Business Education & Accreditation
Vol. 8, No. 2, 2016, pp. 1-12
ISSN: 1944-5903 (print)
ISSN: 2157-0809 (online)

IBFR
www.theIBFR.COM

MOTIVATING FACULTY ENGAGEMENT IN ASSURANCE OF LEARNING USING THE JOB CHARACTERISTICS MODEL

André L. Honorée, Southeastern Louisiana University
Harold E. Davis, Southeastern Louisiana University
Terri Tará Lopez, Southeastern Louisiana University

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the significant issue of low-level faculty engagement/participation in the assessment process by advocating the employment of self-managed work teams and integrating detailed motivational elements in the design of assurance of learning plans. Specifically, this article illustrates how each of the five motivational components from Hackman & Oldham's Job Characteristics Model (1974) can be utilized in the design/redesign of a college's assurance of learning process and attend to the issue of social loafing. Numerous prescriptive actions illustrating how the authors applied the motivational theory are presented to serve as a reference to other institutions as they too seek to improve the quality of their assurance of learning outcomes.

JEL: I20, I21

KEYWORDS: Assurance of Learning, Faculty Engagement, Job Characteristics Model, Job Redesign, Social Loafing

INTRODUCTION

University faculty often pride themselves on the practical application of theories and concepts discussed in their courses to the "real world." However, at times university faculty also fail to practice what they preach. Furthermore, there can also be found in academia apart from faculty a disconnect between what is professed to students in their classrooms and what is practiced within their own institutions. Yet, the very same theories advocated for use in organizations and the workplace also have utility in academia as colleges and universities wrestle with similar issues of increased quality, productivity, and compliance to standards. Examples of this dichotomy within academia can be seen in the manner that universities respond to the increasing demands of accreditation standards that continue to evolve over time. As universities and their faculty often grapple with multiple accreditation bodies, each with their own expectations and standards, it stands to reason that theories and concepts developed to motivate and lead members of organizations would prove extremely relevant to support them as they navigate through these often complex standards, especially those related to assessment/assurance of learning (AOL) processes. Unfortunately, it is the authors' experience that many university AOL processes to address these detailed accreditation standards often develop on an ad hoc basis with little deliberate planning, and therefore little application of the industrial psychology/organizational behavior theories advocated in their classes.

The evolving expectations and standards of accreditation require increased involvement of faculty. Colleges (and universities in general) are having to obligate their faculty to have broader participation in the diverse activities of the accreditation process, especially those activities related to AOL. These

faculty (particularly those outside of Colleges of Education) now find themselves involved in additional activities that are often foreign/new to them (e.g., developing rubrics, creating assessment instruments, conducting assessments in courses). The task of motivating a skeptical or even resistant faculty to take on these increased AOL responsibilities (or "unfunded mandates") is often difficult when such duties are simply added to teaching, research and existing service requirements (Purinton and Alexander, 2013).

Like many universities, the original assurance of learning process within the authors' college evolved primarily in response to the need to meet accreditation deadlines rather than deliberate design. It was largely a centralized process with decisions made in a top-down manner by a select few faculty who served as members of a college AOL committee. This resulted in the remaining faculty having a small number of relatively tedious tasks (e.g., administering tests in their classes) or having a low involvement in hearing assessment results at college-wide AOL meetings. In addition, the general attitude among faculty was that assessment offered no positive outcomes for students, but was instead something that administrators needed to do in order to check a box and wasted the time of faculty. Despite the efforts of well-intentioned AOL committee members, the process resulted in a disengaged, unmotivated faculty who saw little value in assessment efforts. Resultant frustrations of the administration and the AOL committee members prompted a redesign of the job of assessment.

Faced with the task of fundamentally redesigning the AOL process within their college to meet multiple accreditation agencies' standards, the authors quickly realized the need to motivate their fellow faculty and have them become more actively engaged than they had been previously. When considering how to motivate their colleagues, the authors recalled their organizational behavior educational backgrounds and designed an AOL process that applied the specific five major components of the time-honored and accepted job characteristics model (Hackman and Oldham 1976). The results of this new motivational design were immediately apparent in the quantity and quality levels of participation by the faculty.

