THE INTERSECTION OF JOB SATISFACTION, JOB DISSATISFACTION, AND

MOTIVATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGNERS IN ONLINE HIGHER

EDUCATION: A TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

by

Laura E. Dykstra

Liberty University

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Liberty University

2020

THE INTERSECTION OF JOB SATISFACTION, JOB DISSATISFACTION, AND

MOTIVATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL DESIGNERS IN ONLINE HIGHER

EDUCATION: A TRANSCENDENTAL PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

by Laura E. Dykstra

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA

2020

APPROVED BY:

Dr. Chris Bellamy, D.B.A., Committee Chair

Dr. Russ Yocum, Ed.D., Committee Member/Research Methodologist

ABSTRACT

Online education has become a significant part of the strategic growth and health of institutions of higher education (HEIs) today. Instructional designers support the strategic mission of the HEI, and while research to date has looked extensively at the role of the instructional designer in higher education, no research has looked at the experience of the instructional designer focusing specifically on the feelings and intersection of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. The purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study is to understand the experiences related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation for instructional designers working in online higher education. The theoretical framework for this study is Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. The central research question is what experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation? Participants were instructional designers working in online higher education, and data collection included interviews and screen-captured videos of instructional resources created by instructional designers. Data analysis followed the recommended format outlined for transcendental phenomenology. Findings indicated that job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation were related to their work, the relationships they developed, the institutional context, and their individual values and motivation. Although instructional designers generally expressed motivation to do quality work regardless of levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, they also expressed greater levels of organizational engagement with greater job satisfaction. This area would benefit from further research in the role and satisfaction of instructional designers considering current events related to the transition to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as specific research in job satisfaction related to the organizational structure of the instructional design team.

Dedication

"Other things may change us, but we start and end with the family." – Anthony Brandt

I dedicate this to four different generations, each of which has shaped and molded me.

First, to my grandparents. Grandma Sue and Grandpa Herman, who never saw me begin, but who I know would be proud of what I have accomplished. Grandma Annie, who I lost along the way, but I know was proud of me. Finally, my Grandpa Jim, who is still alive and has been my cheerleader all along the way. This would not have been possible without his help and support.

To my parents, who prayed for me, let me cry on their couch, would show up with hugs and dinner, and I know on more than one occasion thought I was overreacting but supported me anyway. Thank you for teaching me to love learning.

To my brother, Will, and sister-in-law, Chelsea, who have shown their love and support in various ways, from meals to phone calls to random visits and hugs.

Finally, to my nephews, Ben, Charlie, and Henry, who I know thought it was ridiculous that I am a grown up and still had homework. Your smiles and laughter brightened up my days and reminded me that there was a life beyond this research. I love you all.

Acknowledgments

Words cannot begin to express how thankful I am for the various people who have spoken into my life along this journey, helping me be better, do better, and achieve this huge milestone. First and foremost, I am thankful to my Lord and Savior for making this possible. This process has tested and strengthened my faith in ways I could not have imagined. I also want to acknowledge my friends and faculty at Liberty University. Thank you for your encouragement, for the laughter, camaraderie, and wise counsel. My chair, Dr. Bellamy, and research consultant, Dr. Yocum, as well as Dr. Milacci, Dr. Zabloski, and Dr. Sweazy, have all spoken into this research and dissertation at various stages. I appreciated your support and honest feedback, and your dedication to helping me develop something that I can be proud of.

I want to thank my participants. Thank you for being honest with me, for sharing the things you love about your work and the things that you wish were different. Thank you for taking time out of your busy schedules to allow me to more fully share the story of instructional designers in higher education.

Finally, to my friends and family and colleagues, both past and present. Your prayers have carried me through. The phone calls, text messages, and cards lit up challenging times. There is not enough room to name everyone who has spoken into my journey, but you know who you are. To my friends and colleagues at CCU, who helped me begin this journey, and my friends at Valor, who have helped me finish strong. Thank you.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

CMC – Computer Mediated Communication

CQ – Central Research Question

ERG – Existence, Relatedness, and Growth. Alderfer's (1969) theory of human motivation.

HEI – Higher Education Institution

IBSTPI – International Board of Standards for Training, Performance and Instruction.

ID – Instructional Designer

LMS – Learning Management System

OPM – Online Program Manager

SQ – Sub-question

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Overview

Higher education is in a period of flux. According to Seaman, Allen, and Seaman (2018), since 2012 overall enrollment in institutions of higher education (HEIs) decreased, and yet in that time enrollment in online programs made modest increases. Seeking the convenience of online learning, students are deciding to supplement or move their entire educational experience online. Online learning has also become an alternative way to deliver education to students who are unable to be on campus in a face-to-face environment. The implications for most HEIs are clear; they must adapt to these trends, recognize the strategic value and important of online learning, and be able offer well-designed, engaging online courses that meet the needs of a new generation of student. Increasingly, institutions need to consider ways to increase enrollment and access to their courses or potentially shut their doors; some have turned to online learning as a way to supplement waning enrollment (Zemsky, Shaman, & Baldridge, 2020). Technology, specifically computer-mediated or online learning, has significantly impacted education, and as noted by Beaudoin (2016), "Arguably internet-supported teaching and learning are the most important innovation in education since the printing press" (p. 11). Establishing an infrastructure for a strong online program is important, and one of the key players in that infrastructure is the instructional designer (Petrovic-Dzerdz & Trépanier, 2018). Although literature has begun to emerge on the instructional designer in higher education, there are still areas to be explored regarding the role and experiences of instructional designers in online higher education, especially as it is related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation.

Chapter 1 offers a background to the study by providing additional insight regarding the current status of higher education, particularly as it relates to the expansion of online learning in

the past two decades and the subsequent adjustments that have been made by HEIs to ensure that they remain relevant and viable, as well as the historical roots in distance and correspondence education. Further, the background provides a rationale for the study rooted in the importance of instructional designers in online higher education for improving the learning experience, student engagement, and student learning, as well as meeting an increasing need for strong online education. Following a consideration of the role of the instructional designer in online higher education, Chapter 1 also discusses the importance of understanding the factors related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation from an organizational as well as academic perspective, and the specific importance to higher education. This chapter contains (a) the background to the problem, (b) the situation to self, (c) the problem statement, (d) the purpose statement, (e) the significance of the study, (f) the research questions, and (g) definitions. The study is a transcendental phenomenology and is conducted by a researcher who spent over 13 years working as or with instructional designers in online adult higher education. The theoretical framework draws on Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959/1993) and addresses a gap in the research regarding the experiences of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation of instructional designers in online higher education.

