to elite private schools as an undergraduate, and as a graduate student. You can get a fabulous education in those places, but very few people get to get such an education, and so I actually am very committed to bringing the very best quality education you can to MSU students who are more likely to be from the state or from this region, less likely to have [opportunities to go] to one of the top colleges or universities…and that’s actually a reason to stay, because I could probably go elsewhere, but I would not be teaching students who may be the first one in their family to go to college. A college degree really matters to these students, and I like teaching to students to whom a college degree is not something they take for granted. So that’s probably a fairly important factor that keeps me around here.

In reference to the emergent theme of ‘sense of responsibility’, it is inextricably involved with the emotions, needs, and intellects of the participants. Although a sense of responsibility did emerge as a distinct motivating theme, there was no indication that it
was a sole, or even controlling, incentive for participants to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman.

**Philosophy/Ideology.** Fifteen of the twenty participants referred to philosophies, ideologies, or personal coping strategies that they had developed that had been responsible for their retention. Epstein (1991) and Seligman (1990) show that our success is not only predicted by our intelligence, but how we perceive and think about the world. Certain individuals have learned to think in ways that lead to success, while others think in more destructive ways that ultimately result in failure (Epstein, 1991; Seligman, 1990). Eight of the participants commented that they felt either lucky, or grateful, or both, to be tenured at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #19 felt humbled by the caliber of his colleagues and felt privileged to work with them. Seven of the participants exhibited optimism when discussing aspects of their employment or circumstances that could have been interpreted as negative.

The following participants described evolved philosophies or ideologies that resulted in positive outlooks, paradigms, and perspectives, and were effective in management of emotions. Participant #1 said, “…[motivation] has to be more of the intangible things that keep a person here… rank and salary don’t play nearly as important a part as just a philosophy of place does.” He also noted that, “…when I really start getting upset [about problems at MSU-Bozeman]… I just remember… it’d be that way no matter where I am, it’s not here, so I don’t worry about it. I do, but not as much.” He had a philosophy of place that motivated him to stay in his position at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #1 described the philosophy:
…that is part of my whole philosophy that I got sort of validated…I had it all along…but the poet and philosopher Gary Snyder, the beat poet, the dharma bum guy, has come through [to me] quite a bit, and has served as a mentor for me, and he basically said that, one of the main moral choices a person can make is to stay in a place and contribute to its community and that one of the things that cause a decline in society is mobility, where people move for salary, and that’s a big part of academia, where you’re supposed to play your place off against another university and move for salary…so I found a place that I like and stay here anyway, even though…it’s not necessarily because of the job security and tenure, it’s something deeper than that. It’s simply, find a place you like, stay there, and contribute to it.

Participant #17 articulated another philosophy that motivated him to stay at MSU-Bozeman:

I actually have a philosophical commitment to teaching students at a state university like this. I went to elite private schools as an undergraduate, and as a graduate student. You can get a fabulous education in those places, but very few people get to get such an education, and so, I actually am very committed to bringing the very best quality education you can to MSU students who are more likely to be from the state, or from this region, less likely to have even though about going to one of the top colleges or universities…and that’s actually a reason to stay, because I could probably go elsewhere, but I would not be teaching students who may be the first one in their family to go to college. A college degree really matters to these students, and I like teaching to students to whom a college degree is not something they take for granted. So that’s probably a fairly important factor that keeps me around here.

Participant #11 described another philosophy:

“…”I would rather hunt, than make money…there’s a lot of things I’d rather do than make money…so the money is only a small part of it…. I like working with young people. People who live a long time are generally blessed with genetics, but, they have some other things in common. One is that they grieve deeply, and then they come back quickly. They don’t go down and stay down. The other is that have a sense of humor, and the third is that they hang out with young people…I like hanging out with young people, and it’s going make me live a long time, I hope. I’m skiing thirty-five days this season. [My spouse]…is up there today skiing her fifty-fourth day of the season…I sleep a lot more [than I used to]. Fortunately, in my profession, in my position here, I’ve got 19 good [coworkers]…for [every]…bad one. I like to think that I add reputation to Montana State University. And one of the things that’s nice about
Montana, is there are so few of us, that you can have an impact, and I am proud to tell people that I belong to Montana State University. I’m a real believer in allowing opportunities for everyone, and that has paid off for me, and I’m very fortunate… I feel very fortunate… and [I] have a great deal of gratitude to the citizens of the State of Montana for paying me as well as they do.

Participant #6 described an alternate ideology:

So, the reason I’m still here is because I stay out of policies and government at the university level. [The reason I stay is]… working with the students, taking students who have had little or no background in…[my discipline] and watching them become enthused, inspired, fired up about…[my discipline]. … to see a change in their life in directions that they never would have anticipated two or three years before coming to MSU. I love working with the students. Giving the gift of…[my discipline] is what I call it, that’s what I do. It never ceases to amaze me how untrained…[student’s of this discipline] can catch hold of the vision and just light themselves on fire with enthusiasm… The reason I stay here is to give the students who have not had the opportunity to taste of the…[discipline], that opportunity. Money is not why I’m here, money is not why I stay in this position… I have the best job in the world, and I get paid for it. I have to apologize to people for what I do, and get paid for it… that’s the way I feel about it.

Participant #7 described a similar philosophy:

I love what I’m doing with my teaching, and as long as I can continue to do that… I can’t do anything about the policies… it’s like butting your head against a wall. I’m not interested anymore. … when I get to a point where I have to decide what is important to me, what gives me satisfaction…and [I find that I’m] getting so frustrated with the university system that I feel unhappy, and I can’t do anything about it, then I just bury my head in the sand like an ostrich. As long as I’m satisfied with my head in the sand, with my teaching and… my development as [a]… [professor of my discipline] [I will stay]. I think it is a crime what this state provides for university professors, but I gave up being angry about that a long time ago, because there’s nothing you can do about it, and my needs are met by the universe… partially by the university, but by the universe for sure… then again, I have had to find ways within myself to be satisfied myself, without expecting a pat on the back, or a pay raise, because it’s just not coming here… what that comes down to… is, I know I’m doing a good job, and that really brings me a lot of satisfaction. I could belly ache about a lot things, but it doesn’t get me anywhere. I’d rather focus on the elements for which I am sincerely grateful.
Participant #9 had still another philosophy regarding tenure at MSU-Bozeman:

Now I have a place that I like to work in, that I like to live in, and I can do what I need to do to keep myself happy, and at the same time, I think that’s what causes productivity. …if I couldn’t manage a way to make things happen in a way that keeps me happy, I wouldn’t teach, wouldn’t be here. So, I see all the garbage that goes around, and I find ways around it. And I survive. I have to.

Participant #5 talked about his cognizant decision to develop an emotional coping strategy because of a personal medical condition:

I had nine months of a lot of intensive [medical] work. I wasn’t sure at the beginning that we were going to get through the whole process, to be honest. I made some choices at that point about, “Why are you doing what you are doing, and what do you like?” and I’ve focused more on that recently, so, my attempt is to pull back from the things that normally would have led me into a frenzy, and frothing discontent at different points, and to say, “If you disapprove of this either change it or move back, and go to something that makes you a little more in tune with what you want, and that’s the kind of choices I try to make, so, I want to be careful, it’s not that these things don’t anger me at different times, and they still do, but that overwhelmingly, I’ve sort of made some choices for myself at this point. Passion is fine but not at the expense of being miserable on a day-to-day basis. Push to a conclusion that we have to live with, or can live with…on committees…in life.

Thirteen of the participants in the study exhibited a marked tendency to be positive or optimistic in their outlook regarding their lives and the future for MSU-Bozeman.

Participant #2 said, “Without being too cynical, you know, I try to be real positive in my life, so, I try not to dwell on the negative.” Participant #3 said, “I think things will probably change for the better.” Participant #4 said, “…we’re working on our…department’s reputation to make it a little better.” Participant #6 said, “…things will change…and change is not bad….” Participant #16 summed up his philosophy regarding why this he remained at MSU-Bozeman in the following way:

I never went into teaching, and research…because of an institution. That was never my motivation. …I think I’ve given a lot to this university and [my]…department over many years, …but it was a commitment
to…ideas, and it was…a commitment to students, and a great and abiding belief that the purpose of education is to help people find their signature strengths…to nurture and develop them, and to not have a very controlling idea about who or what people should become. That’s my belief in education. …on a scale of one to ten, ten being the best, I rate Montana State about a two, as an institution…but I’d rate my own teaching about an eight, and my research/creativity somewhere about the same rank, so it doesn’t matter too much [to me] that it’s a deeply flawed institution. One doesn’t like to see it going [in] that direction, and as a Montana taxpayer, I find it particularly irksome to see the kind of abuses that go on here on regular business, but at the end of the day, it’s finally about doing work well, pursuing ideas honestly, believing that there is truth, and that the pursuit of it is, even to its innermost parts, …a valuable and necessary part of the human condition.