Thus it is the hope of the authors that they may share their collective experiences with specific motivational elements of their redesigned and job characteristics model-inspired AOL process. As so many colleges are facing similar participation/engagement challenges of their own, this paper begins with a literature review of the task of job redesign and an overview of the job characteristics model. The paper then highlights the challenges of social loafing and advances numerous prescriptive actions with examples for each of the five major components of the motivational theory to serve as a guide and spur consideration for similar actions in the design of other AOL processes.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The authors realized that any attempt at significantly improving their existing AOL process would involve a comprehensive redesign of not only the assessment process (e.g., how, when and where to assess specific learning goals), but more importantly (for a motivational and engagement perspective) the jobs and tasks to be completed by the faculty. Job design (also task or work design) is the way that tasks are combined to form complete jobs while job redesign focuses on restructuring existing jobs (Robbins, 1998). Numerous studies on job redesign have indicated that it can significantly improve job satisfaction, employee motivation and productivity, and the quality of products (i.e., Ford, 1969; Lawler, 1973; Maher, 1971; Myers, 1970; Vroom 1964, Casey and Robbins, 2010). Wishing to obtain similar results with their AOL process, the authors selected as the basis for their job redesign the most widely cited and influential model in the work design literature, the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) advanced by Hackman and Oldham (1976). Because the JCM focuses on worker behavior or the job itself, it is primarily considered an intrinsic process motivation theory (Leonard, Beauvais and Scholl, 1999). Process theories of motivation are concerned with the cognitive processes individuals use in making decisions and choices about work (Schultz and Schultz, 1998).

The JCM suggests that objective job characteristics are filtered through an employee's perceptions to result in psychological states that determine affective (e.g., internal motivation, job satisfaction) and behavioral (e.g., work effectiveness, work performance) responses or outcomes. In sum, Hackman and Oldham's (1975) model suggests that the overall potential of any job to motivate employees may be determined through the combination of five job characteristics (or dimensions) into a single index.

Meta-analyses (Fried and Ferris, 1987; Humphrey, Nahrgang and Morgeson 2007) seem to strongly support the use of the JCM in job redesign with all five job characteristics from the index found to be strongly related to job satisfaction, internal work motivation, and growth satisfaction. Briefly, the five job characteristics are skill/task variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. Skill/task variety reflects the breadth of skills and talent used to perform a variety of activities found in a job. Task identity of a job is the extent to which a job involves the completion of a whole identifiable piece of work that has a beginning and an end with tangible outcomes. Task significance of a job refers to the degree to which the job is perceived by the individual to be important and has a significant impact on others (either within or outside of the organization). Autonomy is the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence, and discretion to the worker in scheduling work and in determining the procedures to be used. Finally, feedback is the extent to which carrying out the job's required work activities results in the worker receiving direct and clear information about the effectiveness of their performance. The presence and relative strengths of these five job characteristics are thought to trigger critical psychological states (CPS) in workers which are ultimately related to personal and work outcomes such as employee motivation, job satisfaction, and performance (Debnath, Tandon and Pointer, 2007).

The first CPS, experienced meaningfulness of the work, is a result of the first three characteristics from the JCM. Experienced meaningfulness indicates how work can take on personal meaning and/or how the work accomplishes something. Additionally, the individual must experience the work as being generally important, valuable and worthwhile. The second CPS is drawn from the JCM characteristic of autonomy. This CPS promotes the freedom to determine the process and timing of tasks needed to complete the work and personal responsibility for work outcomes. Finally, the JCM feedback dimension contributes to the CPS of knowledge of actual results. This CPS is determined by how well it provides the employee an understanding of their performance effectiveness. The relationships between job characteristics, CPS, and work outcomes put forward by the JCM (see Table 1) have generally been supported by a large number of empirical studies (Treville and Antonakis, 2006; Lee-Ross, 1998, 2002; Johns, Xie and Fang, 1992; Hogan and Martell, 1987; Glick, Jenkins and Gupta, 1986; Loher, Noe, Moeller and Fitzgerald, 1985). Thus, the JCM has been demonstrated to be an effective tool in both planning and implementing changes in the design of work.

Table 1: JCM – Job Characteristics → Critical Psychological States → Work Outcomes

Types of Job Characteristics	Critical Psychological States	Examples of Work Related Outcomes
Skill Variety Task Identity Task Significance	Meaningfulness of Work	Employee Motivation Job Satisfaction Increased Job Performance Reduced Turnover Reduced Absenteeism
Autonomy	Freedom to Determine the Process & Timing of Tasks	
Feedback	Knowledge of Results	

This table illustrates the relationship between the Job Characteristics Model's five elements with the critical psychological states they generate which lead to specific work-related outcomes.