Background

In the first two decades of the 21st century, online learning has revolutionized higher education and become an integral part of the strategic plans of most HEIs, from the community college to the Ivy League (Allen, Seaman, Poulin, & Straut, 2016; Beaudoin, 2015, 2016; Costley, Hughes, & Lange, 2017; Mbuva, 2014; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017; Zemsky et al., 2020). Remote or distance offerings of college courses have become more mainstream or a more viable option to continue education and learning in the wake of events that prevent students from being

on campus (Bao, 2020; Lorenzo, 2008). While some faculty teaching at these HEIs have been able to transition to teaching partially or fully online, others have struggled to make the pedagogical switch to online learning methodologies. This struggle to transition to online learning is a costly issue for the HEI in terms of the financial output for training and hiring staff, as well as investment in infrastructure and tools that may or may not be fully utilized by the faculty members. The potential loss of students becomes more problematic as students may opt to attend an institution that meets their needs in terms of new learning methodologies and a more convenient experience. Further, there have been situations such as natural disasters or pandemics in which institutions have had to shift to emergency remote learning to finish out an academic year. This shift in delivery also requires a shift in pedagogy (Hodges, Moore, Lockee, Trust, & Bond, 2020). Costley et al. (2017) note that it is important to comprehend the differences between the online learning and face-to-face pedagogy, as this understanding has a direct impact on the student experience, engagement, and learning. As education becomes commodified, HEIs have looked for additional opportunities to attract and retain students, from the traditional, face-to-face classroom to the online competency-based course. Research has been conducted that looks at student learning in the online course (Frantzen, 2014; Lambert & Fisher, 2013; Mansureh, Angie, & Lilia, 2017; Mbuva, 2014; Wu, 2016), and findings suggest that online learning, when designed well with the learner in mind, can be just as effective as the traditional face-to-face format for delivering instruction (Burke, Clapper, & McRae, 2016; Costley et al., 2017; Ke & Kwak, 2013; Krämer, Neugebauer, Magenheim, & Huppertz, 2015; Rowland & DiVasto, 2013). The following sections more deeply examine the historical and social context of online learning and instructional design, as well as the theoretical context for understanding job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation.

Historical Context

Although online learning has emerged most prominently in the first two decades of the 21st century, the idea of delivering instruction to the learner through distance or distributed means has existed much longer. As early as the mid-19th century, distance education became a way of providing education for those who were unable, for various social or personal reasons, to attend formal educational institutions (Caruth & Caruth, 2013; Pittman, 2012; Simonson, Smaldino, & Zvacek, 2014). The earliest forms of distance education were independent, correspondence-based courses, allowing the learner to work at their own pace within the confines of a certain period of time or the content itself, and though the courses still required some design of instruction, the focus was on the asynchronous relationship between the teacher, the learner, and the content (Bergmann, 2001).

Later forms of distance education, such as The Society to Encourage Studies at Home, which was an early correspondence program focused on women, moved away from more informal approaches to more formal university extensions (Caruth & Caruth, 2013). The university extension was the first major movement toward formalizing distance education. Though there was still a prevailing belief that it was not academic, distance education afforded learners the opportunity to expand knowledge and understanding and benefit the institution. The definition of distance education was comprised of four main ideas: the education was institutionally-based, the student and the teacher were separated by distance in some way, there were telecommunication systems in place to facilitate the learning, and there was some kind of established interaction between the learner, the teacher, and the content (Simonson et al., 2014).

Initially considered correspondence courses because the instruction and interaction occurred solely through asynchronous forms of communication such as letter writing and mailed

instructional materials (Caruth & Caruth, 2013), as technology expanded, so did the delivery of instructional materials using video tapes, CDs, DVDs, and other audiovisual resources (Seaman et al., 2018; Simonson et al., 2014). Distance education began to change with the technology. According to Harasim (2000), the emergence of fully online classes in the 1980s brought about a new paradigm of learning that established additional modes of learning and delivery, improved opportunities to participate in further learning, and improvements in the quality of learning. Online learning became a prominent alternative to the traditional college classroom, though the intended audience until the past five years has been the non-traditional adult student. However, as noted by Seaman et al. (2018), as of Fall 2016, 31.6% of all higher education enrollment was for online distance education courses, up from 25.9% in 2012. In the spring of 2020, an even more drastic shift took place as many institutions shifted completely to remote distance learning following the COVID-19 pandemic (Bessette, 2020).

The progression and growth of distance education is important to understand considering changes to the classroom in higher education. Although the primary target for distance education was, and in many ways still is, the adult non-traditional student (Simonson et al., 2014), Seaman et al. (2018) have found that students who may have chosen the more traditional face-to-face classes are now also opting for an online education. As Simonson et al. (2014) noted, "Distance education provides the opportunity to widen intellectual horizons, as well as the chance to improve and update professional knowledge. Further, it stresses individuality of learning and flexibility in both the time and place of study" (p. 38). Distance education has transitioned from low-tech correspondence courses to high tech, multimedia rich online courses, and the transition in pedagogy requires a new set of skills from students and faculty alike (Bonnici, Maatta, Klose, Julien, & Bajjaly, 2016; Costley et al., 2017; Harasim, 2000; Mansureh et al., 2017). Most

significantly, learning must be designed and structured differently, specific to online learning

pedagogies (Eaton, Brown, Schroeder, Lock, & Jacobsen, 2017). Schools have begun to use

online learning to deliver competency-based classes. Many of these course deliveries require

expertise in design and delivery. Finally, it is important to note that distance or remote learning is

increasingly a viable alternative for institutions in the event that face-to-face learning is not

possible. Thus, the intersection of instructional systems design, or instructional design, with

online higher education occurs.