**Ageism and Marketability.** Five participants addressed the issues of ageism and marketability as motivating factors that were responsible to one degree or another for their continuing tenure at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #3 said:

> I don’t know that I feel trapped, necessarily, but I do know full well that I probably won’t find a job anywhere else. I’ll have to retire here, and do something else if it’s time for me to leave, which is going to come, some time, so, that is a factor that probably isn’t allowed for in your questions as much. The working conditions are a part of the consideration of why faculty stay, the place is a part of why you stay, your colleagues are part of why you stay, salary is part of why you stay, but I have a feeling that there are other pressures which bear, and one of them is the situation that older people are not as mobile as younger people no matter what their reputation. It’s difficult to look at a person to hire that is age 55 or more when they’re looking at a new job, because you know they’re going to be looking at retirement in a few years, and that possibly isn’t really worth your time and money to install them in your faculty, and then watch them go away right away. In some disciplines that’s probably more likely than others. It’s nice to have a couple of star people that come through the program regularly, and I know some schools work on that [premise]. Most of the schools that are of the stature of MSU don’t work in that fashion.

Participant #7 said, in deference to the same concerns:

> I believe that if the university system [doesn’t make changes], in terms of policies, financial support for departments, recognition for individual faculty members …[regarding all deficiencies] across the board [there will
ultimately be consequences]...I know there is a lot of dissatisfaction. If I were fifteen years younger, at this point, I would probably think of going somewhere else. I’m...[numerical age]...I’m basically satisfied. If I were fifteen years younger, I wouldn’t be. If the university system does not change...(it’s like pauper-ville), they’re going to lose professors by the droves. Maybe not [numerical age] year-old professors that are looking at retirement within five years...[but]...there are some junior faculty members in our department whom I know are grandly dissatisfied and will be leaving, and it’s going to be hard for MSU to attract quality professors to take their place, because, they [MSU] have, in terms of salary, so little to offer them. Now I don’t know if this is true across the board, across all the departments, but I know that’s the case in the college of...[my discipline] and so I’m assuming it’s elsewhere as well.

Participant #9 observed that “...the older you get, why should anybody else hire you, because they can get somebody right out of school with no background and pay less.”

Participant #10 said:

...you can talk to people who are younger faculty, who maybe just got tenure, or are getting in a position where they will hopefully get tenure...because they speak much better to some of these questions...there was a guy in [specific department] who’s gone now. I mean, he was an up and coming young faculty member, and they lost him...because the same job paid twenty thousand dollars more to go to a much better school. We lose the best.

Participant #17 made the following remarks in reference to the way that tenure affects the marketability of professors:

Tenure has a huge impact, and it may not be the impact that you’re thinking of. It is much harder to move to another institution once you are tenured. You may have heard that from some other people...I don’t know if you’re heard that from others, but once you are an associate professor and you have tenure it is a lot harder to move because to move they have to at least bring you in as an associate professor and the expectation is they will bring you in with tenure, and that’s a real commitment to ask a university to make up front. Universities typically make that commitment after they’ve known you for five or six years. So, it’s actually harder to move once you have tenure, and that means it’s more likely that you will remain at your institution, once you get tenure...
concluded the interview with the following explanation of the ‘real reason’ he chose to remain at MSU-Bozeman. He said:

The real reason to remain here at MSU is...you just don’t find another job if you’re not happy where you are. It’s not so easy to find academic jobs. You could end up in a really undesirable place. You could end up, not in Bozeman, Montana, not at Montana State University, and a large part of the reason I have stayed here is that I, completely by accident, (I had no plans to come here, I didn’t know what I was getting into), found my self in an institution, [in which]...I like my colleagues, I like my students, I like the town, I like the life I get to have here, and it is not at all clear that I could do better, on the whole, by going somewhere else...that I could do as well in all those areas if I went somewhere else. And second, someone else would have to hire me before I could go somewhere else, and I have had opportunities outside of MSU, but they have not been academic opportunities, and so, part of the reason I’m still at MSU is I have a job vs. other places, and I suspect that that’s not the case for everyone you’re going to talk to, but there’s always that [consideration]t back there, that you have to get a job offer, and it has to be better than this, and this actually turns out to be not a bad place, all in all. I would like to point out, in my department our teaching mode is two and two, which means that we teach two courses a semester. That’s as good as you do at the University of Wisconsin at Madison, or at Harvard University. I mean, our teaching load is enough to keep almost anybody here, because you can’t really do better anywhere else. When you try to break it down into factors, the real thing about a job change is, you improve your situation, and your situation has many different dimensions to it, and I kind of view it as, there’s not one dimension that’s most important. If Harvard offered me a job, I would not take it. I would not go there, because all the other pieces would have to fall into place. Could I afford to live there? Do I have relationships with people there? Would I be happy as a colleague there? So, something like the institutional reputation, I can’t imagine taking a job based on that. I can imagine taking a job based on the competence of colleagues, the collegiality, and also the kind of good that you do with students. Those are the things I can imagine taking a job based on.

In contrast, Participant #12 said at the conclusion of the interview:

... just to summarize, ...my reasons for staying here as long as I have, have primarily had to do with factors other than the workplace...university. If I had left...it would have been because I was so dissatisfied, I was so frustrated with the working conditions here that I
couldn’t take it any more, and I would have sought another opportunity, because that has certainly happened to me at many times during the last twenty years. Somehow, however, other factors unrelated to my work…prevailed, and convinced me to stay here, not the least of which…were the opportunities for employment for my wife, the opportunities for employment [and] a healthy environment for my daughters. You know, there…[are] things which are…on a work level…unrelated to MSU. They are related to MSU insofar as MSU is in the town where I live, and that’s why I’m here, and so they are related in a sense, but, purely looking at my work, my position, my coworkers, my students and all of that…they have nothing to do with the reasons why I stayed here.

The author found these explanations of the motivation for retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman to be insightful. The factors that motivate different participants may vary, but generally participants were motivated by a combination of factors unique to their given situation, that, when taken as a whole, were sufficient to motivate them to remain at MSU-Bozeman. This study isolated the most commonly occurring factors and used this information to generate a theory regarding retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman.

**Economic Depression.** Only one participant introduced the theme of economic depression as a major motivating factor behind his retention as a professor at MSU-Bozeman. Participant #9 said:

All right, now, this university…[is]…finally facing the fact that in some departments they’re having to hire people right in the beginning, and pay them more than the department head. It’s just barely catching up to this university, but that’s how suppressed, depressed, compressed…is the best word…that the salary structure of this place has been, and what a ludicrous system they’ve worked on here, and I’m totally amazed that the whole thing hasn’t just dissolved…salary is nothing. [Salary]…is so depressed. We’re forty thousand dollars under the average salary for my position around the country. It’s ludicrous! …Then after being here for a while…you’ve been so oppressed financially, you can’t afford to move. I’m serious. If you stay here too long you are dead meat. You can’t go anywhere else, because you don’t have the money to pick up and move.
Higher Education Motivators. A final theme, not included in Table 11, emerged minimally through analysis of the data. It was not included for the following reason:

Although interesting, the appearance of this theme evidenced itself so peripherally that there was not sufficient data for the author to draw conclusions based upon the evidence. It was, however, rife with implications for further research. Seven of the twenty participants made reference, regardless of how remotely or indirectly, to the fact that some of the motivators discussed may have been more appropriately examined as motivators for academicians to remain in higher education as a vocation, rather than at a specific institution, such as MSU-Bozeman.