Response to Social Loafing

Before attempting to apply the concepts of the JCM at their institution, the authors realized the need to first address the lack of faculty engagement and performance that was attributed to what is termed "social loafing." Social loafing can be defined as the tendency for individuals to decrease their efforts when they work in groups rather than individually (Latane, Williams and Harkins, 1979) and has been found to occur in a diverse set of locations and activities (Earley, 1989; Harkins, Latane and Williams, 1980). Some individuals engage in social loafing for they feel they can "hide in the crowd" (Latane, Williams and Harkins, 1979) because their contributions are not individually recognized and thus realize that they likely will not be singled out for either credit or blame. Other group members engage in social loafing as a result of the "sucker effect" (Orbell and Dawes, 1981) in which they fear that others in the group may free-ride off of their efforts. Regardless of motive, research suggests that social loafing is more likely to occur the larger the size of the group (Agggarwal and O'Brien, 2008). This description of social loafing provides a reasonable explanation of the effects the structure and size of the assessment committees and college-wide meetings had on low faculty involvement and the need to restructure the AOL process.

The authors' new AOL process first set out to attack social loafing head-on through the development of a new structure based on the concept of self-managed work teams (SMWT). Known by a variety of names (self-maintaining, self-leading, self-regulating work teams), SMWT are defined by Attaran and Nguyen (1999, p. 24) as "groups of employees who are responsible for a complete, self-contained package of responsibilities that relate either to the final product or an ongoing process." Applied to the authors' AOL process, the SMWT were called Discipline Curriculum Teams (DCTs). The DCTs were designed so that the majority of the AOL decisions and tasks were decentralized and undertaken by the college's entire faculty. More specifically, all faculty in one discipline (by discipline and not necessarily by department, e.g., Department of Accounting and Finance) would constitute a Discipline Curriculum Team (DCT), which would be responsible for the majority of the tasks associated with assessing their majors. The resultant AOL plan thus sought to engage the faculty by making them responsible for more of the tasks associated with assessing students enrolled in their programs and for proper design and administration of the AOL process.

Implementation of JCM

The second part of the plan involved changing the AOL process in concert with the newly formed DCTs so that more responsibility and authority over the process would reside with the DCTs. To this end, the Job Characteristics Model (JCM) was used as a framework to guide the development of the tasks and responsibilities. In the sections that follow, the authors provide a brief background on each of the five components to the JCM, the college's specific efforts to redesign the AOL process, and how the new design applied key concepts from the Job Characteristics theory.

Skill or Task Variety

Skill variety is the extent to which a job utilizes and challenges the worker's skills and abilities. In reviewing the empirical results of both experimental and laboratory studies of cognitively based models, it can be argued that skill variety is perhaps the most important of the three characteristics, which comprise the meaningfulness of work CPS (see Figure 1) by having the strongest correlates with a variety of attitudinal outcomes (Dodd and Ganster, 1996). Some suggest this is due to the mediating effects of work engagement on the job design-performance relationship (Shantz, Alfes, Truss and Soane, 2013). Others propose that workers whose required skills and tasks are varied, are more likely to feel challenged by their work, believe that their work is interesting (Morgeson and Humprey, 2006) and motivational (Ryan and Deci, 2000). Furthermore, additional research suggests that to improve worker perceptions of skill/task variety, that jobs must be both enlarged and enriched (Malloney and McFillen, 1995). It is

natural to conclude that by increasing the levels of job enlargement and enrichment, that workers would more likely become more engaged in their jobs. Understanding the importance of skill variety to the JCM and to influencing desirable behavioral outcomes, the authors' revised AOL process deliberately set out to engage the faculty through increased job enlargement and enrichment.

By placing the responsibilities for the generation of all the components of AOL down to each of the DCTs, the skill variety component of the JCM was immediately increased in all the college's faculty. Each DCT was given the individualized task of designing, implementing, and evaluating a discipline-specific AOL process that would be integrated and aggregated into the college's overall plan. Faculty went from simply carrying out trivial tasks and listening to the results of assessments to undertaking all of the more challenging and significant tasks required of developing and executing an AOL plan. Skill/task variety was thus immediately increased as the job was enlarged for all faculty.