Historically, instructional design became prominent during World War II and after,

beginning with military training during World War II and moving into the field of education

(Sharif & Cho, 2015). Prominent educational theorists such as Skinner, Mager, Bloom, and

Gagné built upon instructional theory in the design and application of key principles in

instructional objectives, content, and assessment, linking these concepts to the design of learning

experiences (Reiser, 2001). In the 1970s, instructional design as a field made significant

advances. As additional design processes emerged, instructional design became an academic

field of study and a source of solving instructional problems. In the 1980s, computers began to

be used more widely, and with that surge, training and the use of instructional design to design

training and instruction also became more prominent. Technological advances naturally led to

new ways of approaching teaching and learning (Sharif & Cho, 2015). With new approaches,

instructional design education shifted, and continues to shift, to meet new methods of teaching

and learning (Petrovic-Dzerdz & Trépanier, 2018; Yanchar, 2016; Yanchar & Hawkley, 2015).

Though in many ways online and distance education is still marginalized in higher education and

considered less academic than traditional education, the design of online instruction and delivery

is of utmost concern to the HEIs (Shearer, 2012).

Social Context

In today's academic environment, most HEIs must adjust how they function to remain viable (Allen & Seaman, 2015; Beaudoin, 2015; McCaffery, 2010; Seaman et al., 2018; Zemsky et al., 2020). HEIs have increasingly moved toward business models in the hope of remaining financially viable, and in doing so, are adopting certain practices to financially support the efforts of the university (McCaffery, 2010). These efforts include increasing online offerings, which requires additional administrative support at various levels within the university. Beaudoin (2015) noted that online learning in higher education requires a specific skill set and understanding of the changing landscape of higher education. He stated:

> In the digital age, higher education, willingly or unwillingly, is experiencing relatively dramatic changes, which are inherently disruptive, especially because change presents unfamiliar alternatives to the long-established status quo… Institutions that resist innovative opportunities do so at their own peril, as their peers transform themselves to meet new demands. (Beaudoin, 2015, p. 34)

Beaudoin's point is well-taken, and progressively HEIs have claimed that online learning is an important part of the strategic plan of the institution. Between Fall 2002 and Fall 2014, there was a 20% jump in the increase of HEIs that claimed online learning plays a role in the long-term strategy of the institution (Allen & Seaman, 2015). While online learning first became prominent through the work of for-profit institutions, it has entered the mainstream and is now increasingly a part of the strategic plans for non-profit and more traditional HEIs. As this transition has taken place, online for-profit institutions have seen decreasing enrollment while the enrollment of students online in private and public not-for-profit institutions has seen modest, uneven, growth (Allen & Seaman, 2017).

The increase in online learning in HEIs today leads to a fuller understanding of what the institution needs to ensure its academic success. Institutions often, though not always, will opt to adopt a more centralized administrative model, including a single administrator for the learning management system (LMS), a separate student enrollment and marketing department, online best practices training for faculty, and standard formats for online courses (Tannehill, Serapiglia, & Guiler, 2018). It is not enough to just offer online classes; the quality of the course design is increasingly important in establishing a reputation for high-quality education and that is frequently done through a team (Ashbaugh, 2013; Drysdale, 2018; Lenert & Janes, 2017; McCombs, 2015; Shearer, 2012). No longer bound by walls, the growth of online education has changed higher education for many types of students.

As HEIs come under additional scrutiny socially and politically, there is a greater urgency to attract and retain quality staff that can prepare students to take an active role in society (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011). In addition to technological infrastructures and better resources to increase the effectiveness of online learning, HEIs are increasingly relying on instructional designers who are trained or have engaged in extensive professional development in effective practice in online learning, student-and user-centered design, and best practices in general pedagogy (Bawa & Watson, 2017; Brigance, 2011). The effective design of instruction is one of the most important elements in online learning and has been linked in the research to student learning and engagement (Baldwin, Yu-Hui, & Friesen, 2018). Although instructors are often recruited to design online courses, a body of research suggests that instructional designers provide much needed support, and instructional designers can be seen as leaders that guide the university toward increased understandings of technological innovation through supporting online learning, training faculty, and introducing more innovative practices in online classes

(Ashbaugh, 2013; Houareau, 2017; Kumar & Ritzhaupt, 2017; Ritzhaupt & Kumar, 2015).

As instructional designers take their place in the university, questions emerge regarding how they function within the organization. Current research discusses the challenges that instructional designers face with ambiguous job descriptions, responsibilities beyond pure instructional design, and pressure from other stakeholders in the design of online classes (Bawa & Watson, 2017; Bongers, 2017; Campbell, Schwier, & Kenny, 2009; Intentional Futures, 2016; Kumar & Ritzhaupt, 2017). Research in job satisfaction in online higher education should extend to instructional designers to ensure that the university is able to meet the needs of its online learners and create an environment that fosters innovation and student learning.

Theoretical Context

From a theoretical perspective, job satisfaction is an increasingly important focus of study as it applies to how employees engage within their organization, their quality of work, and their motivation (Ayim & Mohammad, 2015; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015; Quinn & Thorne, 2014). Studies have been conducted looking at the job satisfaction of academic and non-academic staff, but none have looked specifically at the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the instructional designer in online higher education (Alghamdi, 2017; Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016; Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Felder, 2018; Hill, 2014; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016; Rich, 2015; Stankovska, Angelkoska, Osmani, & Grncarovska, 2017; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016). Motivation-hygiene theory (Alghamdi, 2017; Hill, 2014), leadership theories (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016), intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016; Stankovska et al., 2017), and even service-profit chain theory and social exchange theory (Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016) have been used to frame job satisfaction in HEIs. Job satisfaction as a theoretical concept is an important element of organizational health,

employee retention, and thus organizational effectiveness. Further, job satisfaction among academic and non-academic staff plays a crucial role in "contributing to positive outcomes in the quality of the institutions and the students' learning" (Stankovska et al., 2017, p. 159), and Machado-Taylor et al. (2016), in noting misconceptions about job satisfaction, stated, "Serious research, however, has revealed that the concept of job satisfaction is a complex collection of variables that interact in myriad ways" (p. 542).

Theories of job satisfaction are addressed in more depth in Chapter 2, but it is important to establish a theoretical awareness of the nature of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation to understand the complexities of the nature of work and motivation in an organization, whether academic or professional. Herzberg's theory has been used in several studies to determine factors of job satisfaction, and thus motivation, for academic staff in higher education (Khanna, 2017; Rich, 2015; Smerek & Peterson, 2007), and it provides a viable framework for the research conducted. However, it is important to note many of the studies that utilize Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory as a theoretical framework attempt to measure job satisfaction on a single scale of job satisfaction to dissatisfaction, which has an impact on how the results are reported. As this study utilizes factors of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, there will be an attempt made to gauge the entire scope of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation in instructional designers in online higher education.