Participant #17 said, in reference to autonomy of thought and action, and personal freedom as a professor, as motivation to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman:

It would be nice to be paid more, but I also did not become an academic to make money. Job security in academia is very nice. Every once in awhile I think about entirely different lines of work, that do not involve academia, and it is rather stressful to think of giving up tenure and the security that comes with tenure, to go branch out into some whole different field. I know people who’ve done it; I admire them for doing it, but I would suggest that tenure...when you give somebody tenure you make them risk-averse in a way that is not good, probably. So, I actually am ambivalent about the value of tenure. Um, so...job security’s nice, and as I said I’ve entertained thoughts of totally non-academic positions, and the thought of giving up tenure...you know, just this notion that I could keep doing the work I do and I have tremendous amount of freedom to do things, and I can keep doing it in this context, and I don’t have to worry about my job. There are very few sectors of the American economy where you do not have to worry about your job anymore, and academia is one of the few left. I do think, by the way, that’s why our salaries are not terrific. Because, you know, we’re paying for all that security with somewhat depressed salaries. Almost everyone I know makes...you know, outside of academia, makes more money than I do. Achievement and recognition: Oh, I think that I understand what you’re getting at with this question, and I will try to rank these things for you. One of the things about being a college professor, and it certainly is true about being one at MSU, is that you basically are given a position, given some responsibilities—you know, I have to teach a certain number of classes, advise a certain number
of students, but beyond that you get to define what your job is going to be. As long as your department finds you productive, and useful, and you’re producing something for the university, you get to pretty much define your own job, and that’s incredibly rewarding, and it’s the same…I know a lot of people who wouldn’t leave academia because somebody would tell them what to do. And we don’t like being told what to do, we like deciding what we’re going to do. There is a balance. You have to think about what the institution needs, and you have to find ways to meet those institutional needs, you may have to convince people there’s an institutional need for whatever you’re doing, but you do get all of this autonomy, all of this freedom to define your own job, to go the directions you want to go in without people reining you in, as long as you are meeting kinds of basic requirements of your job. I would say that’s a huge part—not necessarily keeping me at MSU—but keeping me in academia.

Conversely, Participant #1 said, in response to problems he perceived to exist within the system in place for promotion and growth at MSU-Bozeman:

As I say, my father was a professor at Oklahoma State University and when I really start getting upset about that, [opportunity for promotion and growth] I just remember his getting very upset about exactly the same thing, so, I’ve just…I say, “Oh, okay, it’d be that way no matter where I am, it’s not here, so I don’t worry about it…I do, but not as much.

Participant #4, commenting on the demotivating effect of incompetent colleagues, complacent as a result of tenure, on his motivation to remain, said:

I feel that most of my colleagues, I think, are very strong, strong players, strong teachers. They seem committed to the department. Some have been around awhile and perhaps don’t have the vigor and enthusiasm that some of the younger, newer ones have…but I think that’s probably common everywhere.

In response to the demotivating effect of student quality on retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman, Participant #5 remarked:

… an awareness that in looking at other people and talking to my colleagues in other places that the things that irritate me, while they may be in specific areas onerous here, are not different than the irritants I hear other people talking about. For instance, I might be upset with some of my students [for] being unprepared. Some other of my colleagues, maybe my friend who teaches at Swarthmore, her students in general are much
better prepared than my students coming in as freshmen. On the other hand, the complaints about them over time are probably not that different.

In reference to the same phenomenon, Participant #14 observed:

Autonomy of thought and action: As a professor, yeah, it’s very important. I mean, I don’t know that I could be a professor without that, actually. I think autonomy of thought and action, and personal freedom are something that are present in all universities in the United States. I don’t think that it’s particular to MSU-Bozeman, so that’s not something that keeps me here, because I take it for granted that it should done like that in other universities, as well. I don’t feel like I’m getting something special here by getting that…[and] tenure…well, I don’t know…I mean, all universities—most universities have tenure track… quality of students, I expect…I believe that in all universities there are excellent students and weak students and everything in between.

Participant #15, a professor whose career encompassed positions at a variety of institutions of higher education over a number of years, made a similar comment:

Autonomy of thought? That’s very important, and I have had that all my career, [not just at MSU-Bozeman]…autonomy of thought and action as a professor…

Results: The Participants/The Literature

Faculty Motivation and Conventional Motivational Theory

Study outcomes predominantly confirmed the dictates of the conventional canons of motivational theory. Motivational theories appropriate for the study of retention of faculty in the context of higher education at MSU-Bozeman were those promulgated by Maslow (1943) (his hierarchy of prepotent needs), Herzberg (1959) (his two-pronged theory of satisfiers versus dissatisfiers), and Goleman (1997, 2002), and his theories regarding emotional intelligence. Of the three overwhelmingly controlling motivating factors emergent in the study of retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman, two--family and tenure/job security were representative of lower order biobehavioral needs. Family also appeared as a
motivator in the higher order love needs strata of the pyramid of needs proposed by Maslow. Location as a dominant motivating factor for faculty to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman was not accounted for by either Maslow’s or Herzberg’s theories of motivation, but appeared to be an emotional preference as espoused by Goleman. The outcomes of the study indicated that these professors in higher education at MSU-Bozeman were primarily motivated to satisfy lower order needs and remained in their jobs as long as their jobs facilitate fulfillment of these needs. A minority of responses indicated that when some participants were motivated by dissatisfaction, internal stressors, and emotional motivators, conventionally relevant lower and higher order needs became secondary to the fulfillment of these overriding motivators. As such, these individuals were motivated not to remain at MSU-Bozeman by negative emotions.

**Practical Significance.** The practical significance of the study outcomes for faculty and administrators responsible for retaining faculty at MSU-Bozeman was: (1) promotion of family/family values among faculty, (2) support and facilitation of tenure for faculty members, and (3) ensuring that candidates for positions as faculty at MSU-Bozeman were individuals compatible with the geographic location available to residents of the area, were three strategies that, when subscribed to would effectively enhance and promote the probability of faculty remaining as productive contributors in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. In addition, administrators and faculty responsible for the retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman could develop programs providing informative training and continuing education for faculty at MSU-Bozeman regarding emotional intelligence as a means of retaining faculty. Mastering skills involved in emotional management could minimize the
incidence of professors motivated to leave their positions as a result of goal-incongruent negative emotions.

Relationship to Prior Research

Most of the responses and evidence regarding motivation collected in this study reflected the observations and theories offered by a number of recognized theorists. Although this study was related to the prior research, it was unique in that (1) the prior research was not conducted in the context of higher education, (2) much of the prior research investigating motivational theory was dated, and (3) the research in the present study was unique to a select sample of participants chosen for specific attributes to explore retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman. For the purpose of this study, however, the author focused on the paradigms presented by Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg, and Daniel Goleman as the most appropriate theoretical framework for the study of retention of faculty in higher education at MSU-Bozeman. The three controlling motivators emergent in the present study were, almost without exception, consistently reflective of the principles promulgated in the classical theories of Maslow and Herzberg. Responses of participants apparently inconsistent or deviating from these established principles were easily explained by the application of Goleman’s theories, identifying emotions as significant motivating, frequently dominating, and sometimes goal incongruent forces. Results were predominantly reflective of the motivational theory espoused by Maslow’s needs hierarchy. Herzberg’s satisfaction/dissatisfaction model explained the responses of the participants in the context of the work environment, in the opinion of this author, to a less satisfying extent.
Goleman’s theories of emotional intelligence explained responses of participants that were emotionally driven, and as such, unexplainable within the context of the theories set forth by either Maslow or Herzberg. An unanticipated emergent theme appeared that was not attributable to the tenets of any of the existent canons of motivational thought. This theme was grounded in the motivating objective recognition of, and resignation to existing/perceived limitations of participants (ageism and marketability). This theme was one of intellect as a motivator. Evidenced by the fact that only two participants had applied for alternate employment in higher education following the award of tenure, these professors perceived that tenure limited their ability to be hired at other institutions of higher education. They made intellectual decisions not to attempt to pursue other avenues of employment, regardless of how much more financially, academically, emotionally, or geographically desirable the available positions were. Interrelatedness of the three controlling motivational themes, location, family, and tenure, was visible and extreme, and participants were not uncertain as to the overriding importance of these three controlling motivators. Eighteen of the twenty participants discussed the importance of family living and working in the designated location, family recreating in the location, family preferring the location, and family unwilling to leave the location as strong motivating factors for them to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. Simultaneously, they expressed the positive importance of tenure and job security in regard to the welfare of their families and themselves, the degree to which tenure at MSU-Bozeman tied them to the geographic location, and the negative limiting effect it had upon their marketability as professors at other institutions of higher education, and options regarding alternate locations of domicile. These three reigning motivators appeared as the predominant motivators to satisfy a
number of lower and higher order needs, specifically, physiological needs such as food, shelter, sex, and safety, and higher order needs for love, recreation, and emotional security.