Task Identity

Task identity refers to the idea that people will feel a greater sense of meaning in their work if they can participate in and complete an entire process that is part of their job, including seeing the outcome of their work (Hackman and Oldham, 1974). With a greater sense of meaning, people will have an increased motivation to perform the assigned tasks (Choge, Chepkiyeng and Chelimo, 2014). While being able to identify with a task alone has been shown to have a positive effect on the meaningfulness of work, the capability to change or craft a job allows for employees to provide meaningful input to the tasks that they are assigned to do such that the task itself can be altered. As a result, employees have the ability to craft their own work, which has been shown to increase the meaningfulness of work (Wrzesniewki and Dutton, 2001). Additional studies have shown that task identity has a moderating effect on the concentration and enjoyment of employees using computers in the workplace and that job characteristics, including task identity, interact with personality traits to increase the meaningfulness of work (Ghani and Deshpande, 1994; Barrick, Mount and Li, 2013).

While research does indicate benefits for employees who are able to identify with their tasks, this concept was severely lacking in the original design of the AOL process. Faculty that were part of the initial committee had input to the various parts of the process, but there was very little ownership because most of the responsibility of the tasks of the committee fell to the chair of the committee and a select few others. Most other faculty would typically be involved only at college-wide assessment meetings where information about the process as well as results were disseminated. A very limited number of faculty would actually participate in the generation of assessment instruments with only a handful of others conducting the assessments in their AOL-designated classes. In sum, these faculty felt much removed from the overall AOL process. As previously stated, this resulted in a generally unmotivated faculty who saw little value in assessment efforts as well as frustration from the AOL committee members and administration. The much-needed redesign of the original plan had a very positive impact on the overall AOL process outcomes and on the faculty. In the new process, all faculty are responsible for every aspect of their DCT's assessment process. This has allowed faculty to gain a sense of ownership in what is being accomplished. More specifically, all faculty now participate from the determination of learning goals and outcomes to the analyzing of assessment results, including the corrective actions of making curricular or pedagogical actions to improve student learning where needed (i.e., closing the loop). As a result, faculty now participate in the vast majority of the assessment tasks performed in the college and have gained a newfound understanding and identification with the whole AOL process. This has led to many discussions in meetings about the very things that accrediting bodies are seeking for faculty to talk about to enhance student learning. In short, the discussions that now take place are centered on improving the AOL process and increasing student learning whereas before they were centered on doing the minimum in order for faculty to move on to what really mattered to them.

Task Significance

The construct of task significance attempts to capture the extent to which employees believe their work will affect the lives and well-being of others (Hackman and Oldham, 1974). Employees who believe that the work that they do has a meaningful impact on others will have a greater degree of motivation to perform the tasks associated with the job. Conversely, as the authors' encountered in the prior AOL process, employees who don't see where their efforts provide any positive impact on others will be less motivated to perform the tasks associated with their job. Research supports the role task significance plays in employee motivation. In a series of experiments, Grant (2008) found that fundraisers who "received a task significance intervention," raised significantly more funds than those who had not. Additionally, those fundraisers beat their own previous records. Additional research has shown that employees whose job has a high level of task significance are more engaged and perform more organizational citizenship behaviors (Shantz, Alfes, Truss, and Soane, 2013).

The faculty saw little in the original AOL design related to the construct of task significance. First, the assessments were administered in a handful of upper-level "catch-all" classes. These assessments were designed (with some exceptions) and graded by the instructor of record in which the assessments were administered. Second, the results of assessments for all college of business majors were provided in aggregate to faculty in college-wide meetings and emails. Though responsible for analyzing assessment outcomes and making recommendations to close the loop, faculty not directly involved in the courses felt isolated from the assessment and its outcomes. In addition, the assessment results felt impersonal and seemed to treat students as a number. The original AOL design unintentionally created a silo effect, in which the faculty saw little utility or significance in the tasks they were asked to perform.

The redesigned process helped faculty feel a stronger connection to the assessments, the results, and what the results reflected about what the students had learned and/or retained. Though the administration of the assessments remained in only a handful of upper-level classes, through the use of discipline-based smaller teams (the DCTs), groups of faculty were for the first time asked to develop their own assessment instruments that they felt were most reflective of what students should be expected to know upon graduation. Because faculty naturally feel a strong connection to and sense of responsibility for their own students/majors, this redesign greatly enhanced their feelings of the significance of the AOL tasks.