Situation to Self

I have spent most of my professional career in adult online higher education. My work at a university began during the boom of online learning, and the university had leaders wise enough to recognize the necessity of investing in an online presence. During my tenure at the institution, the adult and non-traditional school moved from an accelerated face-to-face school to

offering predominantly online courses, which necessitated the hiring of instructional designers, instructional technologists, and media specialists as a response to the changing nature of learning in higher education, and the adult-centered online curriculum provided a unique set of challenges. I have lived the experiences discussed by Allen and Seaman (2015), Beaudoin (2015), and McCaffery (2010) regarding the ever-changing nature of higher education.

As I supervised and engaged with a team of instructional designers and instructional technologists, I noticed two trends. The first was an increased quality of work and desire to innovate among instructional designers who appeared satisfied with their jobs, and who remained working on the team and at the university. They understood the unique needs of the students and how to design innovative classes within the framework established by the university. Conversely, instructional designers who disagreed with the strategic direction of the institution and were dissatisfied incurred cost not only in resources for hiring and retraining when they left but also in time and innovation. They were often unwilling to problem-solve or seek solutions to instructional problems. I witnessed first-hand the relationship between job satisfaction, employee retention, and innovation in student learning.

The seeds for this study were planted as I considered looking at the experience of the instructional designer in higher education. A faculty member at another university which also relied on instructional designers noticed growing frustration among both faculty and instructional designers as the design responsibilities for both were changing. Looking to the future, the motivation for conducting this study is tied to my belief that it is increasingly important to understand how to retain and support instructional designers as HEIs seek to solidify their position of offering high-quality online education. The events of Spring 2020 related to the COVID-19 pandemic further emphasized the need for instructional designers who can help

institutions navigate the best practices of online learning. Most faculty are content experts, and instructional designers can come alongside the content experts to assist in the design of meaningful instruction for students. As instructional design can be a small world, I was familiar with and had worked with several of the instructional designers who participated in my research, though not in their current capacity at their institution, and I do not have any authority over any of the participants in the study.

I approached this study with certain philosophical assumptions. From an ontological perspective, I concur with Creswell's (2013) position that qualitative research requires a belief that multiple realities exists and it is the role of the researcher to help reveal each of these realities, especially when conducting phenomenological research. This is also why I chose to conduct a phenomenological study. Job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation are directly tied to the lived experiences of the instructional designer, and the role of phenomenology is to portray the lived experiences and realities of the participants in the study (Moustakas, 1994).

My ontological approach directly affects my epistemological understanding, specifically, that if multiple realities exist, knowledge and understanding is based upon the context and experience of the knower. Lincoln and Guba (2013) noted that knowledge from a constructivist perspective is "mediated by the knower's prior experience and knowledge, by political and social status, by race, class, sexual orientation, nationality, by personal and cultural values, and by the knower's interpretation (construction) of the contextual surround" (p. 40). Although as a Christian I believe in the existence of objective Truth, I also believe that lived experiences lead to an understanding of the world around us. As I studied the experiences of instructional designers, I understood that their experiences contribute to their construction of their understanding of reality and hence their feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction in their work.

Therefore, I embraced a constructivist epistemological assumption in conducting this research, relying on empirical observations based on interviews and different narrative analyses, and ultimately allowing my participants to express their own perceptions and experiences, which they used to construct their reality.

Finally, axiologically, I acknowledge my own biases and values that influence my desire to conduct this research. Hiles (n.d.) noted that the inclusion of axiology and an understanding of one's values is necessary to conduct ethical qualitative research. To that end, I believe that instructional designers play an important role in the HEI, and that institutions need to be aware of the important role they play in the development and maintenance of quality online courses as well as the implementation of new technologies in the online classroom. Further, my previous role as a middle manager impacts those values and beliefs about the importance of understanding what employees need and communicating those needs to the organization. My Christian worldview also impacts the values I brought to the research process insofar as how I conducted research and ethically reported my findings.

In light of what has been articulated, this research is approached from a social constructivist interpretive framework (Creswell, 2013). Instructional design is inherently a practice that requires social interaction, and that interaction directly impacts many of the feelings and attitudes that instructional designers have about their job and work environment (Bawa & Watson, 2017; Pan, Deets, Phillips, & Cornell, 2003). In light of the theoretical framework, social constructivism becomes even more relevant as some of the critiques of Herzberg's theory posit that factors that contribute to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction may vary between participants (employees) and therefore are dependent upon the experience of the participant (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; House & Wigdor, 1967). Even Herzberg (1966) addressed

variations in feelings about motivation and hygiene, noting that what may be motivating for one person may not serve the same purpose in another. To give participants the clearest voice, I focused upon the constructed reality of each participant as they experience feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation.

Problem Statement

According to Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), one of the main ideas explored in light of attitudes about jobs and the desire to learn what motivates employees is the basic question, "What does a worker want from his job?" (p. 6). The problem is that literature surrounding instructional designers in higher education often looks at the work that instructional designers do without considering the causes of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and its impact on motivation. Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction play a significant role in the engagement of the employee in their work (Yalabik, Rayton, & Rapti, 2017). Ayim and Mohammad (2015) and Quinn and Thorne (2014) suggest that there is a correlation between job satisfaction and organizational engagement that contributes to the overall effectiveness of an organization (Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015).

The focus of job satisfaction in higher education is not a new area of study; the heavy reliance on academic staff as the holders of societal and cultural knowledge, as well as the trainers of new generations, makes it an important area of focus (Smerek & Peterson, 2007; Stankovska et al., 2017). However, there are fewer studies that look at job satisfaction in non-faculty, or non-academic staff, in higher education. As the HEI begins to function more like a business, these non-academic employees also make a significant contribution to the HEI and the student experience (Sebalj, Holbrook, & Bourke, 2012).