Negative and Positive Findings. Positive results of the inquiry were found in that the majority of participants derived great enjoyment and satisfaction from their families and the geographic location of MSU-Bozeman, and were simultaneously able to maintain and sustain their familial relationships and obligations, and enjoy the location while remaining in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. Another positive result of the study was the fact that many of the participants enjoyed the job security they experienced as a result of being tenured at MSU-Bozeman.

Negative findings of the study were that the participants were generally not motivated by the work itself to remain in their positions in higher education at MSU-Bozeman. Another negative finding was that many of the participants expressed remaining in their positions in spite of negative internal and external environmental aspects of their working environment at MSU-Bozeman. These participants reported remaining in their positions out of deference to their families and the location, rather than as a result of job satisfaction.

One negative result of the inquiry was that several of the participants, although experiencing negative emotions and dissatisfaction as a result of what they perceived to be undesirable facets of their faculty positions at MSU-Bozeman, were compelled to remain in their positions as a result of a decline in their marketability due to age or tenure, or both. One participant reported being financially unable to leave MSU-Bozeman as a result of salary compression. The effect of tenure, in these cases, proved negative, in that it eliminated the perceived option of transfer to another institution of higher education. Receiving institutions rarely hire tenured professors. The implication of such a hire would
be that the receiving institution would have to offer the new hire tenure and tenure pay, 
when they could hire a young assistant professor more economically without making the 
initial commitment of long term employment. Also, many tenured professors may be older, 
and have achieved a rank commanding a larger salary. Receiving institutions hesitate to 
install an expensive addition to their faculty with the expectation that the new hire may 
retire within a more limited period of time. Another negative finding reported by some 
participants was that the arduous process of achieving tenure eroded familial relationships, 
and resulted in the dissolution of their families.

Uncontrolled Factors Influencing Outcomes. Two participants were the offspring of 
tenured full professors who had remained a lifetime in their disciplines. If, and to what 
degree this influence motivated these two professors to remain in their positions in higher 
education, or affected their responses was impossible to assess. The personality profiles 
and style of interaction of the participants may have influenced outcomes of the study. 
Some participants appeared to have enjoyed the interview process, some appeared 
initially combative, but relaxed during the course of the interview. Some participants had 
more stringent time limits to adhere to during the interview process, either self-imposed 
or as a product of conflicting obligation. Time limits affected study outcomes, in that 
they affected the degree to which participants addressed differing aspects of the study 
during the course of the interview. Three participants made attempts to analyze and 
redesign the study, including the interview protocol and methodologies. Some professors 
invested significant blocks of time and personal effort in their interviews, while others 
did not. Some participants expressed feeling uncomfortable during the study, while
others expressed enjoying the process. Using researchers as participants for research undoubtedly affected study outcomes, regardless of how minimally.

Participants varied in the degree of familiarity and trust with which they interacted with the author. Most seemed relaxed during the interview, but one said, “I just feel somewhat uncomfortable, you know, just talking about myself to a machine.” He did, however, continue with his interview and appeared to relax as it progressed.

Dynamics of the professor/student relationship affected responses both positively and negatively. Many responses reflected the participants’ recognition of the existing relationship and responses reflected the hierarchical aspect thereof. Participant #10 challenged the appropriateness of the opening question in the protocol. He said, “My place of birth? One has to wonder what that has to do with a teaching position at Montana State University?” After being reassured as to the appropriateness of the question, he continued his interview, and was informative, relaxed, and appeared to enjoy the process. Participant #14 wanted to change the pseudonym style to ensure greater anonymity for the participants, which I agreed to. He also wanted to know that his selection had been purely random. I assured him of this. The interview then continued and he was informative and appeared to enjoy the interview. These variations are chronicled within the section of the paper regarding interview experiences with experiences and or statements made by both the participants and the author. Other responses reflected a freedom of expression as a result of this relationship. Some professors expressed themselves openly and displayed a great sense of personal security and freedom of speech, either as a result of feeling confident that their statements would remain anonymous, or that they felt no threat associated with freely expressing themselves.
Some participants were visibly guarded in their responses, in spite of being reassured of the anonymity afforded study participants. To what extent this tendency to be guarded affected study outcomes was impossible to evaluate quantitatively.

Participants exhibited varying degrees of optimism, pessimism, objectivity, and subjectivity in their responses. This in itself was responsible for disparities in study outcomes. Some of the variation in outlook reflected differing personal paradigms and styles of perception. It was unclear whether or not some of the participants who presented views that were uniformly optimistic regarding all aspects of their tenure did so as a result of their perception of the world, and were sincere in their perceptions, or were unsure as to what degree their anonymity would be guarded, and adopted optimism as a safety mechanism to ensure protection of their positions both academically and socially at MSU-Bozeman.

Some participants exhibited a resignation to limitations, whether actual or perceived, which affected study outcomes. For example, one participant reported experiencing job satisfaction, but expressed the fact that he would not experience job satisfaction if the participant were fifteen years younger.

Resolution of Conditions, Inconsistencies, and Misleading Elements in Findings. Recognition of conditions responsible for inconsistencies in findings was important, so that the author could take causal conditions responsible for variations and inconsistencies into account when analyzing and evaluating data. Specific to this study, two participants were unequivocally positive in their assessment of governing policies, administration, and style of leadership and supervision at MSU-Bozeman. These outcomes were misleading and
were attributed by the author to the fact that one of these participants had recently become a member of central administration at the institution, and was married to the other participant who reported categorically that these systems were without flaw. This may be responsible for the inconsistency represented by the responses of these two participants when compared to those of the other eighteen participants who perceived problems, to one degree or another, when evaluating these external environmental motivators. Additionally, one participant reported unequivocally negative perceptions of these same systems, without exception. This participant’s responses appeared to the author to be motivated by negative emotions generated by problems in an interpersonal relationship with a supervisor, and projected globally upon the systems of governance, administration, leadership, and supervision employed by MSU-Bozeman. This outcome was inconsistent with the majority of responses in the study.

Summary of Results

Results of the study indicated that participants were predominantly motivated to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman for the following three reasons: (1) to remain in the geographic area, (2) and/or to remain with their families, and/or (3) because they had achieved tenure at MSU-Bozeman and enjoyed the job security, and/or did not want to go through the tenure process again at an alternate institution, and/or perceived that they were no longer hirable/marketable elsewhere in higher education as a result of achieving tenure at MSU-Bozeman. There were few exceptions to these findings. One participant reported that although location and family were controlling motivators in determination of his decision to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman, tenure was not. Another participant reported that tenure was the overriding motivator in his decision to
remain in his academic position at MSU-Bozeman. Although other motivators such as philosophy/ideology, internal motivators, and external environmental motivators may have contributed, to one degree or another, to participants’ job satisfaction and decisions to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman, they were not the determining factors dictating whether or not the participants would remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. In most cases, participants were motivated by a combination of factors, but overwhelmingly, location, family, and tenure, in that order, motivated participants to remain in their positions. Exceptions to these findings throughout the study were minimal to non-existent.

Chapter Summary

Results of the study indicated that the reason the participants at MSU-Bozeman remained in their positions in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education was out of a desire to remain in the geographic area of Bozeman, Montana, and/or to remain with their families, and/or because they had achieved tenure at MSU-Bozeman and enjoyed the job security, and/or did not want to go through the tenure process again at an alternate institution, and/or perceived that they were no longer hirable/marketable elsewhere in higher education as a result of achieving tenure at MSU-Bozeman (refer to Table 12, p. 218). Generally, although other motivators such as philosophy/ideology, internal motivators, and external environmental motivators may have contributed, to one degree or another, to the participants’ job satisfaction and decisions to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman, they were not the determining factors dictating whether or not the participants would remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. Two of the participants cited personal philosophical/ideological motivators as
contributing to their decisions to remain in their positions at this institution, in addition to the three primary motivators.

One participant saw working conditions at MSU-Bozeman as strongly contributing to his decision to remain, in addition to the three motivators evidenced in the study outcome. One participant reported that, in addition to the three motivators responsible for his tenure at MSU-Bozeman, he was economically unable to leave the position as a result of salary. One participant reported that interpersonal relationships with coworkers was a strong motivator, and, in addition to the primary reasons cited for staying, found that this motivator was influential as an incentive to remain as faculty of MSU-Bozeman. One participant reported that although location and family were controlling motivators in determination of his decision to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman, tenure was not.

Two professors reported that, although they fulfilled the criteria required to participate in the study, they intended to leave their positions as tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman. One participant was motivated by goal incongruent emotions generated by problems in an interpersonal relationship with a supervisor. Although most participants remained in their positions in response to a combination of motivating factors, location, family, and tenure, or a combination thereof, location, family, and tenure were overwhelmingly responsible for the retention of tenured professors in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman. The motivators represented by these findings were most effective in fulfilling lower order physiological and safety needs, and higher order love and emotional needs of study participants. Using Maslow’s needs hierarchy, these outcomes were predictable to a certain degree. These outcomes did not confirm the motivational paradigm promoted
Table 12. Degree Of Motivation By Type Of Motivator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF MOTIVATOR</th>
<th>STUDY RESULTS/DEGREE OF MOTIVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Controlling Motivators</td>
<td>VI/P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Internal Motivators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion for Vocational Activity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy of Thought</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other External Environmental Motivators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Reputation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence of Colleagues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships with Coworkers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Quality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of Leadership/Supervision</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Policies/Administration</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Achievement/Recognition</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for Promotion/Growth</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unanticipated Motivators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Responsibility</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy/ Ideology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ageism/Marketability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Real” Reason</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Depression</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using the following scale designations, responses of participants were presented as follows: [VI/P = Very Important/Positive; CF/P = Contributing Factor/Positive; NI = Not Important; VI/N = Very Important/Negative; NA = Not Addressed]. Categories of motivators designated as ‘other’ consist of motivators not included in the primary category of controlling motivators.

by Herzberg. The two participant’s emotionally motivated to leave MSU-Bozeman illustrated the evidence of emotions as motivators, as theorized by David Goleman in his research on emotional intelligence.

The significance of these findings are that they could be used by faculty and
administrators responsible for retention of faculty in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman. Evidence of the primary motivators revealed by the study findings could be instrumental in targeting candidates as faculty recruits that would be more likely to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. Recognition of the fact that emotions played an integral part in job satisfaction, and decisions of faculty to remain in their positions, could be a significant indicator that it would be profitable for faculty and administrators responsible for the retention of faculty to consider implementation of campus programs designed to educate faculty regarding emotional intelligence, and the acquisition of skills that enabled individuals to effectively manage emotions.

The theoretical significance of the findings was that, there was no single motivational theory that adequately explained faculty motivation. The findings indicated that both lower and higher order needs, satisfaction/dissatisfaction, and emotions as motivators were not always independent of one another, and that a new theory integrating the three motivational phenomena and illustrating the interrelatedness of the motivators needed to be generated. These finding indicated the need for construction of models summarizing and illustrating study outcomes..
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Chapter Introduction

Developing and maintaining a high-quality faculty does not happen by accident. It takes leadership sensitive to the issues that help to create optimal working conditions. Higher education can no longer afford the employment practice of benign neglect so often used on faculty, who are primarily tenured full professors. Knowing what conditions influence job satisfaction for faculty…will contribute significantly to developing a faculty of excellence (Fife, 2000).

It is not known by higher education leaders why tenured faculty members choose to remain in the professorate at Montana State University-Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman). Not knowing why faculty choose to remain in higher education presents a problem for university faculty and officials responsible for recruiting and retaining a stable faculty work force. The stability of the faculty is important to afford the institution a professorate that have remained in their positions long enough to be effective and proficient at their jobs affording students cohesive, fluent, and efficient academic programs. Knowing why faculty chooses to remain in the professorate affords strategic insight to those responsible for recruitment and retention of faculty.

The purpose of this grounded theory study was to explore what motivates faculty at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) to remain in their faculty positions. Specifically, twenty tenured faculty members from disciplines in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman, a land grant, Doctoral II University, were interviewed to determine why they remained in their faculty positions. From their responses, a theory was developed to explain their motivation for remaining.
In an attempt to explore why faculty at MSU-Bozeman remain in their positions in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education, the following questions were examined: Is there a select set of motivators that explains the decision of tenured faculty from disciplines in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education to remain in the professorate at MSU-Bozeman? If in fact there is, are they consistent with those that have been found to motivate workers in industry, or are they unique to the professorate? Comparison of findings of research conducted in higher education with those findings resulting from research conducted in the industrial sector is essential, as most existing motivational theory evolved from research conducted in industry.

The answers to these questions provide insight into the problem of not knowing why faculty remain in the field of higher education at MSU-Bozeman and fulfill the purpose of this grounded theory study which was to examine what motivates faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions.

The study was grounded in motivational theory and sought to determine whether or not there is a select set of motivators that explains the decision of tenured faculty in the aforementioned disciplines to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. Just as knowing why industrial workers remain in their jobs provides insight and information for members of industry responsible for recruiting and retaining a quality workforce, knowing why faculty remain in their jobs provides insight and information for members of higher education responsible for recruiting and retaining a quality faculty.
Summary of the Problem, Methodology, Results, and Conclusions

**Problem.** The problem addressed in this study is that it is not known by higher education leaders why tenured faculty choose to remain in the professorate. Not knowing why faculty choose to remain in higher education presents a problem for university faculty and officials responsible for recruiting and retaining a stable faculty work force. The stability of the faculty is important to afford the institution a professorate that has remained in their positions long enough to be effective and proficient at their jobs affording students cohesive, fluent, and efficient academic programs. Knowing why faculty choose to remain in the professorate affords strategic insight to those responsible for recruitment and retention of faculty.

**Methodology.** Twenty tenured professors employed by MSU-Bozeman for a minimum of ten years in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education were purposefully selected to participate in the study. Thirty-four professors were initially invited to participate, but nine failed to respond. Of the twenty-five that did respond and were interviewed, four were eliminated due to technical problems during the recording of the interviews, and a fifth was eliminated as a result of failure to address all the questions included in the interview protocol. The twenty remaining professors participating in the study were interviewed in April, May, June, July, and August, 2004. The interviews lasted 30 to 120 minutes each, with most lasting from 60 to 70 minutes. Interviews were taped, transcribed, and disaggregated into emergent themes. Both analytical and academic journals were compiled from field notes taken by the author. Participants personally designated the location of their own interviews. Four interviews
were conducted in a campus coffee shop, one professor was interviewed in an off-campus restaurant, one was interviewed in the lobby of an off-campus hotel, two were interviewed in their homes, one was interviewed in a conference room on campus, and the remaining participants were interviewed in their offices. The one-on-one interviews were tape recorded by the author.

**Results.** A select set of motivators, (location, family, and tenure), emerged from the study results that explain the decisions of selected tenured faculty from disciplines in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education to remain in the professorate at MSU-Bozeman in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education. These motivators are not consistent with those that have been found to motivate workers in industry. Comparison of findings of research conducted in higher education with findings resulting from research conducted in the industrial sector is essential, as most existing motivational theory evolved from research conducted in industry. The set of motivators emergent as results of this study may be unique to the professorate. One of the three predominating motivators for participants of the study to remain in their university positions is reported to be tenure, a phenomena not present in industry. Participants also reported that, although autonomy of thought and action, and personal freedom as a professor are not the determining factors that motivate them to remain in their faculty positions at MSU-Bozeman, they are facets of the participants’ employment without which they would not remain in their positions. In this sense, motivation in academia does not parallel that evidenced in industry. According to the results, motivation is interrelated to needs, emotions and intellectual decisions/evaluations experienced by participants/workers. The results of this study
indicate that evaluation of motivation should include consideration of all three factors to make valid assessments/predictions of behavior based on motivation. The results imply continuous interaction between the motivators and evidence instances when some participants would intentionally override motivators of need, and emotion in favor of intellectual motivators.

Study results indicate that the leading motivator for the participants is the desire to remain in the geographic area of Bozeman, Montana. The second strongest motivator found is the desire of participants to remain with their families, who live, work, or have familial and other personal connections to Bozeman and the surrounding geographic area, and that it is a good place to raise their families. The third primary controlling motivator emerging from the data that motivated faculty to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman is tenure and the job security it affords.

Tenure presents itself as the third controlling motivator in a variety of ways. Some participants were motivated to stay because they did not want to go through the tenure process again at an alternate institution. Some perceived that they were no longer hirable/marketable elsewhere in higher education as a result of achieving tenure at MSU-Bozeman. Generally, although other motivators such as philosophy/ideology, internal motivators, and external environmental motivators may contribute, to one degree or another, to the participants’ job satisfaction and decisions to remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman, they are not the determining factors dictating whether or not the participants will remain in their positions at MSU-Bozeman. Two of the participants were motivated by personal philosophical/ideological principles to remain in their positions at this institution, in addition to motivation by the three primary factors.
Another professor reported that, in addition to the three primary motivators emergent in the study, working conditions at MSU-Bozeman were a dominant contributing motivator for him to remain. One participant reported that, in addition to the three motivators responsible for his tenure at MSU-Bozeman, he was economically unable to leave the position as a result of salary. Another participant perceived interpersonal relationships with coworkers to be a strong motivator, and, in addition to the primary reasons cited for staying, found this motivator influential as incentive to remain as faculty of MSU-Bozeman. One participant reported that although location and family were controlling motivators in determination of his decision to remain as faculty at MSU-Bozeman, tenure was not. Responses of two participants, although their profiles fulfilled the criteria required to participate in the study, indicated that they intended to leave their positions as tenured faculty at MSU-Bozeman. Both were emotionally motivated. One participant was motivated to return to the geographic location of his origin. The other participant was negatively motivated by goal incongruent emotions generated by problems in an interpersonal relationship with a supervisor. Although most participants remain in their positions in response to a combination of motivating factors; location, family, and tenure, or a combination thereof, were overwhelmingly responsible for the retention of tenured professors in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman.

**Conclusions/Implications.** These results were considered in light of theoretical tenets that deal with needs as discussed in Maslow’s hierarchy, Goleman’s emotional intelligence and Herzberg’s two-pronged theory of dissatisfiers/hygiene factors versus satisfiers/self-actualization factors. In relation to Maslow’s needs hierarchy, these outcomes were
predictable to a certain degree, but were not satisfactorily explained. Using Maslow’s hierarchy as a reference point, the motivators represented by these findings were most effective in fulfilling lower order physiological and safety needs, and higher order love and emotional needs of study participants. Maslow’s hierarchy works in a general sense when applied to human behavior in a primitive environment. However there are problems in Maslow’s system when applied to specific instances occurring in more evolved and ‘safe’ environments, such as those of higher education, academia, and/or industry today (Herzberg, 1982), as well as those emerging from the data collected during the course of this study. In these environments Maslow’s system does not work in application. If Maslow’s hierarchy of prepotent needs worked in application in these instances, participants would be unable to experience emotion before physiological needs were satisfied. The most primitive and obvious contradiction to Maslow’s theory is evidenced in this commonly occurring scenario. Individuals who have patronized a restaurant, experienced anger in response to a delay in service, and are motivated by the emotion of anger to leave the restaurant without being fed. The emotion is generated before the physiological need is met, if not as a direct result of the unmet physiological need, in contradiction to theoretical paradigm presented by Maslow. In this case, as predicted by the theories of Daniel Goleman, the individual experiencing the negative emotion engages in goal-incongruent behavior, and is motivated by anger to leave the restaurant without being fed. Even Herzberg took issue with the broad application of Maslow’s needs hierarchy, although it has been presented as seminal theory in every education and psychology textbook in print. In reference to some of the problems, Herzberg (1982) said:

The Maslow system, then, does seem appropriate, but it has holes in it. Lower-order needs never get satisfied, as witness the constant demand for
physiological and security guarantees, the continuing socialization of our society, and the never-ending search for status symbols. This is evident even though we have recognized the importance of self-actualization as a potent force in the motivational make-up of people. The Maslow system stresses the material needs of man as primary to his more ‘human’ moral motives. The system has not worked in application because the biological needs of man are parallel systems, rather than either one assuming initial importance. A new theory…in work motivation is needed (p.48).

In the results of this study, as well, there are several instances of participants’ reacting to emotional motivation before responding to the motivation of physiological and safety needs, in direct contradiction to Maslow’s hypothesis. Further, the results of the study did not confirm the motivational paradigm promoted by Herzberg. In fact, study results evidence two incidents in which participants report being motivated to leave their jobs by what Herzberg terms as ‘dissatisfiers’ or ‘hygiene factors.’ According to Herzberg’s paradigm, dissatisfiers/hygiene factors cannot motivate, only dissatisfy. The results of this study provide evidence in direct opposition to this hypothesis. One of two participants emotionally motivated to leave MSU-Bozeman was motivated by hygiene factors/dissatisfiers, and several of the participants expressed that, unsatisfactory hygiene factors at work would motivate them to leave.

In addition, these responses illustrate evidence of emotions generated by unsatisfactory hygiene factors as motivators, and as theorized by Goleman in his research on emotional intelligence, these negative emotions motivated participants to adopt goal-incongruent behavior. Participants provided evidence of being motivated solely by emotion in the absence of unfulfilled physiological needs. However, being motivated by emotion is clearly evidence of unfulfilled emotional needs.

Participants also exhibited behavior motivated by unfulfilled physiological needs in the absence of motivating negative emotions. One participant reported that, although he was
satisfied with every aspect of his work, he recognized the impending possibility of being unable to meet the increases in the cost of living in the area if they weren’t reflected in his salary. He had no reason to expect that they would be, as there was no contractual provision for increases in the cost of living, and the participant had received no raises, even after promotion at MSU-Bozeman. Having to leave MSU-Bozeman as a result of not being able to meet the cost of living increases in the area would be an example of an unmet physiological need as a motivator in the absence of emotion.

Third and finally, participants exhibited behavior motivated by intellect and the management of both needs and emotions intellectually. In these cases, although outcomes imply continuous interaction between the three motivators, it is clear that the intellectual motivator overrides motivators of emotion and need. Goleman (1997, 2002) espouses the management of emotion through intellect, but does not address management of need void of emotion through intellect. In the same way that Goleman describes the way individuals can learn to manage goal incongruent emotions through the application of emotional intelligence, the results of the study imply that individuals can learn to manage goal incongruent needs through need intelligence. Similar to emotional intelligence, need intelligence might motivate an obese person to eat less rather than respond to the primal motivation of hunger, or as indicated by the results of the study, need intelligence might motivate a tenured professor not to apply for a more financially/academically rewarding available position in academia, in recognition of the limitations in his marketability resulting from tenure, rather than respond to the lower order need to increase his job remuneration.
Analysis of the interview data indicates that the participants were motivated by emotions generated by unfulfilled needs, (which may or may not manifest themselves as satisfaction or dissatisfaction, in Herzberg’s terms), both physiological and psychological, or needs generated by emotions, or intellectual decisions. Ultimately, emotions, needs, and intellect are inextricably interrelated as motivating forces, and appear to be continuously interacting. The interrelationship of Maslow’s unfulfilled higher and lower order needs (which include emotional needs) as motivators, and Goleman’s motivating emotions and intelligence, becomes a seamless web. Certainly, both Maslow’s and Goleman’s theories are appropriate in the discussion of motivational theory, but neither system works in application, exclusive of the other. Neither theory provides for the undeniable existence of the other or interrelatedness of emotions, needs, and intellect as motivators, and the synergistic effect of one upon the others. Discussing needs in the absence of emotion as motivators, and emotion in the absence of needs, and needs and emotions as motivators, in the absence of intelligence, becomes ineffective. Neither of the three theories work, in application, without recognition and consideration of the cause and effect of the others, and the way in which intellect operates to motivate, and to manage/override the more primal motivators of need and emotion. The need for a new theory in work motivation is implied.

It is true that most participants were motivated by a combination of factors, but the factors consistently apparent, and, as such, those comprising the select set of motivators influencing them were location, family, and tenure, in that order. A final theme, higher education motivators, not included in Table 12, emerged marginally through analysis of the data. Although interesting, the appearance of this theme evidenced itself so peripherally that there was not sufficient evidence for the author to conclude that it was significant in
Figure 2. A Conceptual Model of a Theory of Retention at MSU-Bozeman
motivating these participants to remain. Seven of the twenty participants made reference, regardless of how remotely or indirectly, to the fact that some of the motivators discussed may have been more appropriately examined as motivators for academicians to remain in higher education as a vocation, rather than at a specific institution, such as MSU-Bozeman.

**Broader Implications of the Findings**

**Practical**

The practical implications of the study, found in Figure 2, for faculty and administrators responsible for retention of faculty were, that those faculty who enjoy the area, have family in the area, and were tenured at MSU-Bozeman were more likely to remain in their positions. This might imply that retention began with the recruitment of professors fitting this profile. It also suggests that in targeting candidates, those faculty and administrators responsible for retention must interact with faculty and administration responsible for recruiting to promote the institution, with the use of, and emphasis on, this select set of motivators.

A distinct implication of the study is the unique appeal of the geographic area (see Appendix C). An emphasis on the growing popularity and appeal of the MSU-Bozeman area in recruiting and retaining quality faculty is implied.

A further implication of the study is that the geographic location of MSU-Bozeman is appealing to participants with family, and that there is substantial overlap between the motivators of location and family as a result.

Another practical implication of the findings of the study is that, faculty are motivated to remain in their positions in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social
sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman by emotions and intellect, as well as satisfied needs. Implementation of support programs conducted and/or by faculty and administration responsible for retention of this faculty, might/should be beneficial to the university’s ability to retain faculty. Programs should be designed to teach emotional intelligence, as recommended by Daniel Goleman, in the interest of both emotion and need management. Such an implementation could minimize the loss of faculty as the result of negative emotions.

Theoretical

The theoretical implications of the findings, found in Figure 3, suggest a new theory of motivation to explore. The existing theories appropriate for analysis of the study findings included systems developed by Maslow, Herzberg, and Goleman. Upon further evaluation, however, it became evident that Maslow’s needs hierarchy, did not satisfactorily explain the findings of the study. Using Maslow’s hierarchy as a basis for analysis of the results, the most apparent implication was that the motivators represented by these findings were most effective in fulfilling lower order physiological and safety needs, and higher order love and emotional needs of study participants. However, there were problems in Maslow’s system, and as such it did not work in application in the environment of higher education or even industrialized society. If Maslow’s hierarchy of prepotent needs worked in application in this context, participants would be unable to experience emotion before physiological needs were satisfied, and according to the findings, such was not the case.
Figure 3. A Conceptual Model of the Three-Pronged Motivational Theory
According to the findings, participants were emotionally motivated to fulfill philosophical, ideological, interpersonal, and recreational needs, and needs for self-actualization, at the expense of salary. Maslow’s theory does not explain this. The most simplistic, obvious, and commonly occurring contradiction to Maslow’s theory in an industrialized society was evidenced in the commonplace occurrence of the following scenario. Individuals in an industrialized society who patronized restaurants experienced anger in response to delayed service, and were motivated either rationally by intellect, or irrationally by the emotion of anger, to leave the restaurant without being fed. The emotion was generated before the physiological need was met, if not as a direct result of the unmet physiological need. As predicted by the theories of Daniel Goleman, the individual experiencing the negative emotion who was motivated by anger to leave the restaurant without being fed, was engaging in the goal-incongruent behavior described by Goleman. This phenomenon parallels and mirrors the motivational tendency exemplified in the study findings that evidenced deference for the fulfillment of emotional needs precedential to, or at the expense of, that of physiological needs.

On the other hand, if the individual leaving the restaurant without being fed was not motivated by anger, but by intellect, the motivator of the intellectual decision to leave and go to another restaurant, or to not eat at all, may have been generated by the physiological need or the goal-incongruent emotion, but when evaluated by the intellect the result was a rational behavior. Maslow’s hierarchy only works in application in the context of a primal environment, if at all. Even within the context of a primal environment, Maslow’s theory often does not work in application. It is common knowledge that if a person is caught in a
burning structure with another living creature and an inanimate object of great material value, the individual will risk his own welfare to save the living creature, at the expense of the materially valuable object (cite). This behavior reflects the precedence of intellectual and emotional motivators over physiological and safety needs, even in a primitive environment.

Also, in the case of the family stranded in a blizzard in subzero temperatures, where the father hiked twelve miles from the family’s stranded vehicle in subzero temperatures to find temporary shelter for his wife and baby, and then left the safety of a cave where he had sheltered his family to hike the twelve miles back to the vehicle the next day and then seventy more miles in the next two days in tennis shoes to get help to retrieve his family, even though he lost portions of his feet in the process, illustrates an instance where intellectual, emotional, and benevolent motivators took precedence over the motivation to fulfill personal physiological and safety needs (Burress, 1993). Even Herzberg took issue with the broad application of Maslow’s needs hierarchy as early as 1982, although it was presented and taught as viable motivational theory applicable in every situation, including those occurring in industrialized society today in every introductory education and psychology textbook in print. In reference to some of the problems, Herzberg (1982) said:

The Maslow system, than, does seem appropriate, but it has holes in it. Lower-order needs never get satisfied, as witness the constant demand for physiological and security guarantees, the continuing socialization of our society, and the never-ending search for status symbols. This is evident even though we have recognized the importance of self-actualization as a potent force in the motivational make-up of people. The Maslow system stresses the material needs of man as primary to his more ‘human’ moral motives. The system has not worked in application because the biological needs of man are parallel systems, rather than either one assuming initial importance. A new theory…in work motivation is needed (p. 48).
Further, the outcomes of this study did not confirm the alternative motivational paradigm promoted by Herzberg. In fact, study results evidenced two incidents in which participants reported being motivated to leave their positions, by what Herzberg termed as ‘dissatisfiers’ or ‘hygiene factors.’ According to Herzberg’s paradigm, ‘dissatisfiers/hygiene factors’ could not motivate, only dissatisfy. They were specifically found in the work environment, and defined the external environment rather than the work itself. The results of this study provided evidence in direct opposition to this hypothesis. One of two participants emotionally motivated to leave MSU-Bozeman was motivated by ‘hygiene’ factors/’dissatisfiers,’ and several of the participants expressed that, unsatisfactory ‘hygiene’ factors at work would indeed motivate them to leave their positions.

In addition, these responses illustrate evidence of emotions generated by unsatisfactory ‘hygiene’ factors as motivators, and as theorized by Goleman, these negative emotions motivated participants to adopt goal-incongruent behavior. Participants provided evidence of being motivated solely by emotion in the absence of unfulfilled physiological needs. However, being motivated by emotion is clear evidence of unfulfilled emotional needs.

Participants also exhibited behavior motivated by unfulfilled physiological needs in the absence of motivating negative emotions. One participant reported that although he was satisfied with every aspect of his work, he recognized the impending possibility of being unable to meet the increases in the cost of living in the area, if these costs weren’t reflected in his salary. He had no reason to expect that they would be, as there was no contractual provision for increases in the cost of living, and he had received no raises,
even after promotion at MSU-Bozeman. Having to leave MSU-Bozeman as a result of not being able to meet the cost of living increases in the area is an example of an unmet physiological need as a motivator in the absence of emotion.

More commonly, participants were motivated by emotions generated by unfulfilled needs, or needs generated by emotions, or an intellectual decision made after the evaluation of both needs and emotions, or a combination of two, if not all three of these factors. Unfulfilled emotional needs were generated by both physiological and psychological unmet needs, and more often than not, manifested themselves as satisfaction or dissatisfaction, in Herzberg’s terms.

Ultimately, motivators of emotion, need, and intellect were inextricably interrelated as motivating forces (Figure 2). The conceptual model resulting from analysis of results of the study strongly implies continuous interaction between the three motivators. Study results evidenced intellectual motivators overriding motivators of need and emotion. The interrelationship of Maslow’s unfulfilled higher and lower order needs, which included emotional needs, as motivators, and Goleman’s motivating emotions and intellect became a seamless web. Certainly, both theories are appropriate in the discussion of motivational theory, but neither theory appears to work consistently or without exception in application, exclusive of the other. Neither system provided for the undeniable existence of the other.

The interrelatedness of emotion, need, and intellect as motivators, and the synergistic effect of one upon the others are not provided for in either of the paradigms. Discussing need in the absence of emotion as a motivator, or discussing emotion in the absence of need, or either in the absence of intellect becomes ineffective, in that it leaves the
synergistic effects of all three motivators unexplained. Neither system works consistently, without exception, in application, without recognition and consideration of the cause and effect of the other. A new theory in work motivation is implied.

Summary

It is not known by higher education leaders why tenured faculty members choose to remain in the professorate at Montana State University-Bozeman (MSU-Bozeman). Not knowing why faculty choose to remain at MSU-Bozeman presents a problem for University faculty and officials responsible for recruiting and retaining a stable faculty work force.