Another element of the redesign impacting task significance was a shift in responsibility for assessing/grading the students' assessments (e.g., evaluating student responses and performances against faculty-designed rubrics). This was similarly delegated to faculty within each discipline. Granted, the faculty were initially not eager to add additional grading/assessing to their list of job duties, they did recognize the value of seeing personally how "their" students performed on the assessment instruments they developed using faculty designed rubrics. Furthermore, because faculty completed this grading task as a team, it stimulated conversations about how each faculty member can reinforce or improve student success on each learning goal, all of which helped faculty feel that the additional work was more significant and worthwhile.

Autonomy

Autonomy refers to the degree to which employees are empowered to use their own discretion in determining how to complete their work and, to some degree, the timing of completion as well. By having the capability to control how, as well as when, a job is completed; employees have a greater sense of empowerment, which results in an increase in their feelings of responsibility for job outcomes and an increase in motivation to be more meaningfully involved in their job (Oldham and Hackman, 2010). This theory is supported by a study of nurses where it was found that those who have a strong desire for

autonomy have more enriching jobs than those who do not, thus a different leadership approach is needed for the different desires for autonomy (Landeweerd and Boumans, 1994).

In the previous AOL process, there was little to no autonomy for general faculty because the locus of control was at the college committee level. The centrality of the authority was designed to provide structure and leadership to meet the immanent accreditation needs of the college while at the same time providing a limited means for faculty to be involved in the process. This limited involvement was hoped to generate a high-quality input from faculty; however, when the general faculty would participate in meetings where they had the capability to interject changes to improve student learning, most chose not to do so. This was partly because of their limited role and lack of being able to provide meaningful input to the process apart from college-wide meetings, just the opposite of the original intentions.

The construct of autonomy was one of the more significant changes in the new AOL process. The new design enhanced the autonomy of faculty in the AOL process by decoupling many of the tasks that were being done by the college-wide committee and instead empowering each DCT with the authority and responsibility to complete these tasks. These tasks involved nearly all aspects of the process development, implementation and evaluation. Furthermore, because each DCT is composed of faculty in a certain discipline, this increase in autonomy allowed these faculty to identify knowledge and skills that were most important for the students that had chosen to major in their field of study. Therefore, faculty members felt less constrained by "general college" knowledge and skills and now had a mechanism that encouraged them to tailor their assessment plans considering their majors/students.

The faculty were empowered through the autonomy of the new DCT structure in a number of areas throughout the AOL process. Two of these areas related to changes leading up to the assessing of students while two areas related to post-assessment changes. One major change leading up to the assessment of students was that the curriculum of each major was "audited" by their DCT rather than a college committee or administrator. Specifically, each DCT was given the task of evaluating their course offerings independently concerning how each course may/may not address any of the college's learning goals. Each DCT was entrusted to determine not only in which courses learning goals were covered, but also whether said coverage was adequate or whether additional measures needed to be taken. Another major change was that faculty were given the discretion to determine the types (e.g., case studies, spread sheet analysis, knowledge exams) and specific designs of instruments (e.g., selecting and writing the test questions, case studies, etc…) to be used to assess their majors and content areas for the college-wide assessments. Thus the faculty teaching the courses in each discipline were given the task of determining the most salient concepts that students should learn and devising the best mechanisms to gauge student retention of said concepts.

Significant post-assessment changes included enabling faculty to assess/grade student responses to the various instruments related to each learning goal. Thus the faculty, who are the most qualified (by discipline) and responsible for students attaining this specific knowledge, were given the autonomy to compare student responses to each learning goal rubric to determine their acceptability. Rather than have a committee or administration report to each discipline student results, the process was reversed by giving the faculty of each discipline the freedom to evaluate and determine how the college's students were retaining course content. Additionally, perhaps the most important task of an AOL process was delegated to the faculty by having each DCT responsible for the determination and implementation of corrective actions to improve student learning. Eschewing the "one size fits all" manner to "closing the loop" that is often mandated at the college-wide level, this process empowered faculty from each discipline to consider the best methods for increasing their students' performance. It is the authors' belief that these actions significantly increased the faculty's "stake in the game" and made them feel more directly responsible for student progress concerning assessment.

Feedback

As explained by Oldham and Hackman (2010), successful feedback provides employees with "direct and clear information about the effectiveness of his or her performance." Through feedback of their performance, employees obtain the critical element of feeling competent in their job, and this is why feedback is considered a strong predictor of motivation and performance (Deci, Koestner and Ryan, 1999). Feedback can also serve to motivate through its effect on employee job satisfaction and intentions to leave (Uruthirapathy and Grant 2015). Further, and perhaps most relevant to this article, feedback has been shown to have a positive impact in the motivation of employees to engage in knowledge sharing behaviors (Foss, Minbaeva, Pedersen and Reinholt, 2009). With the stated goal of increasing the level of faculty involvement and engagement, it would appear that providing feedback would spur more faculty interaction and knowledge sharing and would be critical in the redesign of an AOL process.