It is well-supported in existing literature that instructional designers in higher education can improve student experience and engagement and thus positively impact student learning (Intentional Futures, 2016; Kumar & Ritzhaupt, 2017; Ritzhaupt & Kumar, 2015; Rubley, 2016). Further, research in job satisfaction shows that high job satisfaction leads to increased output (Biswas & Mazumder, 2017). However, the literature also reveals disconnect between the perceived value of the instructional designer by their colleagues, and the instructional designer's feelings of being valued within the institution (Bawa & Watson, 2017; Bongers, 2017; Halupa, 2019; Honebein & Honebein, 2015; Intentional Futures, 2016; Rubley, 2016). To maintain a competitive edge, it is important for the institution to understand the factors that contribute to job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and job motivation in their instructional designers, as job satisfaction is tied to positive organizational behavior, creativity, and organizational citizenship, which, in this case, could apply to the design of innovative and effective online courses (Basit & Arshad, 2016; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015).

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study is to describe the experiences and factors related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation for instructional designers working in online programs in not-for-profit higher education institutions. At this stage in the research, job satisfaction is generally understood as "how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs" (Spector, 1997, p. 2) and more specifically defined by Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory in terms of job satisfaction, or periods when an employee "feels good about their job," and job dissatisfaction, or when an employee "feels bad about their job" (Herzberg et al., 1959; 1993, p. 20). Motivation is considered in light of the "effects" of the feelings or attitude about the job (Herzberg et al., 1959; 1993, p. 16). The theory guiding this

study is Herzberg's motivation-hygiene or dual-factor theory of job satisfaction as it provides insight into the factors that affect both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and thus impact motivation in an organizational environment (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993).

motivation-hygiene theory suggests that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction exist on separate but parallel continuums of high to no satisfaction or high to no dissatisfaction and are related to either intrinsic factors, labeled motivators, or extrinsic factors, labeled hygiene (Herzberg, 1982; Herzberg et al., 1959/1993). Motivators are related to the actual work being done while hygiene factors are related to the work environment. Foundational to Herzeberg's theory is the belief that humans continue to seek opportunities for psychological growth (Herzberg, 1966). Therefore, motivating factors are those which foster psychological growth and lead to a greater sense of self-actualization, where employees have the opportunity to use and grow their abilities (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg et al., 1959/1993). Hygiene factors are those which lead to the overall health of an organization and may cause dissatisfaction. They are considered hygiene because they do not necessarily foster growth but are necessary to maintain a certain level of comfort or organizational health.

Motivating factors such as recognition, development, or responsibility can cause high job satisfaction, while hygiene factors such as salary and company policy can prevent job dissatisfaction but cannot inherently increase satisfaction unless employees perceive those factors in terms of motivators. For example, salary is considered a hygiene factor unless an employee sees it as representative of how they are valued by the institution; then it also becomes a motivating factor. Job satisfaction is directly related to motivation; resolving issues related to hygiene factors may reduce job dissatisfaction but may not directly impact motivation if the

appropriate satisfiers or motivators are not in place (Herzberg, 1974; Herzberg et al., 1959/1993; Sachau, 2007).

Significance of the Study

This study makes contributions to the currently existing empirical, theoretical, and practical understanding of the topics at hand. Empirically, it offers additional insight to a growing body of knowledge on the instructional designer's role and experience in higher education. This study looks not just at the instructional designer's experience but at how it affects their general motivation and the context for those feelings. While several researchers have studied the role and experience of the instructional designer in higher education (Ashbaugh, 2013; Bawa & Watson, 2017; Campbell et al., 2009; Drysdale, 2018; Halupa, 2019; Houareau, 2017; Kumar & Ritzhaupt, 2017; Ritzhaupt & Kumar, 2015; Sugar & Moore, 2015), little research has been done to date looking at job satisfaction, which has become an increasingly important area of research among academic and non-academic staff in higher education. Job satisfaction in higher education is directly tied to organizational commitment, which can ultimately be linked directly with course design and student satisfaction (Basit & Arshad, 2016; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016).

This study also contributes more depth to existing literature on job satisfaction and motivation in higher education, which to this point has focused primarily on both academic and non-academic, or support, staff, but has not specifically addressed the instructional designer (Alonderiene & Majauskaite, 2016; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016). These findings may be significant to leaders in higher education, human resource professionals, and academic practitioners working in online higher education as

they seek to continue to look for ways to improve student learning, faculty training and engagement with online learning, and organizational health.

From a theoretical perspective, Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory has been used in several studies looking at job satisfaction in higher education (Hill, 2014; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Rich, 2015). It is not without critics, many of whom consider it too general (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; House & Wigdor, 1967; Sachau, 2007). Nonetheless, these studies contribute to the body of theoretical knowledge and understanding of the motivation-hygiene theory as applied specifically in higher education, and it expands the understanding of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. The original research conducted by Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman was mixed methods and in a professional business setting (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993). Subsequent research that used the motivation-hygiene theory has frequently been quantitative in nature and only looked at job satisfaction on a single scale.

This study contributes to a deeper qualitative understanding of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. This study is beneficial to practitioners who understand the general parameters of the motivation-hygiene theory but seek a deeper qualitative understanding of those factors, specifically the motivating factors. Further, faculty, curriculum directors, and academic leaders who work in online higher education with instructional designers may also find the results informative as this study provides additional theoretical information surrounding the experience of instructional designers in online higher education.

Finally, at a practical level, job satisfaction is an integral part of employee motivation, engagement, and organizational effectiveness, and both job dissatisfaction and low motivation, as well as employee turnover, is costly for the organization (Herzberg, 1974; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015; Stankovska et al., 2017; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016). HEIs need to consider

the cost of dissatisfied and unmotivated instructional designers in light of the strategic direction of the university to produce effective and innovative online courses. Investment in resources that contribute to job satisfaction is also an important practical consideration; as the motivation-hygiene theory has shown, there are factors beyond salary that contribute to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and working conditions and resources are additional factors (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993).

Further, according to Herzberg's theory, intrinsic factors such as recognition and opportunities for growth are generally associated with job satisfaction, while factors related to dissatisfaction are generally external and related to the job environment (Herzberg et al., 1993). Understanding satisfying and dissatisfying factors practically, in light of the health of the organization, may reveal significant areas for growth and improvement within the institution and help ensure that instructional designers are motivated to persist in their roles, continue to effectively design online classes, foster innovation in higher education, and provide support to faculty in the design and development of online classes. The research should also benefit practitioners, human resource staff, leaders, and middle managers working in higher education who are considering ways to continue to offer high quality online education and recognize the empirically supported connection between job satisfaction and work output, and the necessity of ensuring that staff feel cared for and satisfied with their work.