The purpose of this grounded theory study was to explore what motivates faculty at Montana State University (MSU-Bozeman) to remain in their faculty positions. Specifically, twenty tenured faculty members from disciplines in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman, a land grant, Doctoral II University, were interviewed to determine why they remained in their faculty positions. From their responses, a theory was developed to explain the motivation for remaining.

In an attempt to explore why faculty at MSU-Bozeman remain in their positions in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education, the following questions were examined: Is there a select set of motivators that explains the decision of tenured faculty from disciplines in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education to remain in the professorate at MSU-Bozeman? If in fact there is, are they consistent with those that have been found to motivate workers in industry, or are they unique to the professorate? Comparison of findings of research conducted in higher education with those findings resulting from research conducted in the industrial
sector is essential, as most existing motivational theory evolved from research conducted in industry.

The answers to these questions provide insight into the problem of not knowing why faculty remain in the field of higher education at MSU-Bozeman and fulfill the purpose of this grounded theory study which is to examine what motivates faculty at MSU-Bozeman to remain in their positions.

A select set of motivators emerged from the study results that explain the decisions of tenured faculty from disciplines in liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education to remain in the professorate at MSU-Bozeman in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education. These motivators are not consistent with those that have been found to motivate workers in industry.

The findings of the study represent broad implications for the evolution of a new motivational theory. The new theory carries implications for motivational theorists, organizational managers, and those in higher education at MSU-Bozeman and elsewhere responsible for retaining faculty. The findings may be relevant, as well, to members of such institutions and organizations, and other individuals seeking to maximize their personal potential.

Answer to Research Questions

Faculty are motivated to remain in their positions in the disciplines of liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, fine arts, and education at MSU-Bozeman by the location of the institution, out of deference to their families, and as a result of having earned tenure at this institution. Faculty is motivated by intellect, emotion, and physiological need. Faculty is motivated to remain by the absence of perceived ‘hygiene’ problems, to use
Herzberg’s term, which would motivate them to leave. Faculty report that, if aspects of their employment, such as the external environmental motivators, are not present or not acceptable, they will not remain in their positions. Faculty report that these external environmental factors, including tenure, are fundamental to higher education, and that if MSU-Bozeman did not have these to offer, the participants would not have agreed to the employment in the first place.

**Recommendations**

The scope of emotional intelligence might be expanded to engender an understanding of how emotions generate needs, needs generate emotions, and intellect generates, evaluates, and manages both emotions and needs. Also, that skills facilitating the management of needs and emotions are possible to teach and to learn, and will promote the achievement of long-term goals and emotional serenity, both internally and across organizations. Goleman termed this last effect of the generation of cohesive emotional rapport between members of organizations as “resonance” (2002).

**Further Research**

The potential for further research to question whether or not the present hypothesis is more widely applicable presents itself in higher education in general, and in industry, in both the public and the private sectors. Potential further research is also indicated for personal psychological and clinical development of strategies enabling individuals to learn about how emotions generate needs and needs generate emotions, and how individuals can learn to motivate themselves in accordance to the fundamental interrelatedness of the two through the use of intellect, to attain both personal and professional goals. Investigation of
larger populations of varying ages might reveal the effect of age on motivation as a result of the interaction of emotion, need, and intellect. Understanding the principles behind the generation of motivating emotion by need, and motivating need by emotion, and evaluation and management of both through the use of intellect might enable individuals to more completely self-actualize and manage their own emotions and needs rationally.

A final theme, higher education motivators, not included in Table 12, emerged minimally through analysis of the data. It was not included for the following reason: Although interesting, the appearance of this theme evidenced itself so peripherally that there was not sufficient data for the author to draw conclusions based upon the evidence. It was, however, rife with implications for further research.

Procedural Adjustments. Studies exploring the effectiveness of a theory based on the interrelatedness of emotion, need, and intellect, the continuous interaction of the three, and the tendency for one to produce and/or manage the other, should employ the use of a larger more diversified sample population, and an instrument making inquiry beyond the realm of employment in higher education, or employment of any kind, to determine whether or not there is a fundamental set of principles explaining human motivation that works universally in application in an industrialized society.

Replication. Replication of the study with larger general populations, not limited to, but including academia and industry, using participants of varying ages and backgrounds, might/should be useful in determining whether or not human motivation is explained by a set of fundamental principles that work universally in application in industrialized society. A replication of the study of motivation in higher education nationally might indicate more
clearly the unique aspects of retention at MSU-Bozeman and facilitate a comparison, if not a select set of motivators that are responsible for retention of faculty in a global sense

**New Questions.** The outcomes of this research have implications for further research and raise the following new questions.

1. Does age effect fundamental principles of motivation?

2. Are there fundamental principles of human motivation that work in application in an industrialized society, or even universally, regardless of the context of the study?

3. Are the same motivators applicable to a theory of retention for higher education in general?


Herzberg, F. (1976). *The managerial choice: To be efficient and to be human.* Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
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LETTER FROM HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dulce Drysdale
FROM: Stephen Guggenheim, M.D. Administrator, Human Subjects Committee
DATE: March 21, 2003
SUBJECT: Faculty Job Satisfaction: Retaining Faculty in the New Millennium Why Faculty Remain in Higher Education

The above research, described in your submission of March 17, 2003 is exempt from the requirement of review by the human subjects committee in accordance with the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 46, section 101. The specific paragraph which applies to your research is

____ (b)(1) Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices.

___ (b)(2) Research involving the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior.

____ (b)(4) Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these specimens are publicly available, or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that the subjects cannot be identified.

____ Other

Although review by the Human Subjects Committee is not required for the above research, the Committee will be glad to review it. If you wish a review and committee approval, please submit 3 copies of the usual application form and it will be processed by expedited review.
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL
Interview Protocol
Project: Those responsible for retention of faculty at MSU-Bozeman need to know what motivates faculty to remain in their positions.

Time of interview:
Date:
Place:
Interviewer:
Interviewee:
Position of interviewee:

The project attempts to discover the motivating forces that cause faculty to remain at MSU-Bozeman in order of priority. It focuses on isolating the dominant motives for each interviewee. Confidentiality of information is ensured. In this interest, the requirement by the Human Subjects Committee for consent forms has been waived to eliminate any link between the participants and the information included in their responses. Numerical pseudonyms will be assigned to participants to protect their anonymity. Additionally, all participants will be referred to in the masculine third person to eliminate gender identification.

Questions:

1. Please provide a biographical description of yourself, including place of birth, education and employment history, and length of tenure at MSU-Bozeman.

2. From where do you derive the most satisfaction from/in your current position? (Ex: Teaching, research, etc.)

3. Describe the effect that external environmental aspects of your job at MSU-Bozeman, such as working conditions, competence of colleagues, interpersonal relationships with coworkers, quality of students, governing policies, administration, style of leadership and supervision, and institutional reputation has had upon the strength of your motivation to remain at MSU-Bozeman?
4. To what degrees do salary, tenure and job security present themselves as motivating factors in determining your decision to remain at MSU-Bozeman?

5. To what extent does opportunity for achievement and recognition, promotion and growth, rank, autonomy of thought and action as a professor, and personal freedom affect your decision to remain at MSU-Bozeman?

6. Are family and/or geographic location motivating factors for you in choosing to remain in your position at MSU-Bozeman?

7. Have you at any time looked for another job since receiving tenure at MSU-Bozeman?

8. Is there anything else related to your satisfaction with your job that I have not covered?

(Thank individual for participating in interview. Request follow-up information, if needed. Assure him or her of confidentiality of responses and potential future interviews.)
APPENDIX C

LETTER FROM THE AUDITOR
Randal Batchelor  
1401 W. Garfield,  
Bozeman, MT 59715  

March 11, 2005  

To Whom It May Concern:  

I am writing in regard to my audit of Dulce Scott Drysdale’s doctoral dissertation project, “Faculty Job Satisfaction: Retaining Faculty in the New Millennium.” In addition to reviewing her final proposal, findings, analysis, and conclusions, I have listened to recorded interviews, gone over interview transcripts, and looked at her coded data sheets.  

From this examination, I believe Dulce has systematically conducted her study in accordance with the procedures outlined in her methodology section. Moreover, her findings and conclusions appear to faithfully reflect the data she gathered during the interview process. Indeed, I found no appreciable errors or discrepancies between the participants’ recorded comments and the quotes and descriptions included in her draft.  

In short, I conclude that Dulce’s work conforms to accepted methodological and ethical standards for qualitative educational research.  

Sincerely,  

[Randal Batchelor's signature]