Under the previous AOL process, the college committee members became frustrated at the lack of involvement of their peers. The centralized committee structure required the least amount of effort from faculty, and, as a result, the expectation was that faculty would realize this benefit of the structure and provide meaningful input based on the feedback they received. However, just the opposite was experienced, and the quality of faculty input was severely lacking. This lead to frustration on the part of the college assessment committee because they were doing all of the work, from which they received no real reward, while their peers who were not on the committee were able to skirt any responsibility for the process and didn't encounter any negative effects for their lack of involvement. Additionally, faculty often quibbled about the validity of the results and spent much of college-wide meetings debating the appropriateness of the data collection instruments. Consequently, they paid little attention to the assessment results as a source of feedback. To help address this, participation in assessment activities are now included on the college's annual evaluation instrument, which serves to provide faculty with feedback regarding their performance. All faculty are now expected to contribute in some way toward AOL. The AOL data generated as a result of administering assessment instruments and accumulating student performance information provides the primary feedback mechanism for faculty to learn how the process is working and the extent of student learning.

By its nature, assessment should provide feedback to faculty about how they, and their students, are performing. Because of the new DCT structure and the redesign of the AOL processes, faculty receive results in a summarized college-wide form as well as a disaggregated by major form, which provides them greater detail and a perception of greater utility of results. The new process, though not perfect, improved faculty's respect for and understanding of the data. With all faculty an active member of their DCT, in which they created the instruments and graded/assessed the students' responses, all the faculty now see firsthand the performance of their students. Through these better feedback mechanisms, faculty have a more in-depth understanding of each discipline's performance in specific content areas. Armed with these detailed results, the faculty can identify areas of strength and weakness and design effective correction actions to target areas needing improvement.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Wanting to "practice what they preach" regarding increasing the motivation of faculty, the authors detailed and advocated the job characteristics model to serve as a basis for the job redesign of assurance of learning processes. Since many accreditation standards require increased levels of faculty involvement in AOL processes, the article detailed how each of the five major components of the JCM are linked to increased motivation and engagement. The authors then demonstrated how they successfully increased the engagement of their faculty at their institution with resulting higher levels of quality and involvement through the redesign of the AOL process. Specifically, the authors' use of discipline-based self-managed work teams (SMWT) was found to successfully implement the five major components of the job

characteristics model. Discipline-based teams motivated faculty by allowing them to focus on the issues of curriculum, assessment instruments, grading, and analyzing the results for those students who have chosen to major in their particular subject area. These discipline-based SMWT were found to contribute to each motivational component of the JCM. First, the newly designed SMWT increased the skill or task variety of the process by having faculty take responsibility for more activities related to their disciplines. Second, the faculty's view of the meaningfulness of work was elevated by having them participate in the entire assessment process. Third, by focusing their efforts on their discipline's students, the faculty found the results of their tasks to have greater significance. Fourth, given greater levels of autonomy for all aspects of the AOL process for their discipline greatly empowered the faculty to make decisions on how their students should best be assessed and for corrective actions to be implemented. Finally, the SMWT's provided multiple methods for faculty to receive detailed and meaningful assessment-related feedback on their students.

A limitation of this paper is that the motivational results found based on these activities at one institution may not be generalizable or appropriate for others. However, the authors would suggest that in order to increase faculty engagement in AOL, institutions redesign their processes based upon the JCM or other accepted theories of motivation. By replicating the use of SMWTs along with the elements of the JCM or other motivational theories, the authors hope that other institutions' faculty will report their results and suggestions for improving the motivation of their faculty in the AOL process.

REFERENCES

Aggarwal, P. and O'Brien, C. (2008) "Social Loafing on Group Projects: Structural Antecedents and Effect on Student Satisfaction," *Journal of Marketing Education*, vol. 30(3), p. 255-264.

Attaran, M. and Nguyen, T. (1999) "Succeeding with Self-Managed Work Teams," *Industrial Management*, (July-August) p. 24-28.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K. and Li, N. (2013) "The Theory of Purposeful Work Behavior: The Role of Personality, Higher-Order Goals, and Job Characteristics," Academy of Management Review, vol. 38(1), p. 132-153.

Casey, R. J. and Robbins, J. (2010) "The Hackman and Oldham Job Characteristics Model: Implications from Four Industries, *International Journal of Business and Public Administration,* vol. 7(2), p. 76-90.

Choge, P.J., Chepkiyeng, F. and Chelimo, K.K. (2014) "Effects of Task Identity on Employee Motivation: A Survey of Eldoret Polytechnic, Kenya," *European Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 6(33), p. 72-78.

Debnath, S.C., Tandon, S. and Pointer, L.V. (2007) "Designing Business School Courses to Promote Student Motivation: An Application of the Job Characteristics Model," *Journal of Management Education*, vol. 31(6), p. 812-831.

Deci, E.L., Koestner, R. and Ryan, R.M. (1999) "A Meta-Analytic Review of Experiments Examining the Effects of Extrinsic Rewards on Intrinsic Motivation," *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 125, p. 627-668.

Dodd, N.G. and Ganster, D.C. (1996) "The Interactive Effects of Variety, Autonomy, and Feedback on Attitudes and Performance," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 17, p. 329-347.

Earley, P. (1989) "Social Loafing and Collectivism: A Comparison of the United States and the People's Republic of China," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 34(4), p. 565-581.

Ford, R.N. (1969) *Motivation through work itself*, New York: American Management Association.
Foss, N.J., Minbaeva, D.B., Pedersen, T. and Reinholt, M. (2009) "Encouraging Knowledge Sharing Among Employees: How Job Design Matters," *Human Resource Management*, vol. 48(6), p. 871-893.

Fried, Y. and Ferris, G.R. (1987) "The Validity of the Job Characteristics Model. A review and Meta-Analysis," *Personnel Psychology*, vol. 40, p. 287-322.

Ghani, J.A. and Deshpande, S.P. (1994) "Task Characteristics and the Experience of Optimal Flow in Human-Computer Interaction," *The Journal of Psychology*, vol. 128(4), p. 381-391.

Glick, W.H., Jenkins, G.D., Jr. and Gupta, N. (1986) "Method Versus Substance: How Strong are Underlying Relationships between Job Characteristics and Attitudinal Outcomes?" *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 29, p. 441-464.

Grant, A. M. (2008) "The Significance of Task Significance: Job Performance Effects, Relational Mechanisms, and Boundary Conditions," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. *93*(1), p. 108-124.

Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. (1974) "The Job Diagnostic Survey: An Instrument for the Diagnosis of Jobs and the Evaluation of Job Redesign Projects," *Department of Administrative Sciences*: Yale University.

Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. R. (1975) "Development of Job Diagnostic Survey," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 60, p. 159-170.

Hackman, J. R. and Oldham, G. R. (1976) "Motivation through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory," *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, vol. 16, p. 250-279.

Harkins, S., Latane, B. and Williams, K. (1980) "Social Loafing: Allocating Effort for Taking it Easy," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 16, p. 457-465.

Hogan, E.A. and Martell, D.A. (1987) "A Confirmatory Structural Equations Analysis of the Job Characteristics Model," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 39, p. 242-263.

Humphrey, S.E., Nahrgang, J.D. and Morgeson, F. P. (2007) "Integrating Motivational, Social, and Contextual Work Design Features: A Meta-Analytic Summary and Theoretical Extension of the Work Design Literature," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 92, p. 1332-1356.

Johns, G., Xie, J.L. and Fang, Y. (1992) "Mediating and Moderating Effects in Job Design," *Journal of Management*, vol. 18, p. 657-676.

Landeweerd, J.A. and Boumans, N.P.G. (1994) "The Effect of Work Dimensions and Need for Autonomy on Nurses' Work Satisfaction and Health," *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 67, p. 207-217.

Latane, B., Williams, K. and Harkins, S. (1979) "Many Hands Make Light the Work: The Causes and Consequences of Social Loafing," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 37(6), p. 822-832.

Lawler, E.E., III. (1973) *Motivation in work organizations*. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole.
Lee-Ross, D. (1998) "A Practical Theory of Motivation Applied to Hotels," *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, vol. 10(2), p. 68-74.

Lee-Ross, D. (2002) "An Exploratory Study of Work Motivation among Private and Public Sector Hospital Chefs in Australia," *Journal of Management Development*, vol. 21(7/8), p. 576-588.

Leonard, N.H., Beauvais, L.L. and Scholl, R.W. (1999) "Work Motivation: The Incorporation of Self-Concept Based Processes," *Human Relations*, vol. 52, p. 969-998.

Loher, B.T., Noe, R.A., Moeller, N.L. and Fitzgerald, M.P. (1985) "A Meta-Analysis of the Relation of Job Characteristics to Job Satisfaction," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 70, p. 280-289.

Maloney, W.F. and McFillen, J.M. (1995) "Job Characteristics: Union-Nonunion Differences," *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management,* vol. 121(1), p. 43-54.

Maher, J.B. (1971) *New perspectives in job enrichments,* New York: Van Nostrad Reinhold.
Myers, M. S. (1970) *Every employee a manager,* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Morgeson, F.P. and Humphrey, S.E. (2006) "The Work Design Questionnaire (WDQ): Developing and Validating a Comprehensive Measure for Assessing Job Design and the Nature of Work," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 91, p. 1321-1339.

Oldham, G. R. and Hackman, J. R. (2010) "Not What It Was and Not What It Will Be: The Future of Job Design Research," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol. 31, p. 463–479.

Orbell, J. and Dawes, R. (1981) "Social Dilemmas," In G. Stephenson & J.H. Davis (Eds.), *Progress in Applied Social Psychology,* Chichester, England: Wiley.

Purinton, E.F. and Alexander, E.R. (2013) "Obtaining Faculty Motivation and "Buy In" to a Major Program Change: A Case Study in Assessment," *Business Education Innovation Journal*, vol. 5(1), p. 53-57.

Robbins, S.P. (1998) *Organizational Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ryan, R. and Deci, E. (2000) "Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being," *American Psychologist*, vol. 55, p. 68-78.

Schultz, D. and Schultz, S.E. (1998) *Psychology and Work Today*, Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Shantz, A., Alfes, K., Truss, C. and Soane, E. (2013) "The Role of Employee Engagement in the Relationship between Job Design and Task Performance, Citizenship and Deviant Behaviours," *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 24(13), p. 2608-2627.

Treville, S.D. and Antonakis, J. (2006) "Could Lean Production Job Design Be Intrinsically Motivating? Contextual, Configurationally, and Level-of-Analysis Issues," *Journal of Operations Management*, vol. 242(2), p. 99-123.

Uruthirapathy, A. A. and Grant, G. G. (2015) "The Influence of Job Characteristics on IT and Non-IT Job Professionals' Turnover Intentions," *Journal of Management Development*, vol. 34(6), p. 715-728.

Vroom, V., (1964) *Work and Motivation*, New York, Wiley.

Wrzesniewski, A. and Dutton, J.E. (2001) "Crafting a Job: Revisioning Employees as Active Crafters of Their Work," *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 26(2), p. 179-201.

BIOGRAPHY

Dr. André L. Honorée is an Associate Professor of Management at Southeastern Louisiana University. Dr. Honorée is the Director of both the MBA Program and the College of Business' Assurance of Learning Initiative regarding accreditation agency compliance. Over the last twenty years he has taught a variety of undergraduate business courses and the capstone course in the MBA and Executive MBA programs. He has published in a diverse set of journals with his primary research interests including employment law and compensation issues. André received his Ph.D. from the University of Mississippi and was a Business Division faculty member previously at Spring Hill College. Dr. Honorée may be contacted at ahonoree@selu.edu.

Dr. Harold E. Davis is an Associate Professor of Accounting in the College of Business at Southeastern Louisiana University, United States. Dr. Davis' early career was as an auditor and later as a systems analyst and programmer. In his academic career, he has taught a variety of undergraduate business courses as well as a graduate level accounting information systems course. Dr. Davis seeks to leverage changes in technology to benefit teaching and learning in his courses and has research interests in the impacts of technology on business processes and accounting. Dr. Davis has been with Southeastern Louisiana University for 14 years, and may be contacted at Harold.Davis@Southeastern.edu.

Dr. Tará Burnthorne Lopez is an Associate Professor of Marketing at Southeastern Louisiana University. She has published in the Journal of Business Research, Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, the Journal of Marketing Education, and the Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, among others, and has presented papers at many international, national, and regional conferences. Her primary research interests are marketing education and the role of professional selling in marketing strategy. Dr. Lopez completed her doctoral work at Louisiana Tech University and has also held positions at the University of Southern Mississippi and Mississippi College. Dr. Lopez may be contacted at Tara.Lopez@selu.edu.