Research Questions

Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory is based in the theories of motivation, working from the basic assumption that the goal of all human motivation is to minimize pain and maximize pleasure (Herzberg, 1966). However, complexities arise in how motivation is applied in a professional setting; motivation and motivating factors manifest differently based on

profession, responsibilities, and even one's personal life. Instructional designers in online higher education straddle both an academic world and a professional world, which requires that they are able to make instructional decisions but also provide leadership and support to faculty who are working directly with students. Further research is needed to understand the context of job satisfaction for instructional designers, and to that end, the following central and supporting research questions are posed.

Central Research Question (CQ): What experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation?

The central research question is designed to illuminate the overall experiences of the instructional designer in light of their feelings of being satisfied or dissatisfied in their work. Job satisfaction as a general construct is directly related to the experiences that an employee has in their professional environment. Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) noted that experiences should include prolonged periods of time in which the employee feels either extremely satisfied or dissatisfied, but these prolonged periods are generally associated with critical incidents, defined as "specific, almost anecdotal situations in which a concrete experience was identified as being the focal point of exceptional feelings about the job for a very short period of time" (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993, p. 21). The central research question, in addition to the sub-questions, frames the experiences of the instructional designers in light of the attitudes of the employee, what contributes to those attitudes, and the consequences of those attitudes (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993).

Sub-question 1 (SQ 1): What experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction?

The first sub-question seeks to better understand the factors that contribute to job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is generally associated with positive feelings about a person's job; according to Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), these positive feelings are considered motivating factors and are generally intrinsically oriented. Although the literature supports that motivating factors are what contribute to job satisfaction (Zeb, ur Rehman, Saeed, & HamidUllah, 2014), this question allows for a deeper exploration of the specific factors that instructional designers identify as contributive to their job satisfaction.

Sub-question 2 (SQ 2): What experiences do instructional designers associate with feelings of job dissatisfaction?

The second sub-question is specific to Herzberg's theory in that it identifies dissatisfying factors. In Herzberg's theory, dissatisfying factors, also considered hygiene factors, are directly associated with the setting or the environment and are more often extrinsically motivated. According to Zeb et al. (2014), "Dissatisfied employees attribute their work dissatisfaction to extrinsic factors such as company policy, salary, working condition, administration and supervision" (p. 299). Similar to the first sub-question in considering the factors associated with job satisfaction, the second sub-question drills deeper into the factors that contribute to job dissatisfaction or low satisfaction for the instructional designer.

Sub-question 3 (SQ 3): How do instructional designers describe their motivation in the workplace in light of feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) identified effects of job satisfaction in terms of the work or attitudes of the employee, indicating that an increasingly important component of the job satisfaction-dissatisfaction continuum is the impact that it has on the motivation of the employee (Herzberg, 1966; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016; Zeb et al., 2014).

This final question speaks to the intersection between job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and motivation in the workplace.

Definitions

1) *Critical Incident:* According to Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), critical incidents are "concrete experiences" which provide the focal point for feelings about a job (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993, p. 21).

2) *Distance Education:* "An educational process in which a significant proportion of the teaching is conducted by someone removed in space and/or time from the learner" (Simonson et al., 2014, p. 34).

3) *Higher Education Institutions (HEIs):* Generally considered to be an institution that offers a post-secondary education; for the sake of this study, the definition is narrowed to be either a private or public degree-granting institution, and not-for-profit (McCaffery, 2010).

4) *Hygiene Factors:* Factors related to the context and condition of the job, such as company policy and administrative practices, also known as "dissatisfiers" (Herzberg, 1974, p. 18)

5) *Instructional Design*: "Instructional design is engaged in to create means for human learning; doing so involves performing a set of basic processes; and the product, whether simple instruction or an elaborate environment, is a coherent set of conditions for learning" (Rowland & DiVasto, 2013, p. 10).

6) *Job Satisfaction*: How people feel about their jobs and the nature of their work; generally job satisfaction is positive and associated with intrinsic factors (Herzberg, 1974; Spector, 1997).

7) *Job Dissatisfaction:* The prolonged feeling of unhappiness in a work environment, generally caused by environmental factors in the workplace (Herzberg, 1974; Herzberg et al., 1959/1993).

8) *Learning Management System (LMS)*: A web-based online course delivery platform. Its use can range from being supportive and hosting general documents and course information to fully integrated and interactive, with adaptive learning modules, a fully integrated gradebook, and a direct connection to the student information system.

9) *Motivating Factors*: Factors related to the "content" of a job, also known as "satisfiers," such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, and advancement (Herzberg, 1974, p. 18)

10) *Online Learning*: "Education that uses one or more technologies to deliver instruction to students who are separated from the instructor and to support regular and substantive interaction between the students and the instructor synchronously or asynchronously" (Seaman et al., 2018, p. 6). Online learning uses computer mediated means to deliver the instruction, often through the use of a learning management system (LMS) and may be either synchronous or asynchronous (Eaton et al., 2017).

Summary

This chapter provided context for a research study that looked at the experiences that contribute to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as well as motivation in instructional designers in online higher education. Higher education has transitioned from distance education to online learning, and leaders acknowledge the value of online learning. Many HEIs have invested in instructional designers or educational technologists to help them navigate these changes.

However, while research has looked at the experience of instructional designers in online higher education (Ashbaugh, 2013; Bawa & Watson, 2017), little focus has been specifically on the job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation of the instructional designer in non-profit online higher education. The value of this study can be found in the connection between job satisfaction and positive organizational behavior; in the case of the instructional designer in online higher education, positive organizational behavior can be considered in light of the effectiveness of the curriculum design and the quality of the student experience.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

According to Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), "Work is one of the most absorbing things men can think and talk about…For the fortunate, it is the source of great satisfaction; for many others it is the cause of grief" (p. 3). As work consumes most of an individual's waking hours, the satisfaction that one receives while doing their work becomes increasingly important. In higher education, the study of job satisfaction is significant for understanding the output of highly satisfied academic and non-academic staff, the results often seen in the quality of the HEI as well as improved student learning and engagement (Morris & Laipple, 2015).

Chapter 2 presents an overview of the literature surrounding job satisfaction, touching on some of the more prominent theories of motivation in organizational behavior and organizational theory, as well as giving a more specific overview of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory of job satisfaction. To provide a rationale for the significance of this study, this chapter offers an overview of online learning in higher education today, as well as literature that supports the role and value of the instructional designer in higher education in improving student learning and student engagement in online coursework. While extensive literature exists considering the roles and responsibilities of the instructional designer, there is a gap in research that looks at the lived experiences of instructional designers and job satisfaction, and this review of the literature will bring that gap to light.

Theoretical Framework

From the classroom to the workplace, motivation theory provides a helpful context for understanding the needs of the individual and how those needs influence subsequent actions (Mangi, Kanasro, & Burdi, 2015). Motivation theory offers a broad framework to increase

understanding of human behavior and, when applied in an organizational setting, can be used to inform performance improvement plans and organizational output (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; Cerasoli, Nicklin, & Ford, 2014; Kanfer & Chen, 2016; Latham, 2012; Latham & Pinder, 2005; Manganelli, Thibault-Landry, Forest, & Carpentier, 2018). Several studies have also shown that motivation theory provides a solid foundation for understanding human behavior and performance as well as a deeper insight into employee decision-making processes, essentially why employees set goals and behave the way that they do (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Kanfer & Chen, 2016). The foundation of modern workplace motivation theory was based on the need to develop theories that took into account the needs and goals of employees and look more closely at organizational behavior (Latham, 2012).

In a review of organizational behavior theories, Miner (2003) found motivation theory was increasingly relevant in an organizational context and continued to increase in importance and usefulness in studies focusing on general organizational behavior. Motivation theory provides additional insight into organizational behavior and job satisfaction, as many of the theories of job satisfaction originate with or address key employee concerns regarding motivating factors in the workplace (Latham & Pinder, 2005). Motivation theory in organizational behavior as well as its evolution over time provides a context for the theoretical framework of this study, broadly considering job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation, and more narrowly looking at Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory of job satisfaction.

Motivation Theory in the Workplace

A comprehensive body of literature exists exploring motivation theory in its various capacities related to human needs and behavior (Adair, 2006; Cerasoli et al., 2014; Kanfer & Chen, 2016; Lunenburg, 2011; Mangi et al., 2015; Miner, 2003; Upadhyaya, 2014; Zeb et al.,

2014). For this study, the literature has been narrowed down to look specifically at the motivation theories that have an impact on organizational theory and behavior, as motivation theory is one of the chief concerns of industrial and organizational psychology (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Latham, 2012; Sahito & Vaisanen, 2017).

In a review of literature around motivation theory in organizations, Zeb et al. (2014) noted that the study of motivation theory today moves beyond the idea of basic needs being met as seen in Maslow's hierarchy of needs, and instead focuses on reward, or extrinsic factors, and recognition, or intrinsic factors. Most theories of motivation dealing with organizational behavior can and should be viewed in light of reward and recognition factors that impact job satisfaction (Ayim & Mohammad, 2015; Basit & Arshad, 2016; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Spector, 1997; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016; Zeb et al., 2014), though different motivation theories treat reward and recognition differently. Motivation theory research can generally be broken out into two main categories: content theories, such as Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and Alderfer's ERG theory, which take into consideration the complex interplay of external and internal factors, and process theories, such as Vroom's valence, instrumental, and expectancy theory and Adam's equity theory, which consider how internal factors lead to various behaviors (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; Sahito & Vaisanen, 2017). This distinction between content and process theories provides a lens through which to view motivation and job satisfaction, and whether to look at both internal and external factors, or simply consider how the individual chooses to respond to his or her environmental surroundings.

One of the foremost theorists foundational to motivation theory, Maslow (1943) posited that needs begin at a basic level, primarily to ensure survival, and then progress through more sophisticated needs to the point of self-actualization (Adair, 2006; Maslow, 1943). According to

Maslow (1943), humans have five basic needs: physiological needs, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization. Although the hierarchy is often considered sequential, Maslow noted that it is not fixed, and in some cases will depend upon the individual and how long certain needs have been met and satiated. For Maslow (1943), it is important not to underestimate the power of a person's principles, and to take into account that someone who has always had a particular need met may not recognize its full importance. Maslow provides a helpful foundation for understanding needs and motivation, with the caveat that it is a general framework and will have some exceptions (Latham, 2012; Maslow, 1943).

Although Maslow's hierarchy was predominantly a social theory of motivation, it quickly found application in organizational theory and behavior by speaking to how the organization can fulfill the needs of the individual (Jerome, 2013; Upadhyaya, 2014), and current studies have revealed the continued relevancy of Maslow's theory in organizational behavior even today, though in a western context. Most are looking at higher level needs such as prestige, recognition, and accomplishment (Larkin, Brantley-Dias, & Lokey-Vega, 2016; Lichtenstein, Lichtenstein, & Higgs, 2017). For example, in a mixed-methods study of K–12 online teachers, Larkin et al. (2016) found that the higher level needs articulated by Maslow (1943), such as relationships, recognition, and prestige, were still relevant needs articulated by teachers.

Lichtenstein et al. (2017) looked predominantly at higher level needs as well in applying Maslow's framework to an empirically designed instrument to determine values and workplace motivation, and they justified the use of Maslow (1943) due to widespread organizational familiarity and application in organization theory and behavior. However, it is important to point out that Maslow's theory does not ascribe to the reward-recognition dichotomy that developed in later theories, focusing instead on self-actualization and internal motivation (Tripathi &

Moakumla, 2018). It is this weakness that fostered the growth of additional motivation theories

which addressed motivation from the reward-recognition dichotomy, focusing on extrinsic and

intrinsic needs.

Following Maslow (1943), additional theories of human motivation began to emerge

building upon and modifying his needs-based theory. Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) offered a

theory of human motivation and job satisfaction related to two separate factors: hygiene factors,

which were external and based on the idea of removing dissatisfaction, and motivating factors,

which were internal and based on the idea of increasing motivation (Herzberg, 1974; Sachau,

2007). Herzberg's theory, the framework for this study, is addressed in more depth later in this

literature review. At this time, it is presented in the scope of motivational theories in

organizational settings. Herzberg's theory was unique in the broad scope of motivation theory in

that it viewed job satisfaction and dissatisfaction on two separate continua; both are important,

but the factors that impact job satisfaction are ultimately separate from the factors that impact job

dissatisfaction, and a different approach is required to increase job satisfaction than to decrease

job dissatisfaction.

Beyond Maslow (1943) and Herzberg (1959/1993), Alderfer (1969) modified Maslow's

hierarchy of needs to separate the needs of an individual into existence, relatedness, and growth

(ERG). Alderfer suggested that "people show more interest and motivation for behaviors which

will satisfy one of three needs" (Zeb et al., 2014, p. 302). Rather than five needs as proposed by

Maslow, Alderfer suggested three core needs which provide the basic elements of an individual's

motivation (Alderfer, 1969). One of the distinguishing factors of ERG is that unlike Maslow's

hierarchy, which theorizes that once a need is met, it is satiated, in ERG theory meeting

existence needs satisfies those needs but meeting needs associated with relatedness or growth

intensifies that need. Further, in ERG theory there is not an ordering of the needs; in Maslow's theory, motivational needs are based on a specific hierarchy.

One additional theory that is important to understand in terms of motivation in an organizational environment is Vroom's valence, instrumentality, and expectancy theory, or just expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964), which also takes into consideration the individual's expectations for their working environment as a factor of motivation, noting that the individual will not just make choices based on what they have received, but also what they expect to receive (Zeb et al., 2014). Lunenburg (2011) noted there are four main assumptions that practitioners can find in expectancy theory: people's past experiences color their current expectations about the organization they join, individual behavior is a result of a conscious choice, people want different things from the organizations they work for, and people will make specific choices to optimize their personal outcomes. Lloyd and Mertens (2018), in an update to expectancy theory, argued that social context should also be taken into consideration to account for the different influences of factors such as gender or race.

Each of these theories looked closely at what motivates employees in the workplace, and each theory considers elements of intrinsic and extrinsic motivating factors (Cerasoli et al., 2014; Kanfer & Chen, 2016; Zeb et al., 2014). Although there are commonalities, each theorist's perspective has some marked differences regarding how an individual meets his or her needs and is motivated to work in an organization. This broad overview of motivation theory in organizational behavior should provide the historical and theoretical context for the development and implementation of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. The following section provides a more in-depth explanation of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, including an explanation of the basic tenants, and a summary of the critics and supporters of Herzberg's theory.

Motivation-Hygiene Theory of Job Satisfaction

According to Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), the foundation of the motivation-hygiene theory is people's attitudes about their job, followed by three basic questions. First, how is the attitude identified, second, what leads to those attitudes, and finally, what are the consequences of those attitudes? The previous section looked at how various other theories of motivation attempted to answer these questions. Herzberg's theory was developed out of the realization that there are basic ways to maintain the health of an organization, but organizational health and job satisfaction are not necessarily the same thing and thus must be considered separate constructs (Herzberg, 1974).

Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) developed their theory based on a series of interviews conducted by Herzberg and two colleagues of over 200 engineers and accountants looking at times when employees felt exceptionally good or exceptionally bad about their jobs, and looking at specific events or incidences that may have caused those feelings. The findings revealed that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction existed on two separate but parallel continua of high to low job satisfaction and high to low job dissatisfaction, which was a significant departure from the existing theories of motivation, and somewhat controversial (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; Herzberg et al., 1959/1993; House & Wigdor, 1967; Sachau, 2007). Previous theorists such as Maslow (1943) suggested that motivation and satisfaction existed on a single continuum in a linear matter, while Herzberg's research was a departure from the more widely accepted ideas about motivation and job satisfaction. Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) reported that factors that cause job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are different; factors that contribute to job satisfaction are known as motivators, or satisfiers, and factors which contribute to dissatisfaction are known as hygiene, or dissatisfiers. Therefore, job satisfaction in employees cannot be increased by simply

addressing the hygiene factors, and conversely, job dissatisfaction is not eliminated by addressing the motivators. Management must be aware of how both motivation and hygiene elements have an impact on an employee's attitudes about work and the subsequent output of those attitudes (Herzberg, 1966).

Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) called the general construct of satisfiers and dissatisfiers "factors" and defined them as an "objective element of the situation in which the respondent finds a source for good or bad feelings about the job" (p. 44). There were 14 first-level factors that emerged as the source of feelings about one's job, and included things such recognition, achievement, the possibility of growth, advancement, salary, interpersonal relations, supervision, responsibility, company and policy administration, working conditions, the work itself, factors in one's personal life, status, and job security. Feelings about each of the 14 first-level factors comprised second-level factors, which influenced the participants' feelings about the work environment. Factors were characterized as either motivating or hygiene factors, and either internally or externally oriented. As noted earlier, motivating factors are those which lead to feelings of psychological growth and self-actualization, while hygiene factors are those which determine the health of an organization and the physical comfort of the employee but may not lead to individual growth (Herzberg, 1966). This dichotomy was considered controversial and is expounded upon further in the following section, including looking at critics of the motivation-hygiene theory.

It is important to point out that salary played a role as both a motivating and hygiene factor. Herzberg (1974) noted that as a motivating factor it was tied to factors such as recognition; when employees recognized that a higher salary was associated with motivating

factors, such as recognition for work, appreciation, and merit-based raises, it became a motivator. Otherwise, salary in and of itself was a hygiene factor.

Effects of job factors and feelings about job factors were characterized as effects of attitudes about the job (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993) and include performance effects, turnover, mental health effects, effects on interpersonal relationships, and attitudinal effects. Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) stressed that these effects of job attitudes did not just manifest in the professional life of the employee, but also had an impact in their personal lives. For instance, mental health included evidence such as weight gain, psychosomatic episodes, and clinical illnesses. Additionally, effects on interpersonal relationships could extend to irritation with family or withdrawing from friends in negative situations or, conversely, to better relationships with family and friends in situations where the employee felt good about his or her job (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993). When discussing motivation and hygiene factors, Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) concluded that satisfiers, or motivators, relate directly to the work the employee is doing, while dissatisfiers, or hygiene factors, are related to the work environment.

Critics of Herzberg. Herzberg's theory is not without its critics. There are concerns about the methodology that Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) used, specifically that the "dimensions in the situation can quite possibly reflect more rater's hypothesis concerning the compositions and interrelations of dimensions than the respondent's own perceptions" (House & Wigdor, 1967, p. 372) and that Herzberg relied too heavily on a biased methodