ABSTRACT

WOOD, CRYSTAL. Motivation to Participate in Faculty Development: A Case Study of North Carolina Community College Excellence in Teaching Award Winners and Finalists. (Under the direction Dr. James Bartlett, II).

Both pre-service and in-service learning are opportunities for community college faculty to learn teaching approaches to meet the learning needs of the diverse community college student population. Community college faculty members are faced with complex classrooms with learners of all different ages, races, cultures and academic preparedness. As many community college faculty members join community colleges without formal preparation in teaching pedagogy, in service faculty development becomes an important means by which these individuals can learn how to teach their students. In reviewing the existing research, we do not know enough about what motivates a community college faculty member to participate in faculty development and learn the teaching skills needed to serve their students. Low levels of participation in faculty development are historically documented in the literature as an obstacle faced by community colleges. The purpose of this case study is to offer some insight into the motivation to participate in faculty development from the perspective of 12 North Carolina Community College System Excellence in Teaching Award winners and finalists. These individuals demonstrated both excellence in community college teaching and a commitment to faculty development. In depth interviews were conducted with the participants to better understand the components of motivation as defined in Vroom’s expectancy theory; intrinsic, instrumental, extrinsic and effort, had the greatest influence on their decision to participate in faculty development. This study contributes to the field of postsecondary qualitative research, by examining community college faculty and their motivation to participate in faculty development. The findings of this research indicate that
while much of the motivation to participate in faculty development is intrinsic, there are clear, extrinsic practices that community college leaders can adopt and implement to enhance faculty motivation. Recommendations for future research include investigation of belief in faculty development by community college leaders at each of the 58 community colleges as well as all faculty members, not just award winners.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The origins of the American community college dates to the early years of the twentieth century, a testimony in American faith and dedication to the belief that all individuals should have the opportunity to rise to their greatest potential (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). The open-access comprehensive community college is a uniquely American invention (Beach, 2011) and expanded at an exponential rate over the past century, from 74 community colleges in 1915 to 1244 in 1999 (American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Community, Junior, and Technical College Directory, 1960, 1976, 1979, 1980; Palmer, 1987b; National Center for Education Statistics, 1993, 2001b). Defined as “an institution that has no other valid reason for being except to teach” (Cohen & Brawer, 1972, p.11), community colleges have no obligation to provide knowledge production research services, as do universities, and as a result have been free to focus on the improvement of learning and teaching (Knowles, 1977). The Commission on the Future of Community Colleges states, “the community college should be the nation’s premier teaching institution with quality instruction being the hallmark” (as cited in DeBard, 1995, p.34). In the United States during the fall of 2011, community colleges enrolled over 8 million students (see Figure 1, Fall Headcount Credit Enrollment, AACC, 2011), many of whom were previously blocked from higher education due to social or economic factors (Hendrick, Hightower & Gregory, 2006). Community college student bodies include growing numbers of minority students, first generation students, less affluent students, those with different academic skills and
preparation as well as significant numbers of adult students returning to college (Bailey & Morest, 2006; Civic Ventures, 2006; Furchtgott-Roth, Jacobson & Mokher, 2009). “For most community college students, the choice is not between the community college and a senior residential institution; it is between the community college and nothing”, (Cohen, 1990, p.439). As many students come to community colleges less academically able (Cohen, 1990, p.428), the community college faculty must become the link to provide and develop teaching strategies that will enable, support and stabilize the student in his or her academic surrounding (Nwagwu, 1998).

Figure 1.1. Fall Headcount Credit Enrollment, AACC, 2011

Community college faculty stand out from many of their professorial colleagues not only because of the size and diversity of their sector of higher education, but mostly because teaching- far more than research or service- is the heart of their profession (Huber, 1998, p.12). The widely received, and often unquestioned, story is that community colleges are
teaching institutions and therefore, by definition, their faculty members are good teachers (Twombly & Townsend, 2008). While teaching is identified as the primary activity of 90 percent of community college faculty members (Provasnik & Planty, 2008), calculated on average to be 16 classroom hours per week (Grubb et al., 1999), the assumption that community college faculty are expert teachers simply because they are employed in teaching colleges has not been validated. In truth, until the late 1990’s, almost no empirical investigation of teaching in what was assumed to be a teaching institution was even published (Beach, 2012). As a focus of study, community college faculty have largely been ignored, despite the ultimate justification for knowing more about community college faculty members being their impact on the higher education system through the teaching of so many students” (Townsend & Twombly, 2008, p.21). There is robust literature on the effects of teachers on student outcomes in the K-12 arena, however among studies of community college student success, the role of faculty is often neglected (Goldrick-Rab, 2010). This neglect is problematic as community college faculty are the medium through which the community college accomplishes or fails to meet its teaching mission (St.Clair, 1994. As the community college places the responsibility of student success in the hands of the faculty (Rifkin, 2000), it is critical community college faculty are prepared to be expert teachers and meet the learning needs of their students as according to Cohen (2006) community college students may have no other resources to turn to. There is a visible gap in the research literature related to the study of community college faculty and their effect on student outcomes.
Community colleges are expected to accommodate a wide variety of students, many of whom face financial, academic, and personal challenges that may be beyond the control of the colleges and that can thwart students’ retention and successful completion of programs (Adelman, 2005b; Grubb, 2002; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Part of the central mission of the community college was and still is to serve a larger and more diverse student population than that served by four-year institutions (Murray, 2002). This means that community college faculty members often are faced with the hard but necessary task of meeting students where they are and helping to move them to the next academic level (McIntosh & Rouse, 2009; U.S. Department of Education 2008). A striking example of the difference in diversity of student populations found at community colleges compared to that at four year institutions is provided by Bailey and Jenkins (2009) who note that there are more low-income African American and Hispanic students at Bronx Community College alone that there are in the entire Ivy League. 58 percent of all African American undergraduates and 66 percent of all Hispanic undergraduates are enrolled in community colleges (Katsinas & Tallefson, 2009).

Another area of difference in community college student populations relates to academic readiness. As prior academic success is not a prerequisite for admission, 61% of students at community colleges take at least one remedial course while in college (Goldrick-Rab, 2010, p.438). Students who require remedial coursework appear less likely to complete any type of credential at a community college (Bailey et al., 2005). In addition, a number of veterans and ex-offenders attend community college, two populations whose needs are far outside the norm in higher education (Hyland, 2014, p.23). George Boggs, former President
of the American Association of Community Colleges, noted, “the most important challenge for community college faculty is to develop the ability to adjust styles of teaching to the diverse learning style of students” (1999, p.7). Unless community college faculty have the teaching expertise to successfully diagnose and meet the vast range of learning needs entering the community college classrooms each semester, it is unlikely that community college faculty can honor their commitments to either their students or their institution.

Community colleges enroll those students who have the most daunting educational, economic and social barriers to their education, yet community colleges have the fewest resources per student to serve those students, including resources for teacher development (Bailey & Morest, 2006). Although research has linked higher levels of instruction spending to improved community college outcomes, community colleges often lack the resources to support innovative practices or to fund the development costs for new and innovative teaching approaches (Bailey et al., 2005). According to Beach (2011), one of the ways community colleges have structured the failure of many students is by not providing the necessary trained teachers that would ensure student success. Despite their critical role in the expanding importance of community colleges in postsecondary education, community college faculty generally do not receive the institutional support they deserve to enhance their teaching preparedness and ultimately improve the quality of student learning (Lail, 2005).

Former President Bruce Howell of North Carolina Wake Technical Community College stated “everyone wants quality, but quality comes from the instructor” (as cited in Yates, 2001, p.8). The open, democratic American educational system has been referred to as a
ladder of opportunity and means for upward mobility (Beach, 2011). Within this metaphor, the role of community college faculty is to guide and assist their students, who are starting at the lowest point of entry onto the ladder of opportunity and lacking the funds to purchase adequate climbing gear, in ascending the rungs of opportunity. This challenging scenario begs the question, how are community college faculty prepared to help their students?

While there were over 1 million community college faculty employed in the US in 2006, less than 30% of full time faculty had received comprehensive instruction on how to teach prior to hire (McWilliams et al, 2006). Unlike their counterparts in K-12 and four-year colleges, few community college faculty are prepared in pre-service, graduate programs especially designed for community college teaching (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Faculty members who teach remedial courses require a particular set of skills, competencies and attitudes (Gerstein, 2009), only 20 percent of community colleges in a national study reported requiring full time faculty to possess specific training for developmental education before teaching remedial courses (Shults, 2000). As a greater percentage of students in developmental courses have learning disabilities, many community college faculty have expressed a desire for formal training on how to address the needs of students with learning disabilities (Kozeracki, 2005, p.43). In his review of the literature on pre-service education, Miller (1997) found only a handful of institutions offered coursework or other experiences that prepared masters or doctoral students to teach in community colleges, but none offered a systematic program of study focused on community college teaching. The limited frequency, and at times complete absence, of pre-service learning as it relates to preparing community college faculty to teach in the community college setting is a consistent theme documented in
the literature. If community college faculty are rarely, if ever, prepared to teach via pre-service or graduate learning, then where can community college faculty acquire the skills and abilities to teach and otherwise support the multitude of students who enter the community college open door institution?

One answer is in-service faculty development, both formal and informal. Faculty development is defined as activities, opportunities and resources that enhance the individual faculty member and which may in turn improve the quality of teaching as well as improve learning for students (Wallin, 2010). From the early days of community colleges, leaders have relied upon in-service faculty development activities to assist community college faculty in forming the skills and strategies necessary to provide effective instruction (Murray, 2002). Community colleges face the challenge of retaining open access policies while developing faculty and staff training to cope with the resulting wide range of student academic skills and motivational and cultural barriers (Almeida, 1991; Neilson, 1991). Faculty development programs were intended to help community college faculty explore their attitudes about teaching and learning, acquire more knowledge about professional education, enhance sensitivities to students and colleagues, develop teaching skills and understand how to balance the teaching role with their professional responsibilities (Cohen & Brawer, 1977). The tacit assumption underlying faculty development is that when faculty members learn more about teaching, then they are able to teach better (Rutz et al., 2012). The California Postsecondary Education Commission sees the purpose of faculty development as a means toward providing better education for students than would be possible without such support (Brawer, 1990). To meet the need for competent community college faculty, most
American community colleges have established faculty development programs to assist both full-time and part-time faculty in improving teaching competencies (Dickson, 2006). Accrediting bodies also require the provision of faculty development initiatives at community colleges (Hyland, 2014).

Despite devoting considerable resources to faculty development, ranging from 1 percent of total faculty salaries to stipends of several hundred dollars per full-time faculty member, the success of faculty development has been quite limited (Maxwell & Kazlauskas, 1992; Murray, 1999, 2002). While conducting their research on teaching in the community college, Grubb and associates discovered that by a large margin, community college faculty learn how to teach not from in-service faculty development programs but rather via trial and error, beginning with conventional teacher-centered practices, rejecting those when deemed ineffective, then testing and shifting to more student-centric approaches (Grubb et al., 1999). The obvious problem with trial and error as a method of teacher training is that it is inefficient, time consuming and limited to only the faculty who are engage in the process of trial and error (Grubb et al., 1999). However, there is another problem within Grubb and associates discoveries of community college faculty learning, that faculty development was not taken seriously or valued. A number of researchers have concluded that faculty development programs are often resented by faculty (Murray, 1999; Grubb et al, 1999). Numerous issues have been attributed to the failure of faculty development programs to reach their fullest potential; ranging from lack of clear goals, resentment towards one-shot, episodic workshops conducted by outside “experts” and irrelevant content. Not surprisingly, one of the most pervasive, challenging and consistent issues related to faculty development
program failure is lack of participation. Faculty development programs have little hope of enhancing the teaching skills of faculty members if the individual faculty members are not motivated to participate.

Community college faculty are adults and according to Wlodkowski (2003), unless adults participate, they cannot learn, and without learning there is no possibility for transfer-that is to apply what they have learned to their life or workplace. Participation and learning are inseparable (Wlodkowski, 2003, p.41). Teachers’ motivation to participate in faculty development is a key factor in changing teaching skills (Smith et al., 2003). According to Wallin (2010), faculty development is largely a matter of motivation as ultimately any changes in instructional process are made because of the motivation of the instructor. A recent review of the related literature revealed that what is known about the motivation of community college faculty to participate in faculty development is limited. Greater understanding is needed in order to address the issue of low participation. Community colleges cannot afford to continue to offer faculty development without a firm understanding of the motivations for faculty participation, meanwhile hoping that the historical issue of low participation will correct itself. In order for faculty development to contribute to the quality of instruction for the 11.5 million students served by the 1,045 community colleges in the United States today (Brookings Institute, 2009), researchers need to better understand why some faculty participate in faculty development programs while others do not.
Nature of the Problem

Beach (2011) defines the community college as a contradictory institution with a “muddle of mixed motives and competing actors” (p.xxxi), designed for open access to all with no provisions made to ensure the success of these individuals. One readily observed contradiction is the expectation of a comparatively underprepared community college faculty to overcome some of the most difficult tasks in higher education: to educate growing numbers of minority students, first-generation college students, less affluent students and those with different academic skills and preparation (Bailey & Morest, 2006). The majority of Black and Hispanic undergraduate students in the United States study at community college, the average age of a community college student is 29 and two-thirds of community college students attend part-time (AACC, 2013). In a typical community college class, a faculty member will have millennial students who grew up with text-messaging and blogging; gen X-ers who grew up as CDs and PCs were being invented; and baby boomers who grew up with the development of the television set and record players (Waiwaiole & Noonan-Terry, 2005). Given the heterogeneity among the students that enroll in community colleges, it is clear community college faculty especially need to be given the tools necessary to deal with the wide variety of educational attainment, technology skills and ages of students they will encounter at the community college (McClure, 2011). However, unlike elementary or secondary school teaching colleagues, more often educated through schools of education, few community college instructors are grounded in learning theory; most have never formally studied- or even read much about- cognition, learning styles, human development, moral development, or taxonomies of intellectual growth (Sperling, 2003).
Generally, community colleges require their academic instructors to have master’s degrees in order to ensure subject mastery (Grubb et al., 1999) and community college researchers note that although content mastery is a critical requisite in the faculty selection process, pedagogical proficiency beyond the ability to lecture is rarely a consideration (Miller, Finely & Vancko, 2000; Rouche, Milliron & Rouche, 2003). Though research suggests that those who enter teaching with little professional education and teaching preparation have greater difficulties in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 1992; Grossman, 1989; Jelmberg, 1996; National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 1992), currently the requirements for teaching in community college do not include a prerequisite knowledge of teaching and learning. Furthermore, Cohen and Brawer (1996) stated, “faculty members prepared by traditional graduate programs are often unprepared for the pedagogical challenges of the open door institution”; challenges that Amey argues demand different approaches to teaching and learning (Amey, 1999). Due to the diversity of the community college student body, the methods by which community college students learn require versatility, involvement and instructional expertise (Waiwaiole & Noonan-Terry, 2005). Cohen and associates (1971) assert that teaching causes learning, thus if community college faculty do not possess the teaching skills needed, such as versatility and instructional expertise, it is likely that the learning experiences of their students will suffer. While a master’s degree may support expertise in an academic discipline or specific field of study, “graduate schools don’t generally supply teachers in training with the tools they’ll need to be a success in the two-year college work” (Evelyn, 2001). “Most of us leave grad school without learning about learning,” Barnett (2011). Community college faculty will come into
their positions with training in their profession, but not always training to teach (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy & Beach, 2006).

Hired for subject matter expertise, many instructors arrive on community college campuses only vaguely aware of the preparedness issues they will face (Fayne & Ortgist-Ahrens, 2006). Many community college faculty members receive little or no formal training in teaching and rely on informal training, such as observing their own professors’ teaching methods when they were students (Colbeck et al., 2002). Without any formal teacher preparation or teaching experience, sociologist Dan Lortie suggested that teachers are highly likely to teach in the way they themselves were taught and thus adopt the practices of former teachers (Lortie, 1975). As case studies of beginning and experienced teachers have shown (Bullough, Knowles, and Crow, 1992; Berman and others, 1991; Dollase, 1992), much of how teachers teach is in direct response to how they learned (Brookfield, 2002). This explains why the most common teaching methods are conventionally teacher centered, with teacher controlled knowledge transferred via lecture (Grubb et al., 1999, Cuban, 1993). However, Amey argues that based upon the differences found in community college student populations, “it is increasingly clear that traditional approaches to teaching and learning are inappropriate for many, if not most, of these students” (Amey, 1999, p.41). Many community college faculty are either stuck in the traditional academic-discipline- centered approach, or are ill prepared to facilitate learning from a student centered perspective (Weimer, 2003). If, as argued by Adams (2001), effective learning and teaching in classrooms populated by diverse students is dependent on the flexibility of a community college instructor’s teaching
repertoire, and his or her readiness to draw on a range of teaching styles for a variety of students, lack of preparedness to teach in the community college setting is an urgent and important issue that must be addressed.

Both pre-service and in-service learning are opportunities for community college faculty to learn teaching approaches that meet the learning needs of the community college student population. Pre-service education for community college faculty can include graduate school education and professional experience, occurring prior to employment at the community college. In-service faculty development is broadly defined as activities with the purpose of enhancing the talents, expanding the interest, improving the competence of faculty members, particularly in their roles as instructors (Gaff, 1975, p.14). In the last decade, graduate degree programs, such as the Master of Education (M.Ed.) graduate program with a specialization in Community College Teaching at North Carolina State University and the Master of Arts in Teaching in Community College Education (MAT) at Mississippi State University have been developed to train educators to be qualified professionals prepared for the complexity of teaching in the community college setting. Teaching certificate programs such as the Community College Faculty Preparation Certificate at Sacramento State University and the Community College Teaching Certificate (CTCC) program at San Diego State University have emerged as alternative options to an academic degree to prepare individuals who seek a career in community college teaching as well as to advance the skills of existing community college faculty. The curricula in these programs consist of specifically designed courses of study that focuses on adult education,
adult learning theory (andragogy), instructional strategies and methods, adult learning assessment, competency in curriculum and course development and even skills for online teaching.

While graduate degree and certificate programs do exist as opportunities to prepare individuals to teach in the community college setting, historically, specific preparation for teaching at community colleges has occurred via faculty development (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Faculty development emerged as a process to modify the attitudes, skills and behavior of faculty members toward greater competence and effectiveness in meeting student needs, faculty members’ own needs and the needs of the institution (Francis, 1975, p.720) and has evolved to the promotion of expertise of faculty members within their discipline, improving instruction and increasing knowledge of teaching (Brawer, 1990). It is widely accepted that in-service faculty development is a means for community colleges to provide faculty with tools necessary for meeting the learning needs of students entering through the open door institution (McPhail & Costner, 2004). Faculty development within community colleges is of concern because faculty members at such institutions are increasingly held accountable for student learning outcomes, adjusting to a learner centered focus and learning to incorporate technology in the classroom; they are being asked to teach effectively in far more diverse classroom environments than had been the case (Eddy, 2005). Faculty development plays a critical role in developing faculty into a more knowledgeable, better skilled group who are able to use effective teaching strategies to engage students in the learning process (Center for Community College Student Engagement, 2010). Factors precipitating the need for community college faculty development in the 1970’s included:
• The need for increased effectiveness and efficiency due to competition for limited tax dollars and beginning public demands for accountability.

• The acknowledgement that the future success of the community college depended on the ability of its personnel to adapt to a constantly changing environment, the development of a technology of instruction with potential for improved instruction unknown to most faculty.

• An awareness among faculty that they were becoming unable to cope with the needs of the increasing percentages of “high risk” students enrolling in community colleges; a recognition among leaders that change was imperative and that they needed to become skilled in planning implementing, and evaluating change.

• The increasing influence of court decisions, collective bargaining, and federal regulations on institutional governance.

• The occurrence of a relatively high turnover in leadership positions at the mid-management levels at the community college (Hammons, Wallace & Watts, 1978, p.66).

In addition to these factors, present day issues facing community college faculty include the changing nature of the student body, the increased focus on learning and learning communities, new instructional technologies, and a renewed focus on assessment (Cohen & Brawer, 2008). More than in the past, some scholars argue that expanding the role of faculty development is not optional for community colleges but is integral in the overall development of faculty to meet the needs of a diverse student population and contribute to institutional effectiveness (Community College Survey of Student Engagement [CCCSE],
The difficult, unanswered question from the past 4 decades is how to move faculty development from a theoretical concept into a relevant, effective catalyst for change.

Contrary to the concept presented in the movie Field of Dreams; “if you build it, they will come”, while faculty development efforts have been instituted at virtually all community colleges (Centra, 1972; Grubb, 1999; Murray, 2002; Sorcinelli et al., 2006), community college faculty have not collectively come to participate. Unless adults participate, they cannot learn and without learning there is no possibility for transfer and application of what they have learned to their life or workplace (Wlodkowski, 2003). Angelo (1994) identified low faculty participation as an ongoing issue found in the faculty development literature. “First, a relatively small number of faculty take advantage of the programs; second, those faculty who do participate are often the ones who seem to need them the least”(Angelo, 1994, p. 3). This statement echoes the faculty development participation issues found by Centra (1975) and also Maxwell and Kazlauskas (1992). The decision to participate in faculty development is complex. It involves the individual’s reaction to faculty development offerings, motivation to develop or enhance a specific skill, being available at the time of the faculty development session, anticipated return on the time invested in the session, overcoming the psychological barrier of admitting need, and dealing with ego sufficiently to be seen in a “training” session (Rubeck & Witzke, 1998). In the research literature to date, there remains a large gap in the study of community college faculty development in general and specifically a lack of understanding regarding why faculty are motivated to participate in faculty development.
Problem Statement

While the need for community college faculty development has been consistently documented in the literature, paradoxically the actual study of community college faculty development has been minimal (Lail, 2005; Murray, 2002). There are many published descriptions of faculty development programs and activities, yet the research literature on attendance and participation in faculty development programs and activities is scant (Steinert et al., 2009). In addition to scarcity of research, the study of community college faculty job satisfaction, preparation, faculty development, issues of teaching and learning and career stages (Barnsley, 1992; Carter & Ottinger, 1992; Centra, 1975; Cohen, 1973; Grubb et al., 1999; Kein, 1989; Murray, 1999, 2002; O’banion, 1972), has occurred sporadically every decade or so, with little continuity or depth of study. In the past decade, based upon a recent literature review, only one national review of community college faculty development research conducted by Murray in 2002 was located. Murray (2002) found several themes consistently emerged from the literature, the last of which speaks directly to the issue of low faculty participation:

- Few community colleges make the effort to tie their faculty development programs to the mission of the college.
- Few community colleges attempt to evaluate the success of faculty development programs.
- Faculty participation in most faculty development activities is often minimal and often those most in need do not participate. (Murray, 2002, p.91).

In the last two decades of education reform, teachers have been viewed as central to
both the problems of education and the solutions (OSBA, 2009). Many instructors teach the way they learn and may have difficulty in understanding students with different styles of learning (Thompson et al., 2002). As repeatedly referenced in the literature, community college students differ from their peers in public and private four-year institutions through a variety of attributes including race, nationality, English as a second language, socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds, and the tendency to work full or part time while attending classes (Gerstein, 2009). Community college students are especially learning style diverse due to the previously referenced differences (Gillespie et al., 2010), thus teaching a more diverse population of students requires community college faculty to have a deeper knowledge of pedagogy (Hutchings, Huber and Golde, 2006). Consistently, the literature shows many community college faculty do not come into their teaching roles prepared to teach in any classrooms, let alone the diverse and challenging classrooms of the community college. Faculty development is a possible means for community college faculty to obtain required teaching abilities and skills, however the problem of participation in faculty development must be addressed. The lack of motivation to participate in faculty development negates any positive progress towards building needed teaching skills.

The existing research provides insight about barriers to participation in faculty development, ranging from lack of time, financial resources, dislike of format and general lack of belief in the value of faculty development, which sadly have not changed or been significantly addressed over the last four decades. The question of why faculty do not participate has clearly been answered, however the question of why faculty do participate has not. Few research studies were located that examined cases in which community college
faculty demonstrated motivation and participated in faculty development. The proposed case study seeks to illuminate and understand why the decision to participate in faculty development was made. Until we know why faculty are motivated to participate in faculty development, there is little chance that community college faculty developers will be able to replicate or cultivate this desired behavior. One of the significant limitations of related literature into community college faculty development was the use of a faculty group or convenience sample that may or may not include excellent teachers. The ideal populations for such a study would be community college faculty who actively chose to participate in faculty development and who also exemplified a high level of expertise teaching effectiveness in the community college classroom. The proposed study seeks to identify and select such a selective group of faculty members to examine as a case study. The North Carolina Community College System provides a unique opportunity to access to such an in-depth and contemporary population.

Established in 1963, the North Carolina Community College System employs almost 7000 full time faculty members to serve an estimated 840,000 students annually, it is the third largest community college system in the nation with 59 community college institutions (NC Community Colleges, 2013). Over 99% of the state’s population lives within 30 minutes of a community college campus and each year, one in six North Carolinians enrolls in a community college course (NC Community Colleges, 2013). Urban, suburban and rural communities are served by the North Carolina Community College systems. In 2010-2011 North Carolina Community Colleges enrolled 115,312 students in ESL, GED, Adult High School, Adult Basic Education and Compensatory Education. 65% of North
Carolina Community College fulltime faculty members have earned a master’s degree or higher and while each college may have varying types of faculty development, all of the colleges provide their fulltime faculty with faculty development opportunities. In examining the faculty handbooks of the 59 colleges within NCCCS, it appears that majority of the colleges encourage their fulltime faculty members to participate in at least 1 faculty development program per year should financial resources permit. The size of the North Carolina Community College System, including the number of colleges within the system, population of students served, the quantity of fulltime faculty employed, as well as the existence of faculty development opportunities at each campus substantiates the worthiness of interviewing full time faculty at NCCCS to understand why they were motivated to participate in faculty development.

Because the intention of the proposed case study is to better understand community college faculty development motivation to participate in faculty development, a viable group to study is teaching award nominees and winners for community college teaching awards that specify participation in faculty development as one of the key criteria. The State Board of NC Community College System established the “Excellence in Teaching” (EIT) program in 1985 to identify and individually recognize NC Community College System faculty who have consistently demonstrated the highest standard of teaching as defined by seven specific criteria, one of which is to demonstrate participation in professional development activities and experiences that enhance teaching effectiveness. It has long been accepted that teaching awards are a standard way for institutions of higher education to honor teaching (Carusetta, 2001). Research indicates that in the United States, close to 70 percent of two-year colleges
and liberal arts institutions have awards or programs honoring exemplary teaching (Menges, 1996; Zahorki, 1996). Compared to teaching awards in research, doctoral, masters and comprehensive schools, community college teaching awards emphasize content knowledge, student-centeredness, campus leadership and record of professional development in their list of criteria (Chism, 2006). Angelo (1996) writes, “In order to identify, assess, evaluate and honor exemplary teaching, we need to know what to look for and where to look” (p.6).

**Case Study Purpose**

This purpose of this proposed explanatory case study is to understand why winners and finalists of the NCCCS Excellence in Teaching Award between 2008 and 2013 were motivated to participate in faculty development. As these individuals have been recognized by their intuitions and the EIT committee of the North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges to be both excellent teachers and active participants in faculty development, understanding of their motivations is of particular value. The researcher will examine the lived experiences of award winning community college faculty using the lens of Vroom’s expectancy theory. Vroom’s expectancy theory operationalizes motivation in terms of four components; effort, intrinsic valence in the outcome of high performance emanating from effort, instrumentality and extrinsic rewards (Latham, 2012). Interviews will be used as the main data gathering technique and the motivation of these award winning faculty members to participate in faculty development will be deconstructed into the four components of motivation in Vroom’s expectancy theory. The power of interviews is the opportunity to understand the world from the subjects’ points of view, to unfold the meaning of peoples’
experiences and to uncover their lived world (Kvale, 1996). In general, research is lacking on the phenomena of motivation to participate in faculty development activities, even more so in the specific context of community college faculty. This proposed study intends to provide insight into why NCCCS award winning faculty were motivate to participate in faculty development and within their motivation, which components of motivation were the most influential in their decision to participate.

**Research Questions**

Higher education is a labor-intensive industry and investments in instruction, which include faculty development programs, are particularly expensive (Goldrick-Rab, 2010). Motivation towards faculty development may be individually fostered or it may importantly rise from a climate that inspires commitment and enthusiasm (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). When faculty are motivated to participate in faculty development activities and exemplify excellent teaching, which is partially attributed to this participation, we need to understand why the motivation occurred. The participants of this case study are individuals nominated for the NCCCS EIT award, deemed to be both excellent teachers and active participants in faculty development. Three data collection methods were employed- individual interviews, document analysis and direct observation. A literature review was conducted to determine what is currently known about faculty development, the community college, motivation theory, and teacher motivation to participate in faculty development. Review of the literature and reflecting on the purpose of the proposed case study led to the development of the following research questions:

1) Why were these NCCCS EIT community college faculty nominees motivated to
participate in faculty development activities?

2) What components of motivation, as defined in Vroom’s expectancy theory, are identified by the faculty as having greater influence on their decision to participate in faculty development activities?

**Researcher Propositions**

As community college faculty are adults and motivation a key component of adult learning theory (Knowles, 1984), the propositions for this case study were created using key aspects of adult learners outlined within Knowles’ theory of andragogy in conjunction with Vroom’s expectancy theory. According to Knowles (1984) the five key characteristics of adult learners are:

1) **Self concept**: As a person matures, his self-concept moves from one of being a dependent personality toward being a self directed human being.

2) **Experience**: As a person matures, he accumulates a growing reservoir of experience that becomes an increasingly rich source for learning.

3) **Readiness to learn**: As a person matures, his readiness to learn becomes oriented increasingly to the developmental tasks of their social roles.

4) **Orientation to learn**: As a person matures, his time perspective changes from one of postponed application of knowledge to immediacy of application and accordingly, their orientation toward learning shifts from one of subject-centeredness to one of performance centeredness.

5) **The motivation to learn**: As a person matures, the motivation to learn is internal (p.12).
Vroom’s theory of expectancy states that people base their actions on their perceptions and beliefs (Vroom, 1964). Vroom’s (1964) model suggests that motivation is shaped by the expectation that an act will be followed by a certain outcome (expectancy) and by the value and desirability of that result (valence). Motivation is operationalized by Vroom in terms of four components; effort, intrinsic valence in the outcome of high performance emanating from effort, instrumentality and extrinsic rewards (Latham, 2012).

Two propositions guide this case study:

1) Four components of motivation, as defined by Vroom’s expectancy theory, will influence an individual’s motivation to participate in faculty development and some will have greater influence than others.

2) Intrinsic components of motivation will emerge to be the most potent drivers of motivation to participate in faculty development activities in accordance with Knowles belief that in adults, the motivation to learn is internal.

**Conceptual Logic Model**

Vroom’s expectancy theory states that people base their actions on their perceptions and beliefs (Latham, 2007) and describes the cognitive process used by a single individual when making a choice among alternate behaviors (De Sanctis, 1983). Vroom’s expectancy theory operationalizes motivation in terms of four components, effort, intrinsic valence, instrumentality and external rewards valence (Latham, 2007). Intrinsic valence is the degree to which effective performance is desired for its own sake and instrumentality is one’s perceived causal connection between performance and the rewards one expects to receive as a result of good performance (Latham, 2007). In this research study, effort is defined as the
time and energy invested in an activity and external rewards valence to be extrinsic incentives such as promotions, monetary compensation and recognition. Figure 1.2 is the conceptual model for this case study depicting the components of Vroom’s expectancy theory, beginning from the far left and moving clockwise, the purple squares with arrows labeled “intrinsic” represent possible sources of intrinsic motivation combined with degree of effort required to participate in faculty development activities, the blue squares with arrows labeled “instrumental” represent sources of motivation that are instrumental in nature combined with effort required to participate, and finally the green squares on the far right represent extrinsic sources of motivation combined with effort required to participate in faculty development activities. The expected relationship between effort and valence is an inverse relationship with greater degrees of effort reducing the valence and ultimately decreasing the effect of a specific component of motivation to participate in faculty development.
Figure 1.2. Conceptual Model of Sources of Motivation to Participate in Faculty Development using components of Vroom's Expectancy Theory. Effort is assumed to exist within each component of motivation.

**Rationale and Significance**

The significance of this study is tri-fold, addressing the general lack of research examining community college faculty development, providing visibility into why community college faculty are motivated to participate in faculty development and providing a foundation for future research studies. Low levels of participation in faculty development have been a recurring issue for decades. While discovering what matters to teachers and how to best motivate them for sustained and improved performance is a complicated challenge
it is not a challenge that can continue to be ignored in the community colleges where 11.5 million students depend upon faculty to meet their learning needs. If faculty development is to play a relevant part in education reform, then it is essential to combat the low levels of participation. A better understanding of community college faculty motivation to participate in faculty development, why did this phenomena occur, will help guide community college leaders and faculty developers in their decisions related to faculty development program and design.

**The Researcher**

The researcher is a Chinese female, employed as a vice president in the luxury beauty industry. As a life long learner, the researcher enrolled in the NCSU Ed.D executive cohort program and became interested in exploring the topic of community college faculty development after hearing the feedback of classmates that served in both faculty and administrative positions within the NCCCS. In her professional experience, the researcher has served in several training and development roles and was intrigued by the contrast between training and development in the for-profit sector versus professional and faculty development in higher education. The researcher has minimal bias and a unique perspective to bring to bear in this inquiry as she is neither employed at an American community college nor ever plans to seek employment at an American community college.
Definition of Terms

Autonomy: Behavior that is experienced as willingly enacted and when he or she fully endorses the actions in which he or she is engaged and/or the values expressed by them (Chirkov et al., 2003, p.98).

Beliefs: The representation of a stimulus that is empowered to guide behavior as if it were true- prior to a rational analysis of the representations’ accuracy (Gilbert, 1991).

Case Study: A detailed analysis of a person or group, especially as a model of medical, psychiatric, psychological or social phenomena (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006).

Change: The event in which something appears to become, or turn into, something else, where the something else is seen as a result or outcome (Ford and Ford, 1994, p.759).

Community College: Any not-for profit institution accredited to award an Associates of Arts or the Associates of Science as its highest degree. A community college may also award various program certificates (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).

Competence: The ability to function effectively in the tasks considered essential within a given profession (Willis & Dublin, 1990).

Credibility: The truth value obtained from the discovery of human experiences as they are lived and perceived by informants (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Critical Incident: An incident that makes a significant contribution, either positively or negatively, to an activity or phenomenon (Bitner, Booms, and Tetrault, 1990).
**Development:** The targeted enhancement of an individual or a collective set of individuals to serve better the mission of the organization (Camblin & Steher, 2000).

**Effective Teaching:** The instructor’s ability to adopt a range of teaching methods to meet a variety of needs and ends (Grubb, 1999).

**Expectation:** A momentary belief concerning the likelihood that a particular act will precede a particular outcome” (Vroom, 1964, p.17). Beliefs or subjective probabilities that a specified outcome will likely follow from behavior, not objective likelihoods (Mowday & Nam, 1997, p.130).

**Explanatory Case Study:** A specific type of case study used when seeking to answer a question or explain the presumed causal links in real-life interventions that are too complex for the survey or experimental strategies (Yin, 2003).

**Extrinsic Reward:** Tangible outcome such as pay or promotion (Yamnill & McLean, 2001). Extrinsic rewards are controlled by others (Braxton, 2006).

**Faculty Development:** An omnibus term referring to a myriad of activities that colleges undertake to enhance individuals or institutional capacities to teach and serve students (Alfano, 1993). College and university activities that are designed to help faculty members improve their competence as teachers and scholars (Eble & McKeachie, 1985). Enhancing the talents, expanding the interest, improving the competence and otherwise facilitating the professional and personal growth of faculty members, particularly in their roles as instructors (Gaff, 1975, p.14).

**Force:** The combination of the perceived expectancy of a person that goals can be reached and the value the person attributes to the task (Kreber, 2002, p. 13).
**Instrumentality:** One’s perceived causal connection between one’s performance and the rewards one expects to receive as a result of this performance (Latham, 2012).

**Intrinsic Reward:** Intangible outcomes such as feeling of accomplishment or a sense of achievement (Yamnill & McLean, 2001). Intrinsic rewards emanate from the individual (Braxton, 2006).

**Motivation**—A set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual’s being, to initiate work related behavior and to determine its form, direction, intensity and duration (Pinder, 1998, p.71).

**Participation:** The involvement in life situations and behaviors that can only be accomplished using a variety of tasks or component actions rather than a simple physical task (Jette et al., 2007).

**Pedagogy:** The act of teaching along with its attendant discourse. It is what one needs to know, and the skills one needs to command in order to make and justify the many different kinds of decisions of which teaching is constituted” (Alexander, 2003, p.3).

**Professional Development:** Purposeful learning experiences undertaken in response to individual needs (Rostek & Kladvko, 1988). Activities that promotes the expertise of faculty members within their primary discipline; it is often accomplished through research grants and sabbatical grants, professional conference attendance and similar discipline- oriented activities (Brawer, 1990).

**Self Efficacy:** Belief in one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments (Bandura, 1997, p.3).
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

The purpose of this case study was to understand why award winning community college faculty were motivated to participate in faculty development. The intent of this literature review is to provide an overview of the body of research examined and utilized in the construction of this case study. The literature selected for this study was selected purposefully to help the researcher frame and understand the context of the study. The five main topics reviewed: Work Motivation Theory, Vroom’s Expectancy Theory, Community College Faculty Development, Teacher Motivation, Community College Faculty Motivation to Participate in Faculty Development. The literature review concludes with a summary of the relevant literature findings, discussion of gaps in the research and present the justification for this case study. Online literature searches were conducted using Google Scholar, the ProQuest database, the JSTOR database, and the ERIC database, with access granted through the North Carolina State University online library.

Work Motivation Theory

In the early 1900’s, Harvard psychologist Hugo Munsterburg engaged in systematic observation and interview of factory workers. While his interest was more about the issue of employee selection, his work is recognized as a precursor to the study of employee motivation (Latham, 2012) as it noted the need for overcoming monotony and mental starvation in the workplace (Munsterburg, 1913). At that time, psychologists gave little or no attention to the subject of motivation in the workplace (Latham, 2012). In 1932, the term “motives-in-work” appeared in Viteles publication Industrial Psychology, where he stressed
the need for a “detailed analysis of motives-in-work to determine the factors that underlie attitudes and activities which promotion or interfere with economic efficiency and individual satisfaction at work,” (Viteles, 1911, p.565). Motivation may be defined as the conditions and processes that activate, direct, and sustain behavior (Walker & Symons, 1997). The close of the first half of the 20th century saw a shift in I-O psychology to include the topic of motivation and job satisfaction (Latham, 2012). Industrial and organizational psychology research from the 1900’s through the mid 1950’s approached the study of work motivation with a behavioristic stimulus and response paradigm, using attitude surveys as the primary method of data (Latham, 2012). The philosophy of behaviorism advocated study of environmental stimuli on observable behavior in order to predict and influence behavior (Watson, 1925). Motivation, as an internal psychological concept, was of no interest to the behaviorists (Latham, 2012, p.11). Ryan and Smith (1954) argued this approach to be useless and misleading as behaviorism failed to include the importance of consciousness in regulating work behavior and implied that laws that governed the stimuli and responses in experimental laboratory paradigms were mirrored in the stimuli and responses that occurred in everyday situations. New theories of work motivation would soon emerge to challenge the belief that a human behavior in the workplace was strictly a product of cause and effect.

Maslow’s (1943) theory of human motivation presented a hierarchy of five basic, sequential needs, which determine the behaviors a person, develops in order to satisfy those needs. While systematic research based upon Maslow’s (1943) theory did not occur in workplace settings for another two decades, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs served as a framework for McGregor’s (1957) Theory X and Theory Y as well as Porter’s (1961)
empirical research on job needs. McGregor (1957) rejected the conventional view of work motivation at that time, which assumed that without active intervention by management, workers were passive to organizational needs, and instead proposed an alternate Theory Y of motivation in the workplace which incorporated higher needs, self-control and self direction. McGregor ‘s (1960) Theory Y states:

“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. A responsibility of management is to make it possible for people to recognize and develop these human characteristics for themselves” (p.6).

Porter created a 15-item survey, using Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, to identify patterns of need satisfaction about managers in medium and large organizations (Porter, 1961). In his research, Porter deleted the first level of physiological needs and inserted a third order need for autonomy, which fell between love, which he labeled esteem and self-actualization (Latham, 2012). Porter administered his survey in five different research studies, with different groups as well as different management levels. The data from Porter’s research varied between management levels, however the needs for autonomy and self-actualization were consistently reported as the least fulfilled (Porter, 1962).

Another researcher to build upon Maslow’s hierarchy of needs was Herzberg, (1959) who developed the motivation-hygiene theory, stating that characteristics of the job facilitated or hindered satisfaction of the growth needs for self -esteem and self-actualization. In their research, Herzberg and associates found job content factors were reported by
employees to be the primary source of motivation and satisfaction, while context or hygiene factors were the source of dissatisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959). To motivate employees and foster job satisfaction, attention should be given to job enrichment, to the work itself (job content), recognition, responsibility, achievement and opportunities for advancement (Herzberg, 1966). According to Herzberg (1966), contextual or hygiene factors such as working conditions, company policy, supervision and pay should only be attended to as means to minimize job dissatisfaction and would have little or no effect on motivation or performance. Blood and Hulin (1967) cautioned against universal application of Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory as their research found that employee values moderate employee affective response to tasks and their satisfaction with enriched jobs. In contrast to Herzberg’s definition of money as a hygiene factor that can only be a source of dissatisfaction, Adams’ (1963) equity theory states that individuals examine the ratio of their “outcomes”, namely money, recognition and working conditions, relative to their “inputs”, namely effort, education and experience, and if equity does not exist, then the unequal ratio will produce tension and dissonance. According to equity theory, inequity tensions can be relieved by changing the outcomes, such as increasing salary, or reducing input, such as decreasing effort or quitting. Equity theory was attacked for lack of precision as the modes of inequity resolution are endless and the theory does not account for individual difference that may exist regarding preferences for inequity resolution (Latham, 2012).

Beginning in the 1960’s, The Golden Age of work motivation theories signified a new approach to the study of work motivation, with the emergence of cognitive process theorists focusing on the thought processes that workers go through in determining how to
behave in the workplace (Steers, Mowday & Shapiro, 2004). During this period, interest of I-O psychologists in behaviorism waned as research showed that identical environmental consequences can have different behavioral effects depending upon what the individual is led to believe (Latham, 2012). Rather than focusing on characteristics of a job that energize and sustain desired behavior, Vroom defined motivation as the processes governing choices made by persons or lower organisms among alternative forms of voluntary activity (Vroom, 1964, p.6). Expectancy theory was developed to explain virtually all work related behavior ranging from occupational choice to job performance and was the first cognitive broad-range theory of motivation that focused on individual choice, effort and persistence (Latham, 2012, p.48). Critics of expectancy theory voiced concerns over inappropriate application of expectancy theory, the vast majority of studies based on expectancy theory examined performance between groups of individuals when in fact the theoretical framework was intended to be a “within individual” framework predicting and explaining the choices an individual made (Latham, 2012). Locke also noted that results from expectancy theory research were suspect in that self-ratings were assumed to be better than supervisory ratings (Locke, 1975).

At the last quarter of the 20th century, “expectancy theory was replaced by goal setting theory, a work motivation theory unconcerned with individual differences in needs, desires or instrumentality perceptions “(Schneider, 1985, p.577). Goal setting theory states that when individuals are given specific goals, goal pursuit and attainment will lead to enhanced task interest, improved productivity, pride in performance and heightened sense of personal effectiveness compared to an abstract, vague urge to “do your best” (Latham, 2012). By the close of the 20th century, research involving more than 40,000 participants in at least
eight counters had shown that setting specific, difficult goals increases performance on more than 100 different tasks (Locke & Latham, 1990). Several researchers presented drawbacks to goal setting theory such as goal conflict, lack of collaboration amongst peers, and neglect of quality for quantity (Latham, 2012). Kanfer and Ackerman (1989) found in their research that the absence of knowledge or ability combined with a specific high goal could have a deleterious effect on a person’s performance while urging them to do their best resulted in higher performance. In the final quarter of the 20th century, the cognitive revolution in the study of organizational behavior became firmly established and cognitive variables were shown to predict, explain and influence an employee’s choice, effort and persistence in work settings (Latham, 2012, p.101).

Vroom’s Expectancy Theory of Motivation

Vroom’s expectancy theory operationalizes motivation in terms of four components; effort, intrinsic valence, instrumentality, and rewards, and presented the first systematic formula of workplace expectancy theory. Vroom argued that employees rationally evaluate work behaviors and then chose to engage in the behaviors they believe will lead to their most valued work related rewards and outcomes (Steers, Mowday & Shapiro, 2004). Expectancy theory was the first cognitive broad-range theory of motivation developed by an I-O psychologist to explain virtually all work related behavior ranging from occupational choice to performance on the job (Latham, 2012, p.48). Defining motivation as “the processes governing choices made by persons or lower organisms among alternative dorms of voluntary activity” (Vroom, 1964, p.17), Vroom’s expectancy theory of has frequently provided the theoretical framework for research examining training motivation, motivation to
learn and training effectiveness (Smith et al., 2008). Expectancy theory has been recognized as one of the most widespread ways of determining individual motivation (Ferris, 1977) and Vroom credited for fostering the revolution within I-O psychology to view people and their behavior as immersed in thought rather than governed by hedonistic instincts, job content or work environment (Latham & Ernst, 2006). Central to Vroom’s expectancy theory are two propositions (Vroom, 1964).

**Proposition 1.** The valence of an outcome is a monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valences for all other outcomes and his conceptions of its instrumentality for the attainment of these other outcomes.

**Proposition 2.** The force on a person to perform an act is monotonically increasing function of the algebraic sum of the products of the valences of all outcomes and the strength of his experiences that the act will be followed by the attainment of these outcomes. (p.17-19).

According to Vroom, valence is defined as “affective orientations toward particular outcomes” and “an outcome is positively valent when the person prefers attaining it to not attaining it” (Vroom, 1964, p.15). Conceptually, Vroom’s expectancy equation shows that people are motivated to engage in behavior based upon their subjective probability estimate that (1) their effort will lead to effective performance, (2) multiplied by their subjective probability estimate that their performance will lead to various outcomes, (3) all of which is multiplied by their valence, the degree to which these outcomes are valued (Latham & Ernst, 2006, p.183).
A chief critic of expectancy theory, Locke (1975) noted there were no consistent findings regarding which components are the best predictors of performance, and that expectancy theory was incorrect in assuming that people chose to maximize outcomes and that they will usually perform complex calculations in making choices that will enable them to maximize outcomes. Other critics, Schmidt, (1973) and House et al., (1974) pointed out that the formulas involved in expectancy theory assume a ratio scale when there is no known way of measuring valences on this scale (Latham, 2012, p.50). In personal communication, Vroom (2003) himself stated that the notion that people consider all possible outcomes in expectancy theory and performed formulated calculation in their heads with these outcomes was implausible and he was aware of that. In response to the failure of expectancy theory to incorporate arousal, Vroom (2003) acknowledged that the theory does not address what goals or expectations would be aroused in any given moment and agreed that it was the chief limitation of expectancy theory. In 2005, Vroom also acknowledged that eliminating the mathematical formulations might have helped to convey his belief that expectancy theory should be used for its heuristic value in providing a language for formulating questions about the role of beliefs and motives in work performance (Latham, 2012, p.51).

Teacher Motivation

According to Bess (1977) there is a fairly universal agreement in academic circles that teaching is extraordinarily difficult work and he argues that faculty motivation is an essential ingredient in the formula for good teaching. "There are three things to emphasize in teaching: The first is motivation, the second is motivation, and the third is (you guessed it) motivation." Terrel H. Bell, U.S. Secretary of Education, 1981-1985. Motivation has always
been at the heart of teaching and learning (Maehr & Meyer, 1997). The essence of Buchler’s (2003) question of whether teachers are actually mirroring the life long learner and independent learner behaviors they try to foster in their students basically questions teacher motivation. If the study of motivation is an inquiry into the why of behavior and the factors that give impetus to action (Deci & Ryan, 1985), then a study of teacher motivation is a study of the factors that stimulate teachers to engage in behaviors that enhance their teaching effectiveness. An effective professor is an individual who is intrinsically motivated to learn, because it is he or she who will have the best chance to educate others (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997, p.72). Intrinsic motivation is driven by three innate psychological needs; the need for competence, relatedness and autonomy (Deci & Ryan, 1991) and the nature of teaching allows for satisfaction of all of these needs (Oldham, 2005). In teaching, two main action systems provide intrinsic rewards, one is the educational process itself resulting in changes in the student’s performance attributable to the teacher’s actions and the second is the continuing integration of new information on subject matter during course preparation and classroom teaching (Csikszentmihalyi, 1997). Faculty normally have liberty to construct their own methods and manner of teaching and to function more independently than most occupations, creating a sense of autonomy (Deci et al., 1997). College or university settings offer considerable opportunities to relate to colleagues and students as they engage in activities and discuss ideas (Deci et al., 1997). Grubb and associates (1999) found that the most active and innovative instructors tended to create their own communities of like-minded individuals, both inside and outside the community college, which satisfied both the need for competence as well as relatedness.
However gratifying the intrinsic motivating aspects of teaching may be, most faculty agree that certain types of tangible outcomes and rewards within the academic organization, such as recognition, promotions and salary increases, are desirable and do contribute to personal motivation (Fenker, 1977). Though teacher motivation and satisfaction may ideally be internal and self-determined, the reality is that faculty pay attention to rewards, such as general standing among peers and salary, and also expect institutions to recognize meritorious work (Gellert, 1992). Money, even in miniscule increments, is symbolic of recognition and value for faculty (Wergin, 2011). Among various rewards in higher education institutions designed to induce better teaching, institutional recognition of teaching excellence was the most preferred reward among faculty in higher education (Cook, Kinnetz, and Owens-Misner, 1990). Organizational culture can also be a source of extrinsic motivation, it has been found that the individual’s perception of organizational support influences work motivation (Shore & Shore, 1995). From their national faculty survey, Blackburn and Lawrence (1995) concluded that when faculty judge that adequate support exists from both facilities and people, faculty motivation is high. Bess (1997) also noted that organizational support of colleges and universities induce strong faculty motivation. Organizational researchers have consistently found that the individuals’ perception of organizational support influences their work motivation and commitment, and then both lead to improved job performance (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Miles & Tetrick, 1993; Shore & Shore 1995).

In summary, more than forty years of faculty motivation research has resulted in remarkably consistent findings, as over and over the research has found that faculty are
motivated by a combination of autonomy, community, recognition and efficacy (Wergin, 2001). Teacher’s sense of efficacy refers to the extent to which teachers believe that they have the capacity to affect student performance and achievement (Ashton, 1984) and the concept of teacher efficacy was first introduced into educational research by two Rand Corporation evaluation studies (Armor et al, 1976; Berman et al., 1977). Bandura (1986) states that teacher efficacy is a skill as well as a motivation guided by one’s beliefs. Research on teacher efficacy suggests that two factors combine to motivate teachers, competence and expectancy (Tschannen-Moran et al., 1998). Motivation is strongest when individuals feel competent to carry our their assigned tasks and expect that doing so will have intended effect (Bandura, 1997). Teachers’ sense of efficacy can be affected by a number of variables and the following are recommendations from Dembo and Gibson (1985) that may enhance teachers’ sense of efficacy:

1) Provide pre-service teachers with a wide range of experiences in different social contexts.

2) Provide teachers with strategies to deal with student failure and help them analyze specific aspects of their teaching so that they can identify the sources of their sense of inefficacy.

3) Analyze the differences between teaching efficacy and personal teaching efficacy in order to determine needs of various teachers.

4) Develop school programs to help beginning teachers deal with the role transition from student teaching to full-time classroom instruction.

5) Provide teachers with accurate feedback regarding their performance.
6) Assess the social norms and incentives in the school organization that may enhance or impede teachers’ organizational involvement.

7) Evaluate administrative leadership styles to determine how they may affect teacher involvement in decision making.

8) Encourage collegial approaches personal and organizational problem solving.

9) Provide teachers with skills and opportunities to interact more effectively with parents.

Research has shown that teacher efficacy positively influences teacher engagement in professional learning activities and subsequently enhances the quality of the instruction (Geijsel et al, 2009; Goddard, Hoy & Hoy, 2001); Smylie, 1988).

**Faculty Development in Community Colleges**

Faculty development is both a comprehensive term that covers a wide range of activities ultimately designed to improve student learning and a less broad term that describes a purposeful attempt to help faculty members improve their competence as teachers and scholars (Eble & McKeachie, 1986). Community college faculty development programs began to expand in the 1970’s because of changing, rapidly increasing enrollment patterns (Redmon, 2012). Prior to the 1970’s faculty development in community colleges involved support only for conference attendance, grants to support innovation in teaching, and, perhaps sabbatical leave (Murray, 2002). Because community colleges are intended to be the “peoples ‘ colleges” and invite a very heterogeneous and sometimes less academically prepared population to enter through their “open doors”, the leaders of community colleges in the 1960’s and 1970’s felt the need to develop faculty, not only on pedagogy but also in
the mission and philosophy of the community college (Murray, 2002). “Access without the appropriate support is a false opportunity” (Casazza, 1999, p.6) and faculty development was embraced as a tool to prepare community college faculty to support the array of students entering the open door institution. According to Murray, (2002), serious effects to institutionalize faculty development took root during the 1970’s with the publication of seminal works by Gaff (1975) and Bergquist and Phillips (1975). As faculty members prepared by traditional graduate programs were often unprepared for the number of entering students, upwards of 40%, requiring remediation in various academic skills (Cohen & Brawer, 2003), faculty development programs were constructed in part to help community college faculty members gain knowledge and skills needed to teach a diverse student body, including students who need remediation (Blocker et al., 1965; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Grubb, 1999). During this period, Cohen and Brawer (1996) note that community colleges were providing more in service faculty development training than ever before.

During the 1970’s and 1980s, community college leaders also began to utilize faculty development programs as ways of retraining existing staff to meet the evolving demands of both students and society (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). Sorcinell et al. (2006) refer to this time period as the Age of the Developer, during which the focus of faculty development programs broadened to address curricular issues, faculty needs at different career stages and collective as well as individual growth. Faculty development programs in the community college expanded due to changing enrollment patterns, increases use of part-time instructors, increased requirements for accountability and declining financial resources (Eble & McKeacher, 1985). Community college decisions makers began to consider faculty
development programs as an economically viable way to improve institutional outcomes and maintain institutional integrity (Alfano, 1993). Gradually, the belief in content mastery being the necessary criterion for success in the classroom (Tiberius, 2002) was replaced by the belief that “the professional college educator requires knowledge of learning, student development and the wide array of instructional strategies that can produce durable learning “ (Gardiner, 2005, p.13). In the 1980’s, the purpose of faculty development became “a matter of enlarging a faculty member’s knowledge of learning theory and pedagogical practices, of increasing the professor’s interest in and commitment to teaching, of reinforcing and rewarding excellent teaching, and of providing opportunities to bring about this kind of growth”(Eble & McKeachie, 1986, p.14). While organizations such as the National Council for Staff, Program and Organizational Development (NCSPOD) and the National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development (NISOD) were founded during this time period and initiated many conferences focusing on improving the community college professor’s teaching abilities, the economic down turn during the mid-1980’s forced many community colleges to discontinue faculty development programs (Bodily, 2008).

In the last two decades, the faculty development movement in community colleges expanded and evolved to address not only remediation, but also the rapid advances of teaching technology and issues of professional renewal (Murray, 2002; Wallin, 2003). In the 1990’s, coined by Sorcinelli et al. (2006), as the Age of the Learner, student learning rather than teaching took center stage- the teacher was no longer the “sage on the stage”, pouring knowledge into empty vessels, but a “guide of the side”, facilitating student learning (p.3). For community college faculty in the 1990’s, the what of education shifted from teaching to
learning, resulting in a shift in their roles from one of providing instruction to one of managing student learning (Dickinson, 1999). Sorcinelli et al. (2006) state, during this age, student diversity, which became greater than at any other time in the history of higher education, also called for a greater range and variety in teaching and learning methods, skills and sensitivities. This view is supported by O’Banion (1994), who also noted a trend in community college faculty development toward an emphasis on teaching and learning in response to the increasing diversity in community colleges. While many researchers agreed that community college faculty would be asked to pay far greater attention to facilitating student learning through their roles as coachers or facilitators (Cooper, Robinson & McKinney, 1994), interdisciplinary team members (Ludwig, 2000), Brokers of educational experiences (Dickenson, 1999) and cross-disciplinary learning consultants (Milliron & Leach, 1997), few proposed strategies on how community colleges would work with their current and future faculty to prepare them for their new roles as “designers of learning environments” (Barr & Tagg, 1995,p.24). Harmon et al. (2002) noted community college faculty were being asked to embrace new roles that few had previously enacted or seen modeled elsewhere without sufficient preparation. An assessment of community college faculty development efforts at that time came from Geis and Smith (1989):

It is suggested that the application of some principles of adult education to faculty development activities may be beneficial. It is argues that faculty development programs have not adequately defined learner needs. The tendency of faculty development courses to resemble college courses is also criticized. Finally, it is
suggested that the attitude of many faculty developments is more like that of a traditional teacher than that of the adult educator-resource person. (p.1)

As community colleges blended their classroom offerings to include both traditional classroom instruction as well as various forms of distance learning, including podcasting, interactive video courses, hybrid and online courses (Redmon, 2012), a new area of faculty learning needs emerged around faculty reparation for technology assisted course design and delivery (Carlson, 2000). Faculty development was needed for community college faculty members to expand their teaching repertoire to include expertise in online instruction as well as improve their technological competency.

Lastly, community college faculty development programs also evolved to help community college administrators deal with issues of “burnout” among faculty members (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Eble and McKeachie (1985) argue that the teaching situation at community colleges offers limits opportunity to satisfy the intellectual curiosity and intrinsic motivations of community college faculty members. “Community college teachers have little opportunity to offer specialized courses in the areas of their interests; teaching loads tend to be heavier; and there is less opportunity to work closely with individual students and follow their development over an extended period of time “(Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p.220). The monotony of teaching the same courses, using the same teaching techniques year after year, often resulted in intellectual and psychological stagnation (Menges, 1984) and diminished interest in finding ways to improve learning and teaching (Alfano, 1993). Increases in student enrollment, diversity and under preparedness, combined with decreasing budgets and heavy workloads created tremendous additional pressures on the faculty, staff and administrators of
community colleges (Alfano, 1993). According to Cohen and Brawer (1996), these pressures had a demoralizing effect on community college faculty. (Alfano, 1993). Community college faculty development programs allowed for possible relief of the pressure and stagnation by presenting community college faculty members opportunities to link with professional colleagues, to modify and improve instructional material and delivery and to keep the spark of creativity and enthusiasm alive for themselves and their students (Alfano, 1993).

In regards to how faculty development is delivered in the community college setting, there has been surprisingly little change in the methods over the last four decades. In the 1970s, faculty development looked much like the required, in-service training conducted by public school systems (Lewis, 1998). A 1970 survey by the American Association of Junior Colleges indicated that most faculty development programs involved workshops and short courses on education, curriculum and learning theories (O’Banion, 1972). Despite reports that both good teachers and less adequate teachers tended to resent faculty development in the form of in-service workshops (Brawer, 1990), workshops have prevailed as the most common method of community college faculty development. A faculty development program should provide the time, support and encouragement for participants to re-examine and reflect on their course curriculum, teaching practice and use of educational technology (Aycock, Garnham & Kaleta, 2002). These ideals of faculty development are not likely to be achieved by traditional faculty development programs consisting of “one shot” activities characterized by guest speakers, day seminars and disconnected events typically scheduled immediately prior to the start of classes, when faculty are preoccupied by paperwork and preparing course syllabi (Floyd, 2010). Faculty development is needed more than ever, but
the ways in which faculty development has been conceptualized at many institutions over the past few decades may not fully meet the array of challenges facing the professoriate today (Sorcinelli et al., 2006).

Technology has allowed community colleges to extend their classrooms beyond a physical campus by bringing courses to homes for students who may be unable to attend traditional campus-based classes because of physical disabilities, lack of transportation or the demands of family and work (Floyd, 2010). Technology has also expanded professional growth opportunities and provided an array of opportunities for enhancing the teaching aspect of faculty life (Baldwin, 1998). While in the past, participation in a disciplinary national conference might be thought of as the principal opportunity for professional development and contacts, today’s technologies allow for the creation of professional development activities any time of the day or night (Sherer, Shea & Kristensen, 2003). Sherer, Shea and Kristensen identify ten different categories of online sources and providers of faculty development:

- university and college teaching and learning center websites,
- university and college center online workshops,
- virtual teaching and learning technology centers,
- online teaching and learning courses,
- technology product companies
- publishing companies
- professional associations (resources, listserves, etc.),
- teaching and learning journals and magazines online,
- online newsletters,
- online international resources (2003).

The standard delivery mechanisms for the substance of faculty development traditionally parallel those of regular education programs—individual consultation, synchronous meetings in physical locations (Gillespie, 1998). Just as technology allows community colleges to expand their classrooms outside of the physical proximity of their campuses, technology allows for faculty development to transcend the confines of geography and obstacles of time and funding that may limit community college faculty development opportunities. “The demands of work and family life for faculty coupled with the rise in part-time faculty underline the needs for faculty development activities that can be delivered anytime, anywhere (Vrasidas & Glass, 2004, p.4). Lowenthal (2008) states that online faculty development offers faculty an opportunity to participate in faculty development at their convenience and allows faculty developers the opportunity to increase participation by extending the lifespan of a faculty development workshop. While delivery of faculty development online may eliminate issues of time and location, the issues of content, context and relevance of faculty development workshops, which are also barriers to participation in faculty development, still remain (Lowenthal, 2008). Ironically, many faculty who teach online do not express interest in participating in online faculty development (Stevens et al., 2005). Online faculty development is not a panacea for faculty development issues and attracting faculty to participate in faculty development remains a serious obstacle for faculty developers (Lowenthal, 2008).
Though the rationale justifying the existence of faculty development has been discussed and presented at length in the literature, the actual study of community college faculty development efforts has been minimal. This researcher found only a handful of national studies studying the subject of community college faculty development; Centra (1976), Smith (1981) Hoerner et al. (1991) Murray (1999, 2002) and Grant & Keim (2002), and slightly more statewide or regional studies and multiple single-institution studies examining faculty development in community colleges. Existing research on faculty development efforts to improve teaching and learning at the community college are minimal but focused almost entirely on full-time faculty (ASHE Higher Education Report, 2007).

In what many acknowledge to be the first national study of faculty development in colleges and universities, Centra (1976) surveyed 721 two year and 1,079 four–year colleges and universities. The major purpose of his research was to determine what shared patterns of faculty development practices existed based upon a list of 45 faculty development activities and practices and the perceived effectiveness. Centra (1976) grouped the practices into five main categories:

- Workshops, seminars and presentations
- Analysis or assessment procedures
- Activities involving media, technology or course development
- Institutional wide practices such as sabbaticals or annual teaching awards
- Miscellaneous practices including grants, faculty exchange programs, peer teaching and personal counseling
The key finding of this research relates specifically to faculty participation. While in general, the respondents to Centra’s survey stated that sizeable numbers of faculty members had some involvement in faculty development practices, Centra (1976) found that “the teachers who wanted to get better were the group most involved while those needing improvement were seen as least involved“ (p.59). Acknowledging that participation in faculty development was voluntary and therefore the finding that good teachers were the majority of faculty development participants was unsurprising, Centra noted that if faculty development was to be deemed worthwhile, they required subscription to by more faculty who needed to improve. He proposed several possible recommendations that colleges and universities could implement to motivate faculty members needing improvement to participate in faculty development:

- Require all faculty members to spend 10% of time in improvement activities (Group for Human Development in Higher Education, 1974).
- Tie participation in faculty development practices to rewards structure and annual evaluations.
- Tailor faculty development programs to faculty needs, interests and preferences (Centra, 1976).

Three years after Centra published the findings of his research, Al Smith replicated a portion of Centra’s 1976 study and conducted research specifically targeting community colleges, using research questions relating to what type of goals were being used in community college staff development programs, estimated effectiveness of staff development programs for teaching and non-teaching staff in the community college and changes in
estimated effectiveness of staff development programs from 1976 to 1979. Smith (1981) mailed 1315 questionnaires to community colleges throughout the United States and received responses from 687 community colleges indicating that 413 community colleges had an organized program or set of practices for staff development and instructional improvement. The first portion of Smith’s questionnaire listed 31 staff development goal statements, which were taken from the existing literature or inferred from conversations with practitioners, and each respondent was asked to identify which of the 31 goals was a part of the community college’s staff development program (Smith, 1981). Table 4.1 lists the six most frequently mentioned goals by the community colleges that had organized staff development programs. Within the list of program goals, there is one reference to increase motivation to learn however this goal was applicable to student learning only. The second portion of Smith’s (1981) questionnaire replicated Centra’s study by asking respondents to rate the effectiveness of the same 48 faculty development practices that Centra presented to his survey respondents Regarding the findings from Smith’s research, below are the key recommendations from Smith’s first portion of the research questionnaire which examined the faculty development goals in use within the organized faculty development programs in place at the responding community colleges

1. Goals for community college staff development programs be set so as to reflect the total needs of each group of employees represented in the college

2. The goals for community college staff development programs be limited in the future so that maximum program impact can be achieved in any given year.
3. Greater emphasis be placed on meeting development goals related to the needs of non-fulltime teaching faculty, particularly part-time faculty and non-academic support staff.

4. Greater emphasis to be given to development goals designed to help staff members prepare for future roles as well as for present job responsibilities (Smith, 1981, p.217).

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal No.</th>
<th>Goal Statement</th>
<th>No. of Colleges Using This Goal</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Sample (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>To increase staff (faculty, administrator, support personnel, clerical, etc.) responsiveness to student needs.</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>To increase the faculty's knowledge about the teaching-learning process.</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>To increase the faculty's skills in instruction.</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>To create a climate in which the attainment of effective teaching is the ongoing concern.</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>To increase the faculty's repertoire of teaching methods.</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>To reduce student attrition.</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based upon the findings of the second section of Smith’s questionnaire, which replicated Centra’s study, Smith (1981) presented the following recommendations:

1. Development practices that have proven the most effective over the years for enhancing student learning and for improving community college curriculum and instruction programs should be selected over practices that have not been evaluated.

2. A staff development needs assessment of all college staff members should precede the adoption of specific development activities for a college’s annual staff development program. Activities then should be selected on the basis of need and the goals of the institution so that there is a match between institutional and individual needs.

3. Each staff development program should contain at least one program for each major personnel group in the college and whenever possible, each staff member should be offered a variety of staff development activities to choose from. Just as students have different learning styles and rates, so to faculty; thus a variety of approaches is needed.

4. More research to be conducted to determine the perceptions of participants in staff development programs as to the usefulness of various practices (Smith, 1981, p.218).

While Smith’s research did not address the open issue regarding motivating teachers who needed improvement in teaching skills to participate in faculty development posed by Centra (1976), Smith’s (1981) recommendations regarding the identification of faculty needs and subsequent crafting of faculty development programs to align with those needs
touched upon both intrinsic and instrumental components of motivation as defined by
Vroom’s expectancy theory.

In 1991, Hoerner et al., conducted a 2 year mixed methods study of professional
development programs for occupational- technical faculty in community, technical and
junior colleges. During the first year, the researchers surveyed all 878 community
colleges in the United States to build a comprehensive profile of faculty development
practices in place at that time. From the 708 responding institutions, 16 community
colleges were identified as “exemplary” in that they represented the most comprehensive
use of the identified practices within professional development programs (Hoerner et al.,
1991) and ranged from urban, to suburban, to rural with full time student enrollments
ranging from two thousand to ten thousand students. A second survey was then
administered to this elite group of community colleges as well as thirty other institutions
that were randomly drawn from the remaining 692 of the 708 responding institutions,
requesting responses from both faculty and administrators regarding faculty development
practices at their institutions. The results of the second survey showed there were
significant differences in responses between administrators and faculty related to the
evaluation of professional development activities, 30% of administrators reported this
always took place while only 15% of faculty reported the same, and the evaluation of
instruction to identify professional development needs, 15% of administrators indicated
this practice took place while only 9% of faculty reported the same. On the subject of
participation in professional development activities, 55% of administrators indicated that
participation in professional development was required while 82% of faculty reported it was required.

In addition to gathering responses from the two surveys, another primary task for the researchers was to identify six exemplary institutions to be the subject of additional case study research during the second year (Hoerner et. al, 1991). The six institutions chosen represented urban, suburban and rural community colleges, had full time student enrollments ranging from two thousand to eight thousand students and were geographically spread across the United States. Group and individual interviews were conducted to probe tentative and alternative hypotheses about successful professional development programs (Hoerner et al., 1991). As little was known about the perspectives of those studies, Hoerner et al. (1991) elected to use an unstructured approach to gathering data revolving around dimensions of professional development identified during the literature review, beginning with “grand tour” questions asking informants for their views and neutral probing to elicit additional information and insights. Upon analysis of the interview data, six consistent themes emerged from the six institutions included in the study:

1. The institution has strong leadership, which maintains an emphasis on the growth and development of individuals, programs and the institution.

2. Full-time faculty members perceive a caring and supportive environment at the institution with professional development an outcome of that environment.

3. Part-time faculty see themselves as significant but “lesser” members of the institution.
4. Both the institution and the individual benefit from professional development activities.

5. Professional development activities are diverse and oriented to individual needs and interests.

6. Limitations and barriers to professional development were present, acknowledged, and usually overcome. (Hoerner et al., 1991).

Hoerner and his research team discovered a general characteristic that faculty at these six exemplary institutions shared was an expressed dedication to the profession of teaching and motivation for personal and professional growth, which manifested into a commitment to participate in professional development activities. While the conclusion of the study did not identify one single model of professional development as best, Hoerner et al. (1991) found that the best professional development programs were a natural consequence of a well-led, effective institution.

Murray conducted the more recent national study of community college faculty development in November of 1998, the study was undertaken to evaluate whether elements of effective faculty development programs exist in community colleges. A 65-item survey was constructed and mailed, along with two cover letters and a stamped, self-addressed envelope, to 250 of the approximately 1000 publicly supported community colleges in the United States at that time. In the first cover letter, addressed to the chief academic officer, Murray explained the study and asked the remaining materials, the second cover letter which explained and survey and asked that the recipient complete the survey, the survey instrument itself and the response envelope, be passed to the person responsible for faculty development.
137 of the 250 community colleges sampled returned 130 usable surveys (Murray, 1999). The survey was divided into four parts, the first part asked for information pertaining to institution demographics, the office or person responsible for faculty development and the scope of that person’s responsibilities, the second part inquired about the existence and extent of support for faculty development programming, the third probed any connections between participation in faculty development and the reward structure of the institution and the final part asked faculty developers about their beliefs regarding the importance of the effects of faculty development activities (Murray, 1999). By rating below average survey items that suggested increased extrinsic rewards would improve the quality of teaching, respondents affirmed belief that rewards such as access to faculty development funds, teaching excellence awards or merit pay do not motivate faculty (Murray, 1999, p.60). Murray (1999) noted that while the survey instrument used was not designed to determine the reasons the faculty developers held the beliefs they did, a greater understanding was important and worthy of future study.

**Community College Faculty Motivation to Participate in Faculty Development**

Demonstrating that participation in professional development is the direct cause of student achievement is difficult (Adey, 1995) and the exact contribution of ongoing professional development to student achievement, while considered important, is less well known (Smith et al., 2003). However, the belief is that if teacher pre-service preparation positively influences student achievement, then it follows that professional development may also have similarly positive effects (Smith et al., 2003). According to Smith and associated (2003), teacher motivation to attend professional development is a key factor in teacher
change. Stout (1996) states there are four motivations teachers have for participating in professional development: salary enhancements, certificate maintenance, career mobility and gaining new skills/knowledge. According to Ottoson (1997), if teachers have a strong predisposition to participate in professional development, they will be motivated to participate in professional development regardless of institutional cultures or systems that do not encourage participation. To support motivation to participate in professional development, teachers need individual plans for ongoing professional development built on self-evaluation of their own needs, including reflection (Jones & Lowe, 1985). While the research referenced above refers to all teachers, including K-12, colleges and universities, and their professional development, the findings are assumed to be applicable to community college faculty and faculty development.

Wlodkowski (2003) positions participation, learning and transfer in the image of a logical triangle, stating that unless adults participate, they cannot learn, and without learning there is no possibility for transfer (p.41). Application of this triangular model to faculty development suggests that first and foremost, unless faculty participate in faculty development, they cannot learn about improving their teaching and without learning, there is no possibility for transfer of improved teaching skills. Centra (1976) identified participation in faculty development as an issue, citing that good teachers were the majority of faculty development participants and “the teachers who wanted to get better were the group most involved while those needing improvement were seen as least involved” (p.59). Centra’s findings suggest that to some degree, teacher competency and efficacy motivate participation in faculty development. Hoerner et al. (1991) found in their research that faculty at six
exemplary community colleges had a shared dedication to the profession of teaching and also showed motivation for personal and professional growth. The combination of dedication to teaching and motivation for growth manifested as a commitment to participate in faculty development activities (Hoerner et al., 1991).

Community college faculty surveyed by Murray (1999) responded with below average ratings in response to the suggestion that increasing extrinsic rewards, such as access to faculty development funds, teaching excellence awards or merit pay, would increase faculty motivation to improve the quality of teaching. Grubb and associates (1999) found that one-shot workshops led by outside facilitators were widely disliked and considered ineffective by the community college faculty members interviewed. Faculty development programs facilitated by fellow faculty members, however, motivated faculty to participate in faculty development. Community college faculty want development that is continuous, builds collegiality, creates groups of faculty who observe and discuss teaching regularly, honors internal expertise and is collaborative (Grubb et al., 1999). From the research findings of both Murray and Grubb, it can be inferred that intrinsic motivations influence community college faculty to participate in faculty development. Grant and Keim (2002) concluded that in their study of 300 publicly supported community colleges, that while 99% of the responding colleges offered some kind of faculty development opportunities without some incentive for faculty involvement, the programs could not be truly effective.

When an institution shows it values faculty development by providing financial support, offering travel money, or considering professional development activities in promotion and tenure decisions, faculty respond (Goto & Davis, 2008; Shulman, Cox &
Richlin, 2004; Smith, 2007). When the value for faculty development is lacking, faculty may not choose to be involved in faculty development (Sipple & Lightner, 2013).

Summary

Attracting faculty to participate in faculty development remains a serious obstacle for faculty developers (Lowenthal, 2008). Faculty development is recognized as an important activity in community colleges but it is often understaffed and underfunded (Wallin & Smith, 2005). Similarly, community college faculty participation in faculty development is recognized as an important opportunity to improve teaching and ultimately, student learning, however it is also under-served and underfunded. This chapter represents a review of the literature on the key topics that are relevant to this case study. The phenomena in this case study is motivation, and the context in which this occurs is the current community college setting, with award winning faculty deciding to participate in faculty development. Literature related to work motivation, teacher motivation and community college faculty motivation was explored at length.

Vroom’s expectancy theory of motivation is a crucial component of this case study and served as a base for developing a logic model as well as provided categories for coding and data analysis. Also important to this case was the history of faculty development in the community college setting and the literature provided many examples and perspectives from experts in the study of community college.
CHAPTER THREE

Method

The purpose of this explanatory case study is to explore and understand the motivations influencing EIT award nominees and winners to participate in faculty development. Through semi-structured interviews, these highly effective community college teaching faculty will be asked to reflect upon and recount the various motivations that led them to participate in faculty development.

This chapter describes the research design of the proposed case study, which address the five components of research design recommended by Yin (2009). Yin states for case studies, five components of research design are especially important:

1. a study’s questions;
2. it’s propositions, if any;
3. its unit(s) of analysis;
4. the logic linking the data to the propositions; and
5. the criteria for interpreting the findings (Yin, 2009, p.27).

All of these components are present for this proposed case study research. This chapter also shows the methods used in the proposed case study, including:

1. the rationale for the stated research approach
2. a description of the sample and the site
3. a summary of criteria for the NCCCS Excellence in Teaching Award
4. a summary of needed information
5. a description of the methods of data collection
6. a description of data storage
7. a description of the methods of data analysis
8. ethical and other considerations
9. limitations of study

Rationale for Qualitative Case Study Research Design

Qualitative methods facilitate the study of issues in depth and detail (Patton, 2003, p.170). The value of using a qualitative method (a) lies in the ability to conduct research that elicits multiple constructed realities from participants, which are then studied holistically; (2) delivers in-depth research into complex situations and processes; (c) explains where and why policies and local knowledge and practice are at odds and conflicting; (d) provides research on informal and unstructured linkages and processes in organizations; and (e) provides research on real, as opposed to stated, organizational goals (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Qualitative case studies are “an examination of a specific phenomenon” (Merriam, 1988, p.9). Qualitative case studies have unique features that include being (a) particularistic, in that the case study focuses on a particular process; (b) descriptive, in that the end product is a thick description of the case under study, with “thick description” being a complete, literal description of the process under study and shoes the intersection of many variables over time; and (c) heuristic, in that it illuminates the reader’s understanding of the phenomenon under study and allows for new meaning and an extension of what is known about the phenomenon (Merriam, 2009).

Case study research means conducting an empirical investigation of a contemporary phenomenon within its natural context using multiple sources of evidence (Yin, 2003). Case
study research excels at bringing an understanding of a complex issue or objects and can extend experience or add strength to what is already through previous research (Soy, 1997). Case study method in research becomes more prominent when issues with regard to education (Gulsecen & Kubat, 2006), sociology (Grassel & Schrimier, 2006) and community based problems (Johnson, 2006) were raised (Zainal, 2007). The case study method is preferred in examining contemporary events when the research questions being asked seek to know “why” or “how” a phenomenon occurred. The case study’s unique strength is its ability to deal with a full variety of evidence-documents, artifacts, interview and observations-beyond what might be available in a conventional history story (Yin, 2009, p.11). The essence of a case study, the central tendency among all types of case study, is that it tries to illuminate a decision or set of decisions; why they were taken, how they were implemented and with what results (Schramm, 1971). In particular, explanatory case study method can be applied to explain the presumed causal links in real-life interventions that are too complex for the survey or experimental strategies (Yin, 2009).

Although the case study is a distinctive form of empirical inquiry, many researchers disdain the strategy (Yin, 2009). As a research method, case studies have been viewed as a less desirable form of inquiry than either experiments or surveys (Yin, 2006). According to Yin (2006), lack of rigor is the greatest concern of case study research along with concerns of lack of generalizability, excessive time investments, inability to establish causal relationships and researcher bias. In addressing the concerns against case study as a valid research method, Yin (2009) acknowledges that while lack of rigor may also be present in other research methods, lack of rigor is less likely to be present when using the other methods- possibly
because of the existence of numerous methodological texts providing investigators with specific procedures to be followed whereas there are only a small number of texts guiding case study research. Yin also argues that case studies, like experiments, are generalizable to theoretical propositions and not to populations of universes (Yin, 2009, p.15). Stake (1978) claims that case studies will often be the preferred method of research because they may be epistemologically in harmony with the readers experience and thus to that person a natural basis for generalization. According to Stake (1978), if the aims of inquiry are explanation, propositional knowledge and law, the case study research method is at a disadvantage. However, when the aims of inquiry are understanding, extension of experience and increase in conviction in that which is known, the disadvantage disappears (Stake, 1978).

Critics of case study research argue that the research method inherently contains a subjective bias. “Case study suffers from a crippling drawback because it does not apply scientific methods useful for curbing one’s tendencies to stamp one’s pre-existing interpretations on data as they accumulate”(Diamond, 1996, p.6). Case study investigators are especially prone to the problem of bias because they must understand the issues beforehand (Becker, 1958). The bias towards verification is general and a problem that all researchers must deal with in some way (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Too many times, the case study investigator has been sloppy, how not followed systematic procedures, or has allowed equivocal evidence or biased views to influence the direction of the findings and conclusions (Yin, 2009, p.14). Remedies for reducing the likelihood of bias include reporting of preliminary contrary findings, even while in the data collection phase, to two or three critical colleagues (Yin, 2009) and the immediate creation of documented memorandum of any new
observations, which were opposed to the general results (Darwin, 1958). Other suggested solutions are that a full transcript of the raw data should be made available to the reader on microfilm or computer disk (Waitzkin, 1990) and to present extensive sequences from the original data, followed by a detailed commentary (Mays and Pope, 1995).

All of these components are present for this proposed case study research. The research questions guiding this study are the following:

1. Why were these NCCCS EIT community college faculty nominees motivated to participate in faculty development activities?
2. What components of motivation, as defined in Vroom’s expectancy theory, are identified by the faculty as having greater influence on their decision to participate in faculty development activities?

Within this proposed explanatory, single case study, the phenomenon being explored is the motivation to participate in faculty development and the participants, each individual EIT nominee or winner, are the units of analysis in this case. The primary propositions guiding this research:

1. Four components of motivation, as defined by Vroom’s expectancy theory, will influence an individual’s motivation to participate in faculty development and some will have greater influence than others.
2. Intrinsic components of motivation will emerge to be the most potent drivers of motivation to participate in faculty development activities in accordance with Knowles’ belief that in adults, the motivation to learn is internal.
Interviews with the individual faculty members will seek to elicit data related to their motivation to participate in faculty development, specifically, which components of motivation had the greatest influence on their decision to participate in faculty development, how did these motivations originate and how were these motivations sustained over time.

The original conceptual model for this case study, Figure 3.1, was created using the components of motivation as presented in Vroom’s expectancy theory of motivation and depicts the various components of motivation that influence decision making and subsequent behavior. The conceptual model for this case study will continue to be developed and be finalized once the data analysis is completed to depict the themes that emerge from data analysis. If the propositions are supported by the data, the modified conceptual model will depict the components of motivation to scale, with intrinsic components of motivation being the largest and strongest.
Figure 3.1. Conceptual Model of Sources of Motivation to Participate in Faculty Development using components of Vroom's Expectancy Theory. Effort is assumed to exist within each component of motivation.

**Research Sample and Site**

The sample for this case study was drawn from NCCCS EIT award winners and nominees from 2008-2014. The annual list of EIT community college faculty nominees and winners, their names and community college affiliation, is a public document, published on the NCCCS website. According to Hancock and Algozzine (2006), the most important consideration in the selection of interviewees is identification of those persons in the research setting who may have the best information with which to address the study’s research questions. The rationale behind the purposeful selection of EIT award winners and nominee
finalists as the sample population for this case study is that these individuals have demonstrated both excellence in teaching, a highly desirable outcome, as well participation in faculty development, which is presumed to have some causal link to excellence in teaching. Seidman (2001) states that research conducted to gain a deep understanding of a problem or phenomena is not conducive to the use of random sampling techniques.

The researcher began the selection process in 2014 by contacting the Vice President of the NCCCS to inform her of the nature and purpose of the study and to secure her support in providing the list of winners and nominees as well as future access to the portion of their award nomination that pertained specifically to participation in faculty development. The Vice President agreed to send over the list of individuals immediately and committed to providing the documents requested upon presentation of signed form of consent by participants. When the research was conducted in 2015, the new Vice President of the NCCCS declined to share the document.

Initial requests for interview participation in this case study will be sent via email, phone and post to the EIT nominee finalists and winners from 2010-2012 (see Appendix A). Request packet will include letter of intent, informed consent form and a copy of the interview protocol. Follow up calls and emails requesting confirmation will be placed 7 days after initial requests.

In the event that an EIT nominee finalist or winner agrees to participate, a time and site for the interview will be determined. The researcher will allow the participant to decide location for the interview. According to Seidman (1991) interview locations should be private, convenient and familiar to the participants.
Criteria for NCCCS Excellence in Teaching Award

The stated criteria for this award are as follows:

Demonstration or examples of

1. Interactions with students that focus on their successful development as whole persons.
2. Effective classroom environments that result in motivated students and successful learning.
3. Innovations in teaching methods including the effective use of technology.
4. Professional development activities and experiences that enhance teaching effectiveness.
5. Leadership roles beyond the classroom related to the practice and profession of teaching.
6. Past recognition and awards received as a faculty member.
7. Overall consistent and excellent job behaviors that exhibit unselfish devotion and significant contributions to student, College, and System Success (exceeds normal expectations). (NCCCS, 2013).

Overview of Needed Information

In order to answer the research questions, faculty responses and reflection was required. This case study followed a bounded case study approach to elicit this information through semi-structure interviews. The goal of the study was to illuminate the causes of motivation to participate in faculty development and understand what components of
motivation had greater influence. Table 5.1 below depicts the overview of information needed, research questions and sources of data from which information will be gathered.

Table 3.1

*Data Sources and Information Needed for Primary Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why were you motivated to participate in faculty development activities?</td>
<td>Motivational Factors</td>
<td>Participant Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher Observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What components of motivation were most influential in your decision to</td>
<td>Primary Factors</td>
<td>Participant Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection**

A hallmark of case study research is the use of multiple data sources, a strategy that also enhances data credibility (Patton, 1990; Yin, 2003). Case study evidence may come from six sources: documents, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant-observation and physical artifacts (Yin, 2009). Each data source is one piece of the “puzzle”, with each piece contributing to the researcher’s understanding of the whole phenomena (Baxter & Jack, 2008). Data triangulation, the convergence of multiple perspectives for the mutual confirmation of data, ensures that all aspects of a phenomenon have been investigated
(Knafi & Breitmayer, 1989). This study will strategically use data triangulation of the information gathered from multiple data sources to develop more credible, dependable and accurate findings. The primary data source for this case study will be individual interviews with EIT award winners and nominees from 2010-2015, in totality twenty-five community college faculty members will be invited to participate in this research. The researcher purposefully selected this time frame as relevant due to significant downturn in the US economy.

According to Yin (2009), interviews are essential sources of case study information and allow the researcher to attain rich, personalized information (Mason, 2002). It is through interviews that researchers can best access case participants’ views and interpretations of actions and events (Walsham, 1995). The researcher has two jobs at the same time: (a) follow the line of inquiry reflected in the case study protocol, and (b) to ask actual (conversational) questions in an unbiased manner that also serves the needs of line of inquiry (Yin, 2009). Each of the twelve participants in this case study will be asked the semi guided interview questions listed in the interview protocol, shown in Appendix C, as well as additional follow up questions if the researcher deems it necessary to probe for a more detailed response. Semi structured interviews invite interviewees to express themselves openly and freely and to define the world from their own perspectives, not solely from the perspective of the researcher (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p.40). The interviews with EIT nominees and winners will be recorded and transcribed verbatim in order to provide the most accurate rendition of the interviews and minimize inaccuracies and errors in researcher recollection. Extensive field notes will also be taken by the researcher during the interview, reviewed and
summarized within 24 hours after each interview. Central to the credibility of qualitative research is the ability of informants to recognize their experiences in the research findings (Krefting, 1991). Member checking technique will be employed in this case study by the sharing of interview transcripts with the participants to ensure that their response accurately describe their experiences. The face-to-face interviews also provide an opportunity to gather data by direct observation, including facial expressions and body language, and physical artifacts such as display of awards or certifications.

Neutrality is defined as the freedom from bias in the research procedures and results (Sandelowski, 1986). Neutrality in quantitative research can be achieved through rigor of methodology and the use of procedures such as instrumentation and randomization to establish the proper, scientific distance between the researcher and the subjects (Krefting, 1991). Conversely, Aamodt (1982) notes that in qualitative research, the researcher is part of the research, not separate from it. In qualitative research, researchers try to increase the worth of findings by decreasing the distance between the researchers and the informants (Krefting, 1991). It is possible that the case study researcher can become so enmeshed with the informants that he or she may have difficulty separating his or her own experience from that of the informants (Marcus & Fischer, 1986). Two types of bias may be recognized in case study research: the effects of the researcher on events and the behavior of participants at the case study site, and the researcher’s own beliefs, values and prior assumptions which may prevent adequate investigation and consideration of possible contradictory data and unduly influence the analysis of the case study evidence (Darke, Shanks, & Broadbent, 1998). While biases arising from researcher effects as the site are in one sense unavoidable: the researcher
is influencing what is happening just by the sharing of the concepts and interpretations with personnel at the site (Walsham, 1995), there are remedies to minimize bias in case studies and increase trustworthiness of case study research findings.

According to Yin (2009), a well-trained and experienced investigator is needed to conduct a high-quality case study because of the continuous interaction between the theoretical issues being studied and the data being collected. While unfortunately there are no tests for distinguishing persons likely to become good case study investigators from those who are not, Yin (2009) proposes the following as a basic list of commonly required skills:

- A good case study investigator should be able to ask good questions and interpret the answers.
- An investigator should be a good listener and not be trapped by her or his own ideologies or preconceptions.
- An investigator should be adaptive and flexible, so that newly encountered situations can be seen as opportunities, not threats.
- An investigator must have a firm grasp of the issues being studied.
- A person should be unbiased by preconceived notions, including those derived from theory, and sensitive and responsive to contradictory evidence.

One way of assessing the investigative skills or technical competence is to examine the researcher’s background for any special training he or she has received that is relevant to the project, for example, experience in interviewing or observational technique (Krefting, 1990). This researcher has participated in many professional activities intended to build interviewing competencies and active listening abilities, earning various internal and external
certifications attesting to mastery of these skills. Prior to conducting the actual interviews, this research will engage in practice sessions with her dissertation chair and peer reviewer. This case study research has been undertaken by a student researcher solely to meet the requirements of doctoral research, thus there are no competing interests, funding or sponsorships that might influence or threaten the neutrality of the data collection. Orlikowski and Boudi (1991) state that researchers must always acknowledge the subjectivity of their analysis in that predispositions, beliefs, values and interests always intervene to shape their investigation. This researcher acknowledges that all research has some degree of subjectivity and has attempted to counteract potential bias with the research design of this case study, formal database and implementation of techniques such as data triangulation, member checking, and maintenance of a field journal and peer examination.

Data Storage

The lack of a formal database for most case studies is a major shortcoming of case study research (Yin, 2009). The practice of creating a formal, presentable database is important so that in principle, other investigators can review the evidence directly and not be limited to the written case study reports (Yin, 2009). Using a database improves the reliability of the case study as it enables the researcher to track and organize data sources including notes, key documents, tabular materials, narratives, photographs and audio files for easy retrieval at a later date (Baxter & Jack, 2008). According to Yin (2009), the creation and upkeep of a formal database reduces the risk of any evidence being lost, either from carelessness or bias, and therefore fail to receive appropriate attention in considering the “facts” of a case. One of the challenges of case study research is the storage and management
of the volume of raw data and evidence gathered during data collection. Data in this case study will be classified first by numerical labels assigned to each interviewee, with the following sub-categories: notes, documents, interview transcription, tabular materials and narratives. The document name for each piece of case study evidence will first list the numeric assignment of the participant, the date the evidence was obtained, and the respective sub category to ensure information is saved in an organized, functional manner. The researcher will maintain a physical case study database, with numerically labeled folders for each participate within which hard copies of all data will be filed by sub category. Simultaneously, an identical virtual case study database will be maintained, thus providing a back up copy of all raw data that can be easily shared with other investigators for independent inspection and review. The intent behind the investment of time and rigor in establishing and maintaining the case study database is to safeguard that no evidence is lost, overlooked or forgotten. The collection and comparison of case study data enhances data quality based upon the principles of idea convergence and the confirmation of findings (Knafl & Breitmayer, 1989).

**Data Analysis**

The strategy used for data analysis in this case study is to rely upon the logic model constructed from Vroom’s expectancy theory of motivation. The basic propositions are that community college faculty motivation to participate in faculty development can be attributed to various components of motivation and within those components of motivation; intrinsic components will emerge to be the strongest and most influential. Data will be coded within
the categories of motivations as defined in Vroom’s expectancy theory then manipulated as recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994) in the following manner:

- Putting information into different arrays
- Making a matrix of categories and placing the evidence within such categories
- Creating data displays-flowcharts and other graphics- for examining the data
- Tabulating frequency of different events
- Examining the complexity of such tabulations and their relationships by calculating second-order numbers such as means and variances
- Putting information in chronological order or using some other temporal scheme

The specific analytical technique used will be explanation building as according to Yin (2009) this procedure is mainly relevant to explanatory case studies. To explain a phenomenon is to stipulate a presumed set of causal links about it, or “how” or “why” something happened (Yin, 2009, p.141). According to Yin (2009), the eventual explanation is likely to be the result of a series of iterations:

- Making an initial theoretical statement or an initial proposition about policy or social behavior
- Comparing the findings of an initial case against such a statement or proposition
- Revising the statement of proposition
- Comparing other details of the case against the revision
- Comparing the revision to the facts of a second, third or more cases
- Repeating this process as many times as is needed (p, 143).
The combination of use of logic model and explanation building support the internal validity of this case study.

According to Miles and Huberman (1994), coding is analysis (p.56). In this case study, the coding will be done by hand as most case studies pose a more serious challenge in efforts to use computer-assisted tools (Yin, 2009). The codes have been assigned in the form of category labels to organize the information gathered during the interviews, see Table 3.1 and will be applied systematically during completion of contact summary forms as well as during data analysis phase to determine if any patterns or combinations of codes appear. Narrative analysis will be employed to study the narrative structures used by the participants as they share their personal narratives during the interviews in this proposed case study. According to Hinchman and Hinchmad, “narratives are discourse with a clear sequential order that connects events in a meaningful way for a definite audience and this offers insights about the work and or people’s experiences of it” (1997, p. xvi). “Humans organize experiences through and into narratives, and assign meaning to them through storytelling” (Phoenix et al., 2010, p. 2). Narrative analysis, as defined by Phoenix and associates (2010), is a technique that seeks to interpret the ways in which people perceive reality, make sense of their worlds and perform social actions. Narrative structure can express the identities, moral dilemmas, perceptions and values of the storyteller (Phoenix & Sparkes, 2006a, 2007). The researcher will use the narrative structural analysis approach advocated by Abbott (1995), which is to investigate the sequential organization of narrative structures in search of patterns of recurrent sequences.
Use of contact summary forms after each field contact is recommended as a best practice as it provides a perspective that combines immediacy with a reflective overview of what went on in the contact, capturing thoughtful impressions and reflections, and also serves as a rapid, practical method to do first run data reduction (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Completion of contact summary forms should be completed no later than the day after contact (Lofland & Lofland, 1984). In order to surface bias or selectivity, the researcher will have peer reviewer read the basic write up and independently complete a contact summary form. After first level coding of data into segments, pattern coding will be conducted to seek out explanatory codes that identify an emergent theme, configuration or explanation (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Any themes or explanations discovered during this case study will be displayed in explanatory effects matrix to allow readers to follow emerging threads of causality as to which specific components of motivation most strongly influenced participation in community college faculty development activities and how these components were sustained.
Table 3.2

*Codes used in Thematic Analysis of Research Data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Factor</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Number Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>IS-MOT</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong Learner</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Identity, Competency Gap</td>
<td>SC-IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Need</td>
<td>SN-IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Perceived Instrumental</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental by Others</td>
<td>IO-IS-MOT</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>MAND-EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Feedback</td>
<td>XFEED-EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Reward</td>
<td>XRWD-EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. MOT = Motivation*

**Ethical and Other Considerations**

Researchers need to anticipate ethical issues that may arise during their studies (Hesse-Bieber & Leavey, 2006). Researchers need to protect their research participants; develop a trust with them; promote the integrity of research; guard against misconduct and impropriety that might reflect on their organizations or institutions; and cope
with new, challenging problems (Israel & Hay, 2006). The purpose of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) is to protect the rights and welfare of human subjects in research and there are 5 criteria a research proposal must satisfy to be approved by the IRB. Table 3.3 below lists the five criteria and the corresponding responses to each criterion. Upon consideration, the researcher determined that the risk to participate was extremely low as the interview questions were uncontroversial in nature and participants were selected by virtue of a positive event, namely the recognition of their excellence in teaching and participation in faculty development that enhances their teaching.

The researcher has taken several measures to ensure the anonymity and confidentiality of participants, with the assignment of a numerical label to each participant, conscious omission of identifying remarks and safeguarding documents and electronic files.

Case study protocol is a major way of increasing the reliability of case study research and is intended to guide the investigator in carrying out the data collection from a single case (Yin, 2009, p.79). The case study protocol (Appendix B) was created and utilized by the researcher as a guide during the data collection process.
Table 3.3

Institutional Review Board (IRB) Criteria and Proposed Case Study Protections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRB Criterion</th>
<th>Study Protection(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk to subjects are minimized</td>
<td>Minimal risk. Confidentiality preserved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No physical, emotional, legal, social, or fiscal risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No harmful questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk to subjects are reasonable in relation to expected benefits</td>
<td>No risk anticipated. Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of subjects is equitable</td>
<td>Purposeful selection of sample justified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation is voluntary; no financial compensation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When some or all subjects are vulnerable to undue influence to participate, additional safeguards have been included in the study to protect the rights and welfare of subjects</td>
<td>Not applicable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3 (continued)

**Institutional Review Board (IRB) Criteria and Proposed Case Study Protection(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRB Criterion</th>
<th>Study Protection(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informed consent will be sought and properly documented either from the subject or his/her legally authorized representative</td>
<td>Written consent will be requested and obtained from all participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. IRB Criteria from North Carolina State University
Limitations of the Study

This section addresses the general limitations of case study research and several specific limitations, which are unique to this study.

The most common concern and possible limitation of case study research design is that findings of case study research are context specific and cannot be generalized to populations or universes (Yin, 2009). Another limitation of case study research is researcher bias. Researcher bias tends to result from selective observation, selective recording of information, and allowing personal views and perspectives to affect how data are interpreted and how the research is conducted (Johnson, 1997). Finally, the interview method used in case study research may be limited by participant bias due to poorly articulated questions, response bias, inaccuracies due to poor recall and reflexivity (Yin, 2009, p.102).

Other limitations of this case study related to the size and composition of the study sample. The limited number of NCCCS EIT award winners and nominees restricted the number of community college faculty that could be invited to participate in this study. As only 12 individuals were interviewed, any conclusions generated from this study may be of limited use due to limited sample size.

Summary

This chapter details the methodology used in this case study, outlining in detail the research design, the use of Vroom’s expectancy theory of motivation to create a logic model, and the use of Yin’s (2009) recommended case study tactics to address issues of validity and reliability during the data collection and data analysis phases. Also discussed in this chapter
are potential limitations associated with case study research as a method and additional limitations associated with this specific case study.

The objective of this case study was to better understand the components of the phenomenon of motivation to participate in community college faculty development activities from the perspective of twelve North Carolina Community College System faculty members, recognized by their institutions as excellent teachers and nominated for the annual NCCCS RJ Reynolds Excellence in Teaching Award. Purposeful sampling was employed in the selection of participants that were both excellent teachers as well as engaged in innovative faculty development activities and experiences. All five components of rigorous case study research design recommended by Yin (2009) were satisfied and presented in detail. A blend of data collection methods were employed including individual semi-structured interviews, document analysis and direct observation. Data will be stored in formal database to increase the reliability of the entire case study and a chain of evidence will be maintained to ensure no original evidence will be lost and fail to receive appropriate consideration. Data analysis will be conducted using theoretical propositions that led to this case study and specific analytical technique used will be explanation building.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

The purpose of this case study was to explore the motivation to participate in faculty development from the perspective of twelve North Carolina Community College System Excellence in Teaching Award winners and finalists. The intention of this research is to provide a fuller understanding of why these excellent teachers were motivated to participate in faculty development by examining the components of the phenomenon of motivation to participate in community college faculty development activities. Yin (2009) states that case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon, such as motivation to participate in faculty development, in depth and within its real-life context.

This chapter presents descriptions of the faculty, the community colleges they teach at and their motivation to participate in faculty development from the perspective of each faculty member, in their own words so that the reader may best understand the context of this case study. The names of the participants and their institutions have been replaced with a pseudonym in order to protect anonymity.

As part of the central mission of the community college was and still is to serve a larger and more diverse student population than that served by four-year institutions (Murray, 2002), a shared challenge that community college faculty members often are faced with is learning how to teach in ways that satisfy the wide range of learning needs of the community college student body. As community college faculty members are typically hired for content expertise, rather than pedagogical expertise (Grubb et al., 1999), there may be a gap in
teaching ability and student learning needs. In the existing research examining community college faculty, faculty development has consistently been a recommended resource for community college faculty to learn about teaching and cultivate the teaching expertise needed to succeed in the community college classroom. The mission of the North Carolina Community College System is to open the door to high-quality, accessible educational opportunities that minimize barriers to post-secondary education, maximize student success, develop a globally and multi-culturally competent workforce, and improve the lives and well-being of individuals (NCCCS, 2015). There are 58 community colleges that are under the umbrella of the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS), the colleges are located across the state in both rural and urban areas and vary greatly in regard to size of institution, number of students served and type of programs offered. This researcher found that while all 58 community colleges are all part of the same community college system, each community college has their own distinct methods of operation, which include the faculty development practices of their faculty members. Table 4.1 shows the participants and their respective years of teaching in the community college.
Table 4.1

*Names and Teaching Tenure of Case Study Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years Teaching*</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years Teaching*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Irv</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Liza</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* years of community college teaching

**Amy’s Interview**

Amy taught for 12 years in the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS), at two different community colleges, A1 and A2. A1 community college is one of the largest in the NCCCS and serves over 65,000 students. She described her students at A1 community college as “very motivated and directed, almost all were transfer students”. In comparison, A2 community college was in a more rural, less economically rich area and the students were less academically ready and required more direction and coaching in the classroom. Amy holds a BA and MA in English Literature, as well as a MS in Library Science and a Developmental Studies teaching certificate and is currently enrolled in doctoral studies focused on ESL teaching. Amy is a fourth generation educator and shared that in her family, learning and academic success was an expectation, never an option.
Amy describes herself as a life long learner, both professionally and personally, and passionately stated “if you stop learning, you will die” and “as a teacher, I would be a total hypocrite if I did not model learning myself”. Her motivation to participate in faculty development was primarily driven by her intrinsic need to learn and her desire to add value to herself, her students and her institution. She believes teachers who do not engage in lifelong teacher learning are committing a gross disservice to themselves and the students in their classrooms. No additional compensation was ever given to Amy to reward her for her high levels of participation in faculty development. Her commitment to faculty development led her to self fund and not be reimbursed for her faculty development activity costs.

While Amy was driven by strong intrinsic motivations to participate in faculty development, extrinsic influences in the form of highly supportive administration and senior leaders who modeled a lifelong commitment to professional development, shared their activities and learning, and integrated the topic of faculty development into their vernacular. A peer learning-network has evolved from Amy’s active participation in professional organizations and memberships, this peer group shares teaching practices, faculty development opportunities and new, best practices. A pinnacle faculty development experience for Amy was applying for an international learning grant that was successfully funded. As a result of the grant the teacher traveled to India to learn about teaching practices and sharing the new knowledge via podcasts while overseas. Upon return to the states she was able to deliver face-to-face presentations to share knowledge gained from her grant. Her belief in faculty development has not changed as far as commitment level, however she has become more reflective, actively directing and taking charge of her faculty development
experiences. Recognizing that she has limited time to devote to faculty development activities, Amy now decides which activities she will allocate time to based upon either immediate applicability to self identified gaps in her teaching skills or alignment with her doctoral studies.

**Beth’s Interview**

Beth has been a community college faculty member for the last 8 years at a rural community college that has grown exponentially over the 5 decades, from student enrollments of 455 in 1963 to over 16,000 in 2014. Her undergraduate and master’s degree are in English Literature and she received no formal training in teaching prior to entering the community college classroom, which was 5 days after she completed her master’s degree. Beth is a first generation college graduate and qualified to be a recipient of the Federal Trio Grant as a first generation college student with economic hardship. The Federal TRIO Programs (TRIO) are Federal outreach and student services programs designed to identify and provide services for individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds and part of the student program offered an employment opportunity as a peer tutor. It was then that she discovered her love for teaching others. A mentor in the TRIO program also encouraged her to seek out learning and leadership development opportunities and take advantage of the additional opportunities presented by the TRIO program such application for grants to finance her GRE exam fees. Beth completed her MA in one year, by the age of 23.

Beth has a strong connection to the students she serves at her community college, as many are first generation college students as well as economically disadvantaged, with her
colleagues and senior leaders. She frequently used phrases such as kinship, family, love, pride and care as well as the terms “we, us and our” in describing her teaching and faculty development experiences. Beth knows her students by name and their life stories, frequently attending functions outside of the classroom to show her support of them. A lifelong learner that is intrinsically driven to be the best, Beth expressed a deep-seated belief that community college faculty have a responsibility and obligation to continue to change. She feels that community college faculty should want to learn and actively seek out growth opportunities in order to best serve their students, college and community. Noting that teaching in the community college is hard work which may not be for everyone, Beth believes that if you decide to teach in the community college, you are responsible for seeking out the training and learning you need to meet the needs of your students. The organization she is most actively involved in is the North Carolina Teaching and Learning Association, and through attending many activities, has built a robust network of peer mentors that help one another grow professionally as teachers. “We communicate regularly and they are instrumental in the faculty development activities I do”, said Beth.

The senior leadership at her community college, specifically the President and department chair, have amplified her motivation to learn by not only supporting her learning but also by actively engaging in professional development themselves. “It’s the right thing to bring my best here because they are giving me the best they have. To not do that would be shameful and a failure of character.” Beth has been involved in re-accreditation processes, institutional assessment, program development, and new course development as well as served as an institutional representative on various statewide committees. In addition to open
encouragement and support for faculty development, this community college also provides additional financial rewards, in the form of $200 honorariums, when their faculty create and present workshops or develop learning materials to add to the NC.net, online teaching repository. When asked if she would still be engage in the same activities even without the compensation, Beth said she absolutely would as she feels that as a teacher it is her responsibility to learn and to share what she has learned with others. In closing, her hope is to continue her employment at this community college for the next 32 years until she retires.

**Christina’s Interview**

Christina is a first generation college graduate with an undergraduate and graduate degree in science education, making her unique among the general community college faculty population in that she has both content expertise as well as expertise in teaching. Prior to joining the community college, she taught for over 6 years in high school and credits her teaching excellence to a combination of her formal education, a BA in Biology Education and a MA in Biology Education, student teaching and the mentorship of two key professors. As the youngest of six children being raised by a single mother, Christina always aspired to be a teacher and after being awarded a full scholarship to a 4-year university, she studied science education and earned a comprehensive teaching certification; which allowed her to teach any science course in K-12. Mentors have played an integral role in her learning experiences, professors in her formal studies as well as peer teachers. Part of her motivation to earn her master’s degree was extrinsically motivated by her ambition to transition to
teaching in the community college setting. She has been employed at Community College C for the last 10 years.

Community College C is a small institution, serving under 2000 students, in an economically depressed, high crime area. State budget reductions at this community college have resulted in reductions in force, reduction in institutional spending and reduction in faculty development funding. Christina finds that lack of funding is her greatest obstacle to participation in faculty development activities that she is interested in. In order to work around this obstacle, Christina chose to start a grassroots faculty learning committee within her department so that they could support one another with in house faculty development on a regular basis. Her department is a highly connected, close knit team that meets regularly to coach one another, share outcomes of different approaches they tried and collaborate on teaching methods. Christina encourages her students to take life’s situations and challenges as incentives and models this behavior herself with resourceful methods to further her personal faculty development journey, either by finding no cost alternatives such as webinars and publications or by presenting at conferences she would like to attend.

**Denise’s Interview**

Denise has been teaching for 19 years at the same community college, prior to her entry into community college teaching, she was a research chemist for a large corporation. Community College D is located in a rural area and was founded in the late 1960’s, the college offers 74 degrees and enrolls close to 3500 students each year. Denise is a first generation college graduate and came to the community college as a full-time faculty
member as a result of her spouse’s career move. While her undergraduate and graduate studies did not include preparation to teach, her BS and MS in Organic Chemistry qualified her to teach in the community college. Wanting to have proficiency in teaching as well as her subject area, Denise enrolled in several teaching pedagogy courses at a nearby four year North Carolina state university, whose teacher education program is nationally recognized, so she could learn “how to teach”. She has continued to build upon those learning by participating in various faculty development activities to acquire more knowledge about teaching and improve her skills. Denise believes in serving her students by looking for creative solutions and being flexible to student needs, an example of her commitment to student success is the parallel curriculum design she created for her courses that allows her online students to opt into face to face classes should they need to. Incorporation of learning styles into chemistry labs is another example of how she has taken pedagogical learning she acquired and implemented in the classroom to better serve her students and improve their learning experience.

Denise attributes part of her commitment to faculty development to her background in research and development where her primary job function was to solve problems and develop new solutions. She states, “I have a quest to improve, find newness, and look for solutions.” One example of this quest was when she volunteered and was selected to create the first online chemistry course in NC. Faced with the challenge of offering science labs virtually, Denise learned to write HTML code herself. Faced with lack of institutional funding to participate in faculty development activities, she has discovered solutions such as websites that specifically support community college faculty as well as grants and
volunteer opportunities. Participating in faculty development also fills a social need for Denise as in her past profession; she truly enjoyed the collaboration of a research team and working with others. Grubb (1999) described teaching in most community colleges as an isolated experience, which inhibits the interaction with peers that might provide them with new ideas about teaching, suggestions about teaching problems and support for their experiences. Denise has built a professional network of peers to offset this isolation and through communication with these peers finds motivation, support, and information about faculty development opportunities. It was from a peer referral email that she learned about a 10-day science fellowship that was being offered in Alaska, which she successfully applied for. Denise’s peer network consists of other science teachers and researchers she has met at the conferences and faculty development activities she has participated in over the years.

**Eli’s Interview**

Eli has held multiple positions at his community college over the last 20 years, matriculating from classroom instructor to Dean of Student Learning. Currently Eli holds a position at Community College E that is a mid-sized institution located in a suburban area. Eli holds undergraduate and masters degrees in Physical Education and he began his teaching career as a graduate student teaching assistant at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Describing his fellow students as high flyers, all striving to meet expectations of excellence implicit by the prestigious reputation of the university, Eli found his intrinsic motivation to learn about teaching intensified by the group norms. He recalls, “You took a lot of pride in your craft, there were no slackers. You know how lucky you were to be selected to teach”.
The faculty member in charge of the graduate teaching assistants during his graduate education also served as mentor, informally providing pedagogical training, lesson plans, feedback on teaching problems and guidance on assessment. Formal and informal mentors continued to play a valuable role over his career, providing external feedback, support and encouragement to learn more about teaching.

Peers have also continued to positively impact Eli’s motivation to participate in faculty development, serving as resources as well as peer to peer mentors. Although Eli was the sole instructor in his field at the community college, he found other teachers through community team coaching activities and with them, established an informal learning network. Currently, he is enrolled in an education doctoral program Adult Learning at Liberty University and finds the discussion forums and projects to be a valuable source of faculty development and teacher learning. In reflecting upon his faculty development experiences over the last 20 years, Eli stated that while his belief in faculty development as a vital necessity has not changed, what has changed is his need for the faculty development activity to serve an instrumental purpose. He evaluates which faculty development opportunities will either improve his job performance or benefit the institution. After determining which are most beneficial, he then elects to invest his time in those opportunities. The need to improve and to add value to his institution are both strong intrinsic needs of Teacher Eli’s, consistently shown over his professional career.
Francine’s Interview

Francine had unique preparation for teaching in the community college, with an undergraduate degree in Sociology and Psychology, an Associate Degree in Dental Hygiene from a community college and a graduate degree in Health Education from George Mason University. Prior to teaching in the community college classroom, she taught in a regional vocation high school program that trained dental hygienists. A life long learner that is committed to learning and improvements, she feels that community college faculty must be prepared to serve the diverse student body and their different learning styles. The need for improvement seems to be common among many of these individuals participating in this study, including Francine. She believes teachers are responsible for learning about their students and how to best teach them, explaining “there are more of them than me, so it’s easier to fix me and adapt so that I can suit their needs.” She encourages community college faculty to seek out opportunities to learn about teaching from peers, colleagues, faculty development activities and serving on institutional committees. During the interview for her current position at the community college, she was asked if there was anything the institution could provide for her and Francine immediately requested a mentor. She said,” I need a mentor because I don’t know how to do anything that you want me to do”, recognizing that while she had the subject mastery and professional experience, there was a gap in teaching competencies.

She has been a full time faculty member at Community College F for the last 16 years. There is a strong culture of recognition and support for faculty development at her
community college, this is demonstrated via semester opening professional development
days as well as 18 hour, 6 week, certificate programs dedicated to teaching strategies and
teacher improvement. When a faculty member completes the entire program, they are
compensated at their current salary for the time spent on faculty development. Also, during
the faculty assembly meetings, which all faculty are required to attend, upcoming faculty
development opportunities are presented and discussed. Follow-up emails reminding faculty
members of these development opportunities are sent later in the semester. Community
College F sounds like it supports and encourages professional develop and has a culture that
encourages professional development.

Francine recognizes the instrumental value of participating in faculty development,
citing several mandatory teaching courses she was required to take as part of her employment
at the regional vocational high school. According to Francine, those teaching courses were
“probably the best things I ever did” in regards to teaching her how to effectively teach.
Collaboration with fellow community college faculty, at the same community college as well
as those at other community colleges, have encouraged and exposed her to pursue additional
faculty development. As she highly enjoys team learning, Francine belongs to several
professional organizations, such as the North Carolina Dental Hygiene Educators Association
and the American Dental Hygiene association. She actively participating in various
leadership roles, ranging from President, Vice President and membership chair, as well as
attends the sponsored workshops and activities. While her spouse wishes she would be less
active and dedicate less of her personal time to these organizations, Teacher Francine deems
these experiences invaluable both for the formal presentations as well as for the informal
learning from her peer educators. She is currently part of a new faculty mentoring initiative at her community college.

**Gemma’s Interview**

With an undergraduate degree, masters and Ph.D in science, Gemma planned for a career in research and development, not teaching. Her teaching experiences prior to joining the community college were limited to teaching as a doctoral student and playing school with her two sisters on rainy days. The three girls would take turns being the teacher, creating lesson plans, presenting topics, leading learning exercises and grading tests, following the example of their mother, who was an elementary school teacher for over 33 years. Both of Gemma’s parents were first generation college students themselves and academic excellence and learning were values they strongly emphasized in parenting their 3 daughters, thus becoming Gemma’s first mentors of lifelong learning. Like the majority of community college faculty, Gemma began teaching in an adjunct capacity and was recruited due to her subject matter expertise and academic qualifications. She has been teaching in the community college classroom for almost 15 years and currently teaches at larger community college that support 900 faculty members and serves almost 30,000 students.

When asked about her motivation to participate in faculty development, Gemma shared a critical moment at a learning conference that opened her mind to the concept of whole student care rather than content delivery. In a learning session on alternative teaching methods, she questioned the applicability of the alternative teaching methods in content rich science classes. The presenter calmly said to Gemma, “while I understand that you are
passionate about the students being well-grounded in your subject and content is important to you, but if they are not learning it, what difference does it make how much of it you present?” Gemma describes hearing that statement as akin to being struck by a lightning bolt as she realized that student engagement and whole student care had been completely “off my radar”. Since then, she has actively researched and sought out faculty development resources and opportunities, applying her love for learning and the research skills cultivated in her formal education in order to find solutions and options to better her teaching skills, improve student retention and student success.

Gemma participates in faculty development activities ranging from attending and presenting at conferences, attending on campus workshops, self funding and enrolling in undergraduate and graduate education courses at nearby four year universities, both public and private, and utilizing a variety of online resources as well as engaging in development outside of academy via the Boys Scouts of America, enrolling in almost all of the troop leader development and leadership courses available. Her family continues to be a strong source of motivation to continually improve teaching acumen and student learning. One of Gemma’s sisters became a school psychologist and the dialogue between the two sisters is rich with education theories such as Bloom’s Taxonomy, Piaget’s Learning Theory and student development. Despite winning many teacher awards and showing high levels of student success, Gemma is adamant that she still has more to learning about teaching and how to best serve and care for the diverse population of students that enter the community college classroom. Her motto is, “student care is more important than any amount of academic knowledge, because I promise you, if you students feel like you don’t care, they
shut down. I wish that I had known that sooner.” Gemma’s desire to serve her students and help them achieve success is a primary driver of her motivation to participate in faculty development.

**Howard’s Interview**

Howard began his higher education journey in the community college classroom, earning an Associate’s degree in Electrical Engineering before transferring to a four year institution where he earned a B.S. in Electrical Engineering and Technical Education. Employed in the for profit engineering sector while completing his undergraduate studies, Howard was drawn to teaching in the community college for lifestyle reasons and the flexibility of the community college schedule. He has been teaching at the same community college for 25 years and plans to continue teaching for the rest of his professional career. Describing himself as a life long learner who as a child used to read encyclopedias, Howard participates in many on campus, in-house faculty development programs as well as attends professional conferences specific to his subject expertise across the country. He finds the internet a valuable tool to research and discover resources for community college teaching practices and strategies. In addition to teaching in the classroom, Howard has also been promoted from instructor to program director to department head. As an individual, he very much values freedom and the ability to self-direct his learning experiences.

As he described his motivation to participate in faculty development, two consistent themes emerged; strong top down support for faculty development and a climate of freedom for faculty to self direct their faculty development experience. The institutional support for
faculty development at the community college where Howard is employed is manifested in multiple ways; demonstrated participation in 40 hours of faculty development per year is one of the criteria of the annual employment contract, the leaders of the community college discuss the value of faculty development in their communications to the faculty, each year there are 5 or 6 days of on campus, institution sponsored faculty development and there is an allowance for every faculty member to take a no-cost class each semester as well as a $600 annual tuition reimbursement benefit for faculty, the caveat being that the grade achieved must be a B or better. Howard was motivated to continue to his formal education and earn a MS in Special Studies and Adult Education in part due to the additional compensation that would be granted by the community college with the graduate degree. While the compensation was not the sole impetus driving the decision to earn graduate degree, Howard states that the increase in compensation symbolically represents the value for teacher learning. He also shared that his community college was one of the few institutions that the SACS accreditation board made no recommendations for improvement in regards to the faculty development programs and practices.

In additional to being a lifelong learner, Howard has also always loved to create and add value. When he was asked to create new programs of study, he was also given the freedom to develop additional program enhancements that he felt would add value to the institution as well as to the community. The freedom to research, explore and investigate has resulted in several successful programs of study as well as a national gaming conference that draws thousands of attendees each year and has resulted in the addition of eight new employers to the region. The freedom to create and develop his own professional learning
experiences in accordance to his personal interests has been motivational for Howard as well as played a critical role in his retention and loyalty to the community college. Howard strongly encourages community college leaders to use faculty development opportunities as a reward and a tool to leverage the inherent talents and drives of their faculty members.

**Irv’s Interview**

Irv first joined the community college as a student, earning an Associate’s degree in aviation, then almost twenty years later, returned to the community college to earn an Associate’s degree in computer programming. Upon completion of his associate’s degree in computer programming, the community college invited him to teach as an adjunct faculty member. Irv earned his BS in information technology and MS in the electronic commerce while working full time in the for profit industry. He joined the community college as a full time faculty instructor in 2010. As his formal education did not include education electives or courses in pedagogy or andragogy, he elected to join a teacher-learning cohort at the community college the first semester he began teaching and earned a certification in Active Learning. This participation in a peer groups to support professional development was a practice that Irv has continued to engage in. The student engagement strategies and facilitation practices he learned in that program served as a valuable resource both then and over the rest of his teaching career. Irv has also continued to earn additional industry certifications, such as a LEED solar energy certification, and attend technology conferences and technology instructor workshops, at his own cost, to stay abreast of new industry developments and teaching innovations so that he may have the most current knowledge to
share with his students. The year he was nominated as a finalist for the Excellence in Teaching Award, the $2500 award was put to good use in the form of additional conference and workshop attendance fees. “If I am only teaching my students out of a text book, then I really haven’t brought a whole lot to the table,” said Irv.

Irv is thankful for the summer learning institutes sponsored by his community college and attends each summer, the faculty development topics range from teaching practices, development teaching strategies, and student advising to institution specific policies and programs. Faculty members are compensated with a learning stipend when they complete the faculty development classes and pass a certification test at the end. While his community college requires each full time faculty member to complete 30 hours annually and faculty are required to submit documentation of this as part of their annual review, Irv typically doubles that amount annually and if funding was not an issue, actually participate in even more faculty development and attend national technology conferences. His perspective on teaching is borrowed from a quote by Lawrence Welk: “if you are not getting better, you are getting worse,” and thus he always desires to learn more about his subject matter as well as the practice of teaching so that he can better teach his students. Irv demonstrates a consistent commitment to improvement of teaching and a self-directed approach to his professional learning.

**Jonah’s Interview**

Jonah comes from a long line of educators, superintendents, principals and school administrators and remembers his parents taking him on his first college visit when he was 7
years old. Teacher learning and student learning were constant topics of discussion at the dinner table and during family functions. Jonah’s mother was a non-traditional student and began her college degree in early childhood education when he was ten. “I vividly remember she had these flash cards on educational terms and psychological development which I used to quiz her and help her with her schoolwork.” Jonah encountered more mentors that stressed the importance of teacher learning and student engagement during his undergraduate and graduate studies. He was encouraged by his mentor in graduate school to teach undergraduate courses as well as present papers at academic conferences.

Upon graduation with his master’s degree, he was offered a visiting teaching position at the University of Texas, El Paso. There, he discovered not only a true passion for teaching but also a tremendous satisfaction and reward in serving a diverse student population comprised of non traditional students, ESL students, and first generation college students. Recruited by a private, liberal arts university in North Carolina and a tenure track position in the Political Science department, Teacher J left his teaching post in Texas. However, he soon realized that for him, teaching at a four-year institution with predominantly traditional students was “not nearly as rewarding” as teaching a more diverse, non traditional student body and he began looking for teaching opportunities in community college. He found a full-time opportunity at a large community college that serves almost 30,000 students and has been employed there for the past 5 years.

Jonah attends many teaching workshops and professional development conferences to further elevate his teaching skills and actively uses online resources to learn more about
teaching. In his experience, he has continued to find mentors that champion teacher learning and motivate his to expand his teaching abilities, both in the form of department chairs and senior leaders as well as peers mentors. He believes that behavior is modeled from the top down as faculty often takes on the personality of their administrators. How leaders feel about faculty development will flow downhill, if the leader is not supportive of faculty development, then none of the department chairs are going to be and the faculty will not be motivated to participate in faculty development. Conversely though, one good leader could change everything. His community college president openly supports faculty development and states that reduced budgets does not mean reduced faculty development, it just means that the institution has to be more careful and resourceful in their faculty development decisions. One of these decisions is the creation of a Center for Teaching and Learning where on the community college campus so teachers can learning about teaching and find additional resources to serve their students without having to leave the campus, incur traveling costs and pay conference fees. This again is a tangible example of how the culture of the organization can actively support professional development.

At his community college, Jonah has found an informal cohort of educators who are equally passionate about learning and teaching, taking advantage of every teacher learning opportunity available and resourcefully finding the funding. This group of peer teaching mentors collaborate on new teaching practices, observe each other teaching in the classroom, give feedback and share learning from faculty development activities they have attended as well as relevant faculty development opportunities they have discovered. Several of these peer mentors are also award-winning faculty and Jonah describes a good natured rivalry that
motivates and fuels the groups’ shared desire to learn more and do more with their students. One of these peer mentors also happens to be Jonah’s wife, whom he met when he started teaching as the community college. She has shared her insights on faculty development opportunities and activities that he was previously unaware of as well as identified outstanding faculty that in her words “were better teachers than you” that he could learn from. This seems to be a motivation to seek out professional development opportunities to improve that is self-directed.

**Katherine’s Interview**

Katherine differs from the majority of faculty in community colleges in that her undergraduate and graduate degrees are grounded in education. She holds a BA in elementary education and a MA in early childhood education, and prior to teaching in the community college classroom, she had teaching experience in the K-12 sector as well as a unique opportunity to teach at a gifted and talented magnet school. After having her first child, she took a break from teaching full time and joined the community college as a part-time faculty member, teaching in the early childhood education program. Five years later, she moved into a full time position and has been at the same community college for the last 14 years. While being nominated for the Excellence in Teaching award was a great honor, she feels that the bigger honor is being part of the education program at her community college and getting to engage with her students every day. She describes herself as someone who always wanted to be a teacher with an internal tick to keep learning and improve herself.
Katherine credits the learning culture at the community college, the example set by her department chair and departmental pride as key influences on heightening her motivation to participate in faculty development. Her community college offers “tons of professional development, even where we can sign up to lead our own faculty development forums” and recently instituted a college wide practice called the Golden Hour, which occurs every Wednesday at noon, and is a sacred time for teacher learning. Her department chair was a former Excellence in Teaching award nominee, is currently leading the professional development committee for the entire community college and actively engages in faculty development herself. Katherine describes her department chair as a servant leader who has built a strong and cohesive team that is recognized as being leaders within the college and a teaching resource for other faculty. Their department wanted to elevate the credentials and reputation of their program and add value to the community college, so they decided to apply for a grant and embark on a two-year process to attain national accreditation from the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC).

Having successfully completed the process of building rubrics to align and assess the program coursework and teaching to the 27 key standards defined by the NAEYC, Katherine now aspires to be a peer reviewer for the NAEYC so that she can help other educators through the accreditation process. Learning from others and with others is another source of motivation for Katherine as she enjoys getting ideas from others, hearing about their successes and discussing teaching practices. She belongs to several professional educators’ organizations, such as the North Carolina Early Childhood Association and North Carolina Access, and attends the conferences they produce as well as participates in the professional
development days offered at the start of each semester at her community college. Katherine defined the entire experience of being nominated for the Excellence in Teaching award as a once in a lifetime learning opportunity with introspective questions that really challenged her as a learner to identify her belief in teaching and wishes that many others could engage in that same learning process.

**Liza’s Interview**

From an early age, Liza aspired to be a teacher and began her teaching experience during her senior year of high school, serving as a special education aid for half of each school day. Her undergraduate degree is in child development and family relations and during her undergraduate studies; she also earned a K-6 teaching certification. She has been teaching for 20 years at the same community college and while employed there, was encouraged by her supervisor to earn her master’s degree in developmental education with a minor in counseling from one of the North Carolina state universities. Additional support for her advanced degree came from the community college in the form of underwriting the tuition costs and emotional support and cheering from her spouse, who is the Director of Counseling and Student Advising at the same community college. Like many of her community colleagues across the nation, Liza began as part-time faculty at the community college, teaching evening classes one night a week. She started teaching GED classes for adult and then moved into full time teaching in family literacy.

Liza belongs to many professional educator organizations, such as the Adult Educators Association, Family Literacy Alliance, and the Association for the Education of
Young Children, attending conferences and workshops regularly, as well as participating in cohorts and leadership academies. Through these activities, she has developed a peer network that encourages each other to learn by sharing additional faculty learning opportunities such as webinars and white papers. In her interview responses, Liza repeatedly highlights her director as the biggest influence on her motivation to participate in faculty development by instilling in her the belief in faculty development on Day 1. “I have been blessed to have a supervisor that has emphasized staff development as a huge priority, so any time there is any money to go to conferences and learn, we are on our way.” The same director also identified specific faculty development opportunities she thought would be beneficial to Teacher L and encouraged Liza to further grow and start presenting at conferences. When there were teacher learning opportunities that conflicted with Liza’s teaching schedule, her director approved a substitute teacher to come in so that Liza could participate in the learning opportunity. Over the last 20 years, the two attended many conferences and workshops together, both locally and statewide and even though her director recently retired, she still acts as a mentor to Liza and continues to share information on grants and learning opportunities.

In addition to her classroom responsibilities, Liza has also been promoted into the director role and serves on the Teaching Excellence team, which is in charge of staff development for the entire community college including updating the website with new faculty development opportunities, creating learning days and presenting at “lunch and learns.” She dedicates at least one hour per day to her own learning, researching specific topics or looking for appropriate faculty development opportunities for herself and her team. One area of learning that she identified for herself and her department was learning about
community resources and programs that exist to help economically disadvantaged students so they could better serve their students. Liza feels it is important to learn something new each day and whether it is learning about new teaching practices or sitting at the lunch table with her students and learning about the current rapper that her students are following, Liza finds education wherever she is.

There is very little empirical research examining the motivation of community college faculty to participate in faculty despite a significant amount of research stating that faculty development is a valuable means by which community college faculty can close the gap between their teaching abilities and the diverse range of student learning needs found in the community college classroom. The data gathered by the researcher during interviews with 12 NCCCS Excellence in Teaching Award winners and finalists was used to create individual profiles and written narratives for each participant. The profiles and narratives were sent to each participant to validate, employing use of the member checking technique recommended by Yin (2009) to enhance the accuracy of the case study and increase the construct validity of the case study. Profiles were then analyzed using explanation building technique as well as narrative analysis technique to determine if any causal links or themes emerged to explain why these award-winning teachers were motivated to participate in faculty development. The research findings as a result of this analysis are presented in the form of 3 major findings.
Research Findings

The three major findings, which are explored in greater detail in the sections that follow, were:

1. Intrinsic components of motivation were identified by the participants as having the greatest influence on the faculty member’s decision to participate in faculty development; second in degree of influence were extrinsic components of motivation. Intrinsic motivation for lifelong learning was present in all participant profiles.

2. Within intrinsic components of motivation, lifelong learning and the desire to add value were the top self-identified sources of motivation to participate in faculty development. From the data, two additional intrinsic motivators emerged. These were an obligation to serve the student and the need for self-improvement.

3. The majority of the participants credited feedback from institutional leaders regarding the importance of faculty development as having a significant positive effect on their motivation to participate in faculty development. In addition, during the interviews, half of the participants discussed seeing their leaders actively engage in professional development and modeling the commitment to faculty development.

Additional data gathered about the participants from the in-depth participant interviews are as follows:

a. All of the participants hold graduate degrees
b. One participant has earned a Ph.D, three participants are enrolled in doctoral studies currently and three other participants aspire to earn a doctorate.

c. One third of the participants are male, the rest are female.

d. Half of the participants have formally studied education and pedagogy.

e. One third of the participants are first generation college graduates.

f. One quarter of the participants earned associate degree at a community college.

g. Almost half of the participants have immediate family members that are professional educators.

All of the 2010-2014 NCCCS Excellence in Teaching award winners and finalists were invited to participate in this case study, 25 individuals in total. Among the 12 individuals that participated in this case study, 4 were the EIT award winners, the rest were finalists.

**Finding #1**

*Intrinsic components of motivation were identified by the participants as having the greatest influence on the faculty member’s decision to participate in faculty development; second in degree of influence were extrinsic components of motivation. Intrinsic motivation for lifelong learning was present in all participant profiles.*

This finding emerged from the first research question, in which participants were asked why they participated in faculty development. The major finding indicates that intrinsic components of motivation have the greatest influence on the individual’s decision to
participate in faculty development and in fact, the intrinsic motivation for lifelong learning was present in all participant profiles. This major finding also supports the primary propositions guiding the research design, which are:

1. Four components of motivation; intrinsic, instrumental, extrinsic and effort, as defined by Vroom’s expectancy theory, will influence an individual’s motivation to participate in faculty development and some will have greater influence than others.
2. Intrinsic components of motivation will emerge to be the most potent drivers of motivation to participate in faculty development activities in accordance with Knowles’ belief that in adults, the motivation to learn is internal.

What the major finding also shows is that extrinsic components can play a significant role as well. Table 4.2 summarizes the findings related to the intrinsic components of motivation that were identified by the participants as having the most influence on their decision to participate in faculty development.
Table 4.2

*Intrinsic Motivators reported most frequently by Study Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifelong learning for sake of learning</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to add value to students and/or institution</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of duty and obligation to serve students</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-identified competency gap</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction of social needs and sense of belonging</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desire to improve</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intrinsic motivation for lifelong learning was present in all participants, this major finding aligns with Knowles’ belief that in adults, the motivation to learn is internal. Many of the participants self-identified with the term lifelong learner and referenced their commitment to lifelong learner during their interviews. Amy shared her views on learning:

“I love to learn. I have to learn for myself and for my students. When you stop learning, you die. It’s important to me to know about the best teaching practices, just for me to know. If there is something to be learned, I am going to be the first to find out what it is!”

Liza echoes a similar passion for lifelong learning: “It’s important to learn something every day and find education wherever you are, at a conference or sitting at a lunch table with your students learning about what rapper they are following on social media. Faculty development
is an everyday practice, I spend at least one hour each day learning something new, researching and looking for faculty development opportunities.”

The majority of the participants were motivated by an intrinsic desire to add value, either to their students learning experiences or to their respective institutions, by learning more about teaching and elevating their teaching practice. Eli evaluates which faculty development opportunities he will pursue by considering how it will improve his teaching or benefit the institution, his goal is “to leave something better than you found it.” Howard’s intrinsic motivation to add value to students, the community college and the community itself led him to research and expand his content expertise in order to create a new Game Development program with a companion East Coast Gaming Conference which currently draws thousands of attendees annually. The success of the program and conference has also brought 8 new employers into the region, creating jobs that benefit the community. Howard stated, ”I love to create programs that support students and the community. These students are up against a lot and I admire them for wanting to get a degree.” Both Jonah and Katherine were involved in rigorous accreditation processes at their respective institutions that they describe as enormous faculty development experiences that were highly rewarding, as they knew they were elevating their community colleges and adding value to their programs of study. Having just successfully completed a national accreditation process for her department’s program of study, Katherine is now looking into opportunities to become a peer reviewer and travel to other community colleges, helping other departments successfully complete the national accreditation process.
Participating in faculty development also served to satisfy intrinsic social needs for several of the participants. Denise was employed in the for profit research sector as a chemist and recalls:

I am very much a people person. I really enjoy working with people and I enjoy working in groups… it’s an aptitude that I have, something that allows you to be a good colleague to the people that you are working are, for example in a research and development setting where there is a lot of collaboration. It was a hard transition the first few years of teaching but now the professional peer network that I have been able to find outside of my community college and continuously look for professional development opportunities with has helped a lot. Someone forwarded me an email about a 10-day learning fellowship in Alaska that was sponsored by a organization supporting the advancement of environmental education, I thought it was an amazing opportunity and applied for it. Though this fellowship was several years ago, I still incorporated learning from that program in my classes today.

Christina has founded a faculty learning committee within her department and is actively working with other community college biology instructors in North Carolina to create a North Carolina Community College Biology Association. She happily bragged that “we have the best department, we help develop each other, share teaching experiences and each month, we take turns teaching other something new.” During the interview, several of the members of the department, including the department chair, stopped by and the camaraderie was clearly evident in the way they spoke to each other and of each other.
Finding #2

Within intrinsic components of motivation, lifelong learning and the desire to add value were the top self-identified sources of motivation to participate in faculty development. From the data, two additional intrinsic motivators emerged. These were the opportunity to serve the community college student and the need for continuous self-improvement.

The researcher expected to find the lifelong learning and the desire to add value as intrinsic motivators that existed among the study participants given the role and responsibilities of a community college teacher. Also anticipated was that a significant portion of the participants would be motivated to participate in faculty development as a result of self-perceived gaps in teaching competency, especially since teaching in community colleges is typically an isolated experience and learning to teach often occurs via trial and error (Grubb, et al, 1999). What was somewhat unexpected was the emergence of an intrinsic desire to serve the community college student and the intrinsic need for continuous, personal improvement. A third of the participants in this study are first generation college graduates and feel a strong connection and affiliation with their students, many of whom have limited resources to help them complete their education and earn a degree. Beth stated:

I feel such a kinship to my students. I was a low income, first generation college student myself and really identify with people who the odds are stacked against. Community college is real work and that’s where I need to be…I need to be here because I am a teacher. I teach real people, I teach them real skills and I let them see I am a real person too. Basically, I have these credentials and I have this knowledge
and my job is just to share it with you, that’s what I do on this earth. It’s not a hierarchy here, we are people working together. That’s what I love about it so much.”

Jonah resigned from a tenure track position at a four year university after realizing that his passion for teaching was in part strongly driven by serving non-traditional students. Upon completing his master’s degree in subject matter, he was recruited by a university in Texas whose student population was very similar to the diverse student body found in most community colleges. Jonah described the student population as “overwhelmingly first generation college students, a lot of non-traditional students, higher average age, diverse in race and many were ESL.” He shared the following experience:

When I was there, I had a lot of tough conversations because there was a copper smelt right on the other side of the border and many of the Mexican students and their families worked there. One young man came to me, he had a 98 average in my class, one of the smartest young men I have ever met, and told me he had to drop out because “my dad got hurt in the copper smelt and I have to take his place. I have to drop out of school.” Instead of allowing the student to drop out, I (Jonah) created a flexible learning plan, during which the student would come in after his shift at the copper smelt and receive supplemental lectures.

Denise is also a first generation college graduate and is on a “constant quest to make sure students are actually learning”, going as far as creating a parallel path curriculum for classroom and online chemistry courses so that her students will have parity in teacher support and the option to join either format should they need more instruction. Irv pays for
all of his faculty development outside of the community college because he believes that he “owes it to his students to learning and bring more to the table than just teaching from a textbook”. While Katherine was very proud to be selected as a finalist for the NCCCS Excellence in Teaching award, she attests that her greatest honor is the daily honor of walking into her classroom and serving her students.

Half of the participants attributed the intrinsic need for continuous improvement as one of the primary reasons they are motivated to participate in faculty development. “I have always participated in faculty development because I have always wanted to be the best,” said Gemma, this statement was said almost verbatim by Amy during her interview. Jonah states he is never satisfied by his outstanding course reviews, as he knows he can always do better and continuously attends various teacher learning and development activities to learn about new technique and practices he can implement in his classroom to improve the student learning experience. During her Excellence in Teaching interview, Denise told the panel,” I think I can still be an even better teacher because I think there is always something you can do better. It goes back to continuous improvement and looking for ways to find a different path or a different way to be flexible, a different avenue to show students something, a different presentation using computer animation.”

**Finding #3**

_The majority of the participants credited feedback from institutional leaders regarding the importance of faculty development as having a significant positive effect on their motivation to participate in faculty development. In addition, during the interviews, half of the_
participants discussed seeing their leaders actively engage in professional development and modeling the commitment to faculty development.

Part of the need for a more robust understanding of faculty motivation to participation in faculty development was to address the gap in the existing literature and provide community college leaders and faculty development decision makers with insights on best practices by which motivation to participate in faculty development could be enhanced. Table 4.3 summarizes the extrinsic components of motivation and which were identified by faculty, in reflecting upon their lived experience, to have the greatest influence.

Table 4.3

Extrinsic Motivators reported most frequently by Study Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivator</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from leadership supporting faculty development</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from peers valuing faculty development</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing leadership engaging in professional development</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving financial rewards for participation</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance with mandatory faculty development policy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While several of the community colleges did have faculty development policies mandating faculty attend a certain amount hours per year, none of the faculty indicated that compliance to a mandatory policy influenced their decision to participate in faculty development. The majority of the participants (83%) stated that feedback from their community college leaders, presidents, vice presidents, deans, directors and department heads, was the greatest extrinsic motivator. Two of the participants, while at completely different institutions and at different periods of time, specifically identified the same individual leader as having a strong influence on their motivation to participate in faculty development. Amy recalls this leader “always having faculty development as part of his vernacular” and being very, very supportive and encouraging of her to attend and present at conference and learning workshops. Also he strongly urged her to share what she had learned from faculty development activities with her peers and the rest of the community college. Jonah states that when this leader was hired at his community college that there was an immediate change:

It was a breath of fresh air and faculty knew that now there’s going to be professional development opportunities. Our president’s biggest challenge has been the budget over the last two years but his position is that “I want to support all of you doing this, but I am telling you we have to be very careful with how we spend out money. We might not have the same opportunities as we used to have but instead of sending ten people to a conference, we may send a few and have them come back and teach the others.” Under his leadership, there is an on campus Center for Teaching and Learning being created so that more community college faculty can benefit.
Liza credits feedback and direction from the director of her program, whom she reported to for the last 20 years, for instilling in her the motivation to participate in faculty development. She recalled:

From Day 1, my motivation to participate in faculty development started with my supervisor. I have been blessed to have a supervisor that has put a huge emphasis on staff development, so any time there is money to go to conferences and to learning from others and attend workshops, we are on our way. She started sending me to stuff (conferences) and once I felt I knew the material, she encouraged me to move into presenting materials at these conferences. If she found something that she thought would be helpful to me in a conference she was attending, I would just tag along. Our institution has been wonderful and my supervisor put a lot of energy and priority on staff development. She just retired and if she hears of something, she’ll send me stuff and say “you need to look into this or you need to do this”.

Beth’s motivation to participate in faculty development is boosted by the support and feedback she receives from the leaders at her community college:

I have never been told no, always told GO! Our leaders at this community college find a way for people to get faculty development despite budget cuts. No one has ever said “you are not going to be able to go,” instead it’s like “let’s find a way for you to go”. There is a great push for people to work together so we can get professional development. The administration really stands behind the faculty and our president goes to battle for us. When from the top down, you see people investing in your
development and in you, you feel a lot more committed to your institution. There becomes a moral obligation and it’s the right thing for me to bring my best here because they are giving me the best they have. To not do so would be shameful and a failure of character.

During the very first research interview and throughout the remaining eleven interviews, the concept of leadership modeling and engaging in professional development themselves emerged as having significant influence on the participants’ motivation to participate in faculty development. Amy stated:

My president was a pro-professional development person because he brought to our campus a global learning partnership. He thought it was important enough for our community college to have conversations with institutions around the world. It helps when you have a leader who promotes a climate of learning because I think if he had been a different person, I would not have been so eager to do those things. He really showed his value in faculty development.

Several participants reported their immediate supervisors jointly participate in faculty development activities with them, in describing these experiences; the participants frequently used the terms “we, family, friends, team and ours” which suggest a shared ownership. Sharing their learning and feedback after engaging in professional development was another way in which leadership showed the participants that the leaders were themselves actively participating in faculty development. Howard described senior leadership frequently discussing what they had personally learned as a result of participating in professional
development during institution wide assemblies. Katherine is continually inspired by her department chair and shared the following:

My department chair has very similar beliefs to mine and she is very much a servant leader. She definitely participates in professional development, maybe even more so that I do. She’s huge in it. She does all of the outside things that I do and in additional she’s actually on our professional development committee for the community college. So she has a true hand in picking and deciding on opportunities and leading. She was a past Excellence in Teaching award nominee.

While a few participants indicated that they did not observe their leaders supporting or modeling participation in professional development, these individuals showed strong intrinsic motivation to participate in faculty development as well as found faculty development to be instrumental in adding value to their teaching ability which appeared to mitigate the absence of leader modeling.

Some community college experts posit that lack of external rewards and compensation are to blame for low levels of faculty participation in faculty development. While several of the participants, 5 out of the 12, indicated that they were appreciative of the stipends and compensation provided by their community colleges to faculty when faculty development was completed, all of the participants vehemently stated that they would still have the same commitment to participate in faculty development even if the compensation and stipends were removed. Howard articulated, “the compensation is symbolic of the value and support the institution and the leader has for faculty development, it’s not really about
the money itself.” Christina shared similar sentiments, indicating that the stipends are “nice and appreciated, but I would absolutely still have the same level of motivation to participate in faculty development.” Of the 5 participants that reported receiving financial compensation for, the researcher would like to note that for 3 of them, it was a one-time occurrence.

**Summary**

The data gathered from the semi-structured interviews conducted with each of the 12 participations produced 3 major findings.

The first finding was that intrinsic components of motivation were identified by the participants as having the greatest influence on the faculty member’s decision to participate in faculty development; second in degree of influence were extrinsic components of motivation. Intrinsic motivation for lifelong learning was present in all participant profiles.

The second finding was that within intrinsic components of motivation, lifelong learning and the desire to add value were the top self-identified sources of motivation to participate in faculty development. From the data, two additional intrinsic motivators emerged. These were an obligation to serve the student and the need for self-improvement.

The third finding was related to extrinsic components of motivation. The majority of the participants credited feedback from institutional leaders regarding the importance of faculty development as having a significant positive effect on their motivation to participate in faculty development. In addition, during the interviews, as new component of extrinsic motivation emerged as half of the participants discussed seeing their leaders actively engage
in professional development and modeling the commitment to faculty development as having a positive influence on motivation to participate in faculty development.

After completing the analysis of the data and review of the findings, several conclusions were drawn that offer insight on how to enhance motivation to participate in faculty development based upon the insights shared by these 12 award winning community college faculty members. The original conceptual model created by the researcher was divided into two models, one to show intrinsic components of motivation and one to show instrumental and extrinsic components of motivation. The original model was also modified to include the additional components that emerged during the in depth interviews and to reflect the magnitude of influence each component represented. The revised model is shown below in Figure 4.1.
Figure 4.1. Revised Conceptual Model of Sources of Motivation to Participate in Faculty Development using components of Vroom's Expectancy Theory
CHAPTER FIVE

Study Summary

The purpose of this case study was to explore the motivation to participate in faculty development from the perspective of twelve North Carolina Community College System Excellence in Teaching Award winners and finalists (see Table 5.1 for information on case study participants). Bess (1977) posits that faculty motivation is an essential ingredient in the formula for good teaching. Smith (2003) states that teacher motivation to participate in faculty development is critical in changing teaching skills. As Townsend and Twombly (2007) state, faculty development has historically been the means by which community college faculty attain the specific preparation needed for teaching in the community college classroom. The primary intention of the research was to provide a fuller understanding of the motivations of these excellent teachers related to participation in faculty development by examining the components of the phenomenon of motivation that influenced their decision to participate in faculty development activities. As research on attendance and participation in faculty development is scant (Steinert et al., 2009), the secondary intention of the research was to contribute to the existing research.

All 50 NCCCS faculty members that were either winners or finalists of the Excellence in Teaching award from 2008-2014 were invited to participate in this study. Emails, phone calls and letters of invitation were deployed at the beginning of February 2015 and 12 individuals agreed to participate in the research study. Several of the faculty winners and finalists responded to the researcher with questions regarding the nature and intent of the
study, other study participants, motives of the researcher as well as the sharing of final findings, but ultimately declined to participate. All participants received formal permission from their direct supervisors to participate in the study. Within the 12 participants, there is a balanced mix of winners and finalists, males and females, and a wide range of subject matter expertise including dental hygiene, environmental biology, remedial English, organic chemistry, electrical engineering and political science. Teaching tenure in the community college spanned from 5 years to 25 years. The community college student populations at the colleges which employ the study participants ranged in size from serving 2500 students to over 70,000 students. Two of the interviews were conducted over the phone, while the remaining 10 were conducted face to face, on the community college campuses, either in the faculty member’s office or faculty break areas.

There is a grossly disproportionate degree of attention and research examining community college faculty and how they are prepared to teach in the highly diverse, multigenerational classroom. What we know is that the majority are hired for content expertise with little or no formal preparation to teach (Grubb et.al, 1999). What we also know is that community college enrollments continue to grow year over year, thus adding even greater complexity to the role of the faculty member. Borrowing from the body of research in the K-12 arena attesting to the relationship between teacher development and positive effects on student outcomes (Darling-Hammond, 1992; Grossman, 1989; Jelmberg, 1996; National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 1992), the subject of community college faculty development warrants research attention that is proportionate to the 11.5 million community college students they serve. The Center for Community College Student Engagement (2010)
states that faculty development plays a critical role in developing faculty into a more knowledgeable, better skilled group who are able to use effective teaching strategies to engage students in the learning process. The assumption guiding this research is that participating in faculty development can help community college faculty broaden their teaching skills to better meet the diverse learning needs of their students. But in order to gain the potential benefits from faculty development, community college faculty must be motivated to make time for faculty development. Low levels of participation have been a decades long issue facing community college faculty development initiatives (Murray, 2002), a deeper understanding of the components of motivation that heighten or hinder a community college faculty member’s decision to participate in faculty development is long overdue.

Community college faculty are faced with the hard but necessary task of meeting students where they are and helping to move them to the next academic level (McIntosh & Rouse, 2009; U.S. Department of Education 2008). During the early 1970’s, community college leaders began to utilize faculty development programs as ways of retraining existing staff to meet the evolving demands of both students and society (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). This chapter will provide a summary of this research study, which sought to understand why these high performing community college faculty members, who have successfully met the hard task of helping their students, were motivated to participate in faculty development when the research shows that many of their peers are not. The major findings of the research and the researcher’s conclusions will be discussed along with recommendations for future research. The following research questions guided this case study:
1) Why were these NCCCS EIT community college faculty nominees motivated to participate in faculty development activities?

2) What components of motivation, as defined in Vroom’s expectancy theory to be intrinsic, instrumental extrinsic and effort, are identified by the faculty as having greater influence on their decision to participate in faculty development activities?

The propositions listed below guided this research:

1) Four components of motivation, as defined by Vroom’s expectancy theory, will influence an individual’s motivation to participate in faculty development and some will have greater influence than others.

2) Intrinsic components of motivation will emerge to be the most potent drivers of motivation to participate in faculty development activities in accordance with Knowles’ (1977) belief that in adults, the motivation to learn is internal.

There were three major findings obtained from the twelve in-depth interviews conducted with winners and finalists of the NCCCS Excellence in Teaching Award and analysis of the data gathered during each interview. The major findings are listed below:

1) Intrinsic components of motivation were identified by the participants as having the greatest influence on the faculty member’s decision to participate in faculty development; second in degree of influence were extrinsic components of motivation. Intrinsic motivation for lifelong learning was present in all participant profiles.
2) Within intrinsic components of motivation, lifelong learning and the desire to add value were the top self-identified sources of motivation to participate in faculty development. From the data, two additional intrinsic motivators emerged. These were an obligation to serve the student and the need for self-improvement.

3) The majority of the participants credited feedback from institutional leaders regarding the importance of faculty development as having a significant positive effect on their motivation to participate in faculty development. In addition, during the interviews, half of the participants discussed seeing their leaders actively engage in professional development and modeling the commitment to faculty development.

Conclusions

The researcher has drawn three main conclusions from the research findings and the learnings that emerged during the face-to-face interviews and data analysis.

Conclusion One

The researcher concludes, first and foremost, that excellent teaching in the community college classroom begins with the hiring of individuals that are intrinsically motivated to engage in lifelong learning. The lifelong love for learning provides a foundation upon which faculty development can be used to build teacher and learner success. The commitment to lifelong learning was present in each of the study participants and manifested itself repeatedly during their lived experiences, both personally and professionally. When Amy is not working new curriculum or a presentation for a professional educators workshop,
she is busy connecting with other teachers around the globe, in places such as Saudi Arabia, so that she can learn from their teacher leadership experiences. In her personal time, she signs up for cooking classes, wine tasting and cake decorating. Gemma, who grew up playing school on rainy days with her sisters, says “I have always wanted to be the best at everything I do and some of the faculty members here make fun of me because I change everything every semester.” Gemma’s project for this summer is learning about different strategies to teach science to non-science majors so that she can implement a new, topical approach. “It’s going to be a little scary and I am a little terrified but my goal is to teach biology in a way that students, even in their non-majors, will be going ‘Oh God! That is so cool!’.” While lifelong learning cannot be taught, it can be identified and observed in actions and behaviors.

**Conclusion Two**

The researcher concludes that community colleges leaders have a powerful effect on the motivation of their faculty to participate in faculty development, both in how they address the topic of faculty development as well as “walking the talk” and actively demonstrating participation in professional development themselves. During the interviews with Katherine and Liza, when each of the spoke about the many faculty development activities they had attended with their direct supervisors, there was an observable change in their voices and body language, their eyes lit up and glowed with happiness recalling those influential experiences. During his interview, Howard shared that president of his community college includes the topic of faculty development during his semester kick-off presentations. Though Beth has more than 30 years of teaching before her planned retirement date, she is absolutely
devoted to teaching at her current community college until then because of the culture and
support shown by community college leaders to the learning and development. Beth said,
“the slogan here at this community college is ‘Opportunities for Life’ and I have always
really taken that to heart, because here, I have been given so many opportunities as an
employee. My college really has a trust for its employees and there’s this unspoken
encouragement.”

**Conclusion Three**

Financial limitations and budget reductions represent roadblocks not absolute
obstacles to excellent community college faculty. Their commitment to lifelong learning and
serving their student motivates them to be creative and resourceful, finding alternate paths
and solutions. Jonah wanted to attend a weeklong International Studies Association
conference in San Francisco but knew obtaining $4000 in funding for airfare, conference fee
and a 5-day hotel stay was going to be a deal breaker. As he was scanning the names of the
panelists, he discovered that a good friend who was currently teaching at a university in
Sweden would be attending. By rooming with his friend and then presenting a paper at the
conference, Jonah was able to reduce the cost of his attendance to only $700, which his
community college was able to support. Faculty development budgets at Christina’s
community college have been severely impacted by the state budget reductions as well as the
effects of the recession on local businesses and industry. Christina remains committed to
learning and her faculty development. She says,” there are all kinds of webinars and stuff
online; there’s lots of free stuff out there. Offer to present at a conference you want to attend.
Sometimes you can find a grant. If you are really interested in one particular thing that you really want help with and you have found there is no money, you may have to pay up.”

Almost half of the participants pay for their own faculty development, which is a testament to their belief in the value of faculty development. Irv was especially happy to receive the $2500 award for being a, EIT semi-finalist, as that meant he had $2500 more to invest in his faculty development.

**Recommendations**

The researcher offers the following recommendations for community college leaders and faculty development decision makers based upon the research findings and the information shared by the individuals during the in depth interviews. The recommendations fall into three primary categories; hiring practices, leadership practices and institutional practices. The researcher also offers additional recommendations for further research.

**Hiring and Recruiting**

The researcher recommends that community colleges adapt their hiring and recruitment practices to include the following:

a. Actively look for examples of lifelong learning in candidate CVs and resume history.

   Educate HR staff on the meaning of lifelong learning, what lifelong learning looks like and the importance of lifelong learning as a teacher belief. Evidence should be provided to demonstrate the relationship between lifelong learning and teaching
practices, and ultimately, the impact on student success in the community college classroom.

b. Enter key words associated with lifelong learning into any computer software tools that used in the scanning of resumes and online applications.

c. Incorporate semi-structured questions during the face the face interview that require the candidate to share examples of their learning and their personal beliefs about teacher learning. Individuals conducting the interview should be trained on how to properly deliver the questions and how to probe further into the candidate’s experiences to determine if the intrinsic commitment to lifelong learning truly exists.

d. When checking references, ask the referring individual about the candidate’s commitment to teacher learning and for specific examples where they observed this. An addition, inquire about what additional contextual practices may have been in place such as a mandatory policy or advancement opportunity.

e. In the case of adjunct faculty hiring practices, identify the individual (s) that would be making the hiring decisions and train them on the meaning and importance of lifelong learning as a teacher belief. Provide the individual with interview questions and coach on delivery.

Community College Leadership Practices

The following recommendations are relatively simple, low cost and immediate ways in which community college leaders can positively influence the motivation of their community college faculty to participate in faculty development:
a. Adopt the mindset of faculty development as a non-negotiable aspect of the role of teachers and a standing quality education practice. Leaders should reflect upon their belief in faculty development and quantify it so they can authentically enhance existing motivation to participate in faculty development and possibly inspire a new belief and commitment to faculty development in individuals who currently are not motivated to participate.

b. Be mindful of including faculty development as a topic in institution wide communications, both written and verbal. Consciously integrate the practice of faculty development into annual reviews and performance feedback.

c. Leaders should share their professional development activities and what they have learned with their direct reports. Also important is to share the back story behind why they elected to participate in that activity, how they have actioned and applied the learnings and even what’s next on their learning plan.

d. Include others, such as individual community college faculty, members in the professional development activities the leaders participate in. This will send a clear message that their belief in faculty development is more than lip service. Additionally, this will be an opportunity to reduce feeling of isolation often found in community college teaching (Grubb et.al, 1999) and build feeling of community.

e. Allocate a portion of faculty development funds for reward based faculty development, establish a clear process for individual community college faculty members to apply for the funds, and communicate that process. Share the winners and their accomplishments.
f. Implement a weekly, campus wide teacher learning “Golden Hour” during which all employees are to dedicate to their learning. Block out the time on all outlook calendars.

g. Leverage top teaching talent to create and deliver in house faculty development and compensate accordingly. Ask these individuals to identify topics as well as develop future talent.

**Institutional Practices**

During the participant interviews, it was apparent that institutional policies and practices could either enhance or diminish the motivation of their faculty members to participate in faculty development. Below are some of the institutional practices that the participants identified as having a strong positive influence on their motivation. Implementation of these practices does not involve increasing funding for faculty development.

a. From the existing budgets, allocate a portion of funds for rewards based faculty development award. Establish and publish clear guidelines on the application process so that faculty are clear on how to apply for the funds. Once awards are granted, follow up with institution wide communication on how funds were spent, what did the individual faculty member learn and how it improved teaching.

b. Implement high frequency, campus wide dedicated learning time. The example of a weekly “Golden Hour”, a consistent dedicated appointment devoted to institution wide learning, was shared as a highly effective practice.
c. Leverage top teaching talent to onboard and mentor new hires as well as pair with existing faculty members. Cross departmental mentoring can reduce the isolation felt by some community college faculty as well as increase sharing of ideas and development of teaching solutions.

**Future Research**

Research on community college faculty development is essentially non-existent. Despite the need for community college faculty development consistently documented in the literature, the actual study of community college faculty development has been minimal (Lail, 2005; Murray, 2002). The future research recommendations from this researcher were created specifically with the NCCCS in mind but could potentially be applicable to other community college systems in the United States. Experts have noted that while faculty development efforts have been instituted at virtually all community colleges (Centra, 1972; Grubb, 1999; Murray, 2002; Sorcinelli et al., 2006), each institution may have different practices. The researcher found this to be true at the 58 community colleges that make up the NCCCS. Each institution has a different approach to faculty development; additional research is needed to understand the climate and culture surrounding faculty development within the NCCCS and the best practices.

In particular, as the value of feedback from leaders and leadership modeling emerged as significant influencers, more research is needed to better understand the belief in faculty development by community college leaders at each of the 58 community colleges. It would be beneficial to understand the belief in faculty development among all community college
faculty in order to create a tiered strategic approach to positively influence the motivation to participate in faculty development. When resources are limited, it becomes even more critical to use the resources wisely instead of in a one size fits all method. The final recommendation for areas of future research relates to mentoring and the effect of different types of mentoring, informal versus formal, leader versus peer, on motivation to participate in faculty development. Several participants in this study indicated that mentoring, both formal and informal, played an influential role cultivating their belief in teacher learning and faculty development. Also the peer mentoring relationships appear to sustain and grow the motivation to participate in faculty development. While much is unknown about community college faculty and their teaching experiences, given the increasing intensity and focus on community college student outcomes and the proven link in K-12 literature documenting the relationship between teachers and student outcomes, the researcher is hopeful that the study of community college faculty will increase in the future.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A
Letter of Invitation

Date _________________________

Dear _________________________,

I am a doctoral candidate at North Carolina State University in the Adult and Community College Education Charlotte Cohort program and I am currently preparing my dissertation research project.

I plan to study community college faculty motivation to participate in faculty development. I would very much appreciate your participation in this study. The study is not possible without your participation. You have been invited to participate due to your nomination and or winning of the NCCCS Excellence in Teaching Award.

I will conduct face-to-face interviews with you which will be audio recorded and should last approximately one hour. It is my plan to conduct the interviews in person and I will make myself available to travel to your location and work around your schedule and at your convenience.

I ask that you complete the enclosed consent form and return to me. Please call me with any questions. I will follow up this letter with a phone call and email within one week to ensure that you fully understand the study and the extent of your participation in the study.

Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Crystal Wood

(704) 774-0840

cwood3@ncsu.edu
Appendix B
Case Study Protocol

I would like to have a conversation with you about your motivation to participate in faculty development and your thoughts about where these motivations originate. I will be asking you to reflect upon your decisions and your faculty development experiences. This research is being done in support of my dissertation, and once the results have been compiled and coded, I will send you a copy of the results. It is not my intention to ask you any sensitive questions and your responses will be kept in the strictest confidence. During your participation in this case study, you will have control at all times to decline to answer any questions, decide what is on and off the record and modify any of your feedback.

As accuracy is very important, I would like to audio record our conversation if you have no objections. The only other persons who will hear the recording is a transcriber, who will convert the voice recording to written form.

Before we begin, do you have any questions?

Interview Questions

1. To get started, please tell me about your preparation to teach prior to joining the community college as a faculty member?

   a. Did your undergraduate or graduate focus of study include development and theoretical understanding teaching skills? Was any focus given specifically to teaching in the community college classroom?
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Case Study Protocol

b. Did you receive training via membership in organizations that developed teaching skills?

c. Did you receive training via a teaching certificate program? Was any focus given specifically to teaching in the community college classroom?

2) What do you believe you need to know in order to be an excellent teacher in the community college classroom?

3) Besides any pre-service development on how to teach, how did you learn to teach in the community college classroom during your employment as a community college faculty member?

4) Tell me about your motivation to participate in faculty development.

   a. What has helped or hindered your decision to participate in faculty development?

   b. What external influences have helped or hindered your decision to participate in faculty development?

   c. Describe your personal beliefs related to faculty development.

   d. Has your motivation to participate in faculty development changed over time? What factors influenced the change?

5) Is there anything you would like to add that we haven’t discussed?
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Case Study Protocol

6) Is there anything that you have shared during this conversation that you would like me to keep in confidence?

Thank you very much for your time and sharing of your experiences. I truly appreciate your insights and feedback. If there is anything that you would like to add or discuss further, please let me know.
# Appendix C

Final Coding Schema

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOT: ORIGIN</td>
<td>3.1, 3.2, 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT: INTRINSIC</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT: INSTRUMENTAL</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT: EXTRINSIC</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT: INTRINSIC</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL: LIFELONG LEARNER</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC: SELF IDENTIFIED GAP</td>
<td>3.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN: SOCIAL NEED</td>
<td>3.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV: DESIRE TO ADD VALUE</td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS: OBLIGATION TO STUDENT</td>
<td>3.1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT: INSTRUMENTAL</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS: PERCIEVED BY SELF</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS: PERCIEVED BY OTHERS</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Final Coding Schema

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOT: EXTRINSIC</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAND: MANDATORY</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XFEEDL: FEEDBACK FROM LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XFEEDP: FEEDBACK FROM PEER</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRWD: REWARDS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XMODL: MODELING BY LEADER</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D

Sample Contact Summary Sheet with Coded Portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE(S)</th>
<th>SALIENT POINT</th>
<th>THEME(S)</th>
<th>CODE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interest in teaching started from TRIO Mentor. TRIO provided workshops</td>
<td>XFEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I absolutely loved working as peer tutor</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CC is where I need to be, I identify with students here</td>
<td>SN-IN-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRIO really taught me to seek things out and network with people to learn</td>
<td>XFEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>IO-IS-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I made good grades my whole life and nothing would get in the way of that.</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel such a kinship with CC Trio Program Students</td>
<td>SN-IN-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>INCTA peer teaching group- we help each other grow professionally</td>
<td>XFEDP-EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If you want to teach in CC, you have to be a lifelong learner and willing to change for your students</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>CS-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>We make a difference and you have to be willing and energized to grow and change</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I have been involved with re-accreditation, institutional assessment, new course development, new programs. Inertia is my enemy</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I see my superiors doing a lot of professional development</td>
<td>XLMD-EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I do more than 9 hours reg, and some of it falls under my own interests</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>SC-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mission statement of CC, I take it to heart the encouragement from CC</td>
<td>XFEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Leaders find a way for people to get faculty development, despite budget cuts</td>
<td>XFEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.2.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I am proud of my colleagues, there is group commitment to share and transfer knowledge.</td>
<td>XFEDP-EX-MOT</td>
<td>SN-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Faculty development is a great tool for people already motivated, gasoline on a fire</td>
<td>IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Great encouragement for faculty- one example is $200 honorarium for presentation/ workshop dev.</td>
<td>XRWD-EX-MOT</td>
<td>XFEDL-EX-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Compensation is a cause, so is credentialing</td>
<td>XRWD-EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I would present with no compensation, it's part of my responsibility</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Content of faculty development has changed due to job change/ more administrative</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT</td>
<td>SC-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I need more training on student support services for position change and future</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT</td>
<td>SC-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>My greatest joy comes from my students and classroom</td>
<td>SN-IN-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Student success- we had a part of that, we invested in that person, and that feeds you</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>3.1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>There are challenges that are not going away, its our responsibility to get on board and make it happen. If you are not trained, you need to seek that training. Its your job to</td>
<td>SO-IN-MOT</td>
<td>SC-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Administration goes to battle, our president says and shows that “I believe in you”</td>
<td>XFEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>3.3.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Top down investment in FD, I need to bring my best here because they are giving me the best they have</td>
<td>XFEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1) What was your preparation to teach prior to joining the community college as a faculty member?

BA in English Literature/ minor in Spanish

MA in English

No Formal education in teaching pedagogy.

Trio Federal Grant Program Recipient- 1st Generation College Student, Peer Tutoring was Work Study Employment

Shared life experience of economic need/ limited resources

2) What do you believe you need to know to be an excellent teacher in the community college classroom?

1) Life long learner
2) Flexibility/ willingness to change
3) Love people, love to help.
4) Divorce yourself from elitism of academy
5) Desire to invest in the community

3) How did you learn to teach in community college classroom?

1) Trial and error and self directed research on teaching practices
2) Peer to Peer Coaching
3) Memberships in Professional Organizations- North Carolina Teaching and Learning Association-attending workshops/ summer institutes- also led to meeting/building of peer network to collaborate and share learnings with.
4) Online Resources: NCnet
3) Tell me about your motivation to participate in faculty development?

I. Personal Belief: As a CC Faculty member, to be successful, you must pursue faculty development regularly. FD has to be a habit. FD is like pouring gasoline on a fire. FD is critical to bridge teaching gaps. If we are not trained on how to teach, it is our responsibility to seek out and engage in FD to serve our students. Challenges are not going away and it is the CC faculty member’s responsibility to get on board and make it happen. CC faculty have an ethical obligation, they owe it to their students to be the best teacher (the faculty member) can be.

II. Motivation Helped: by Top Down investment in FD from dean and chair, showing value for FD by
1) Actively participating in professional development themselves
2) Never saying NO, always saying GO.
3) Encouragement to share what I have learned
4) Compensation for attending FD and coming back to present to faculty/adding to NC Net material repository. Its not about the actual money, more so about the value/appreciation.
5) Mission of Institution: Opportunities for Life
6) Colleagues- group commitment

* Also Winning EIT award was life changing. Validated self worth as teacher and individual overcoming so many challenges/obstacles/strife.

III. Motivation Hindered: While personal motivation has never been hindered, she has observed that others motivation to participate in FD has been hindered by perception that there is little value/return for investing the extra time in faculty development. Complacency, lack of immediate gratification and lack of funding. Also, for adjunct faculty, not enough hours. Due to Obama care, PT/Adjunct hours are capped to avoid benefit obligation.
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IV. No Change in Belief in FD- Change in the focus of the FD opportunities I participate in: I am now less geared towards credentialing and more towards student support services and administrations. More quality rather than quantity and also more regular, consistent activities as part of a group, specifically NCTLA.

V. Recommendations for community college faculty development decision makers: None
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Frequency Table for Top Three Motivators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>#1 Source of Motivation</th>
<th>#2 Source of Motivation</th>
<th>#3 Source of Motivation</th>
<th>XFEEDLM</th>
<th>FORMAL STUDY NON-EDUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francine</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>XFEEDP-EX-MOT</td>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irv</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT</td>
<td>OS-IN-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liza</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denise</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>OS-IN-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli</td>
<td>XFEEDP-EX-MOT</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT</td>
<td>SC-IN-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemma</td>
<td>OS-IN-MOT</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonah</td>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT</td>
<td>XFEEDP-EX-MOT</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Frequency Table for Top Three Motivators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#1 Source</th>
<th>#2 Source</th>
<th>#3 Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LL-IN-Mot 58%</td>
<td>AV-IN-MOT 42%</td>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV-IN-MOT 17%</td>
<td>LL-IN-MOT 25%</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT 8%</td>
<td>PS-IS-MOT 17%</td>
<td>OS-IN-MOT 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS-IN-MOT 8%</td>
<td>XFEEDL-EX-MOT 8%</td>
<td>SC-IN-MOT 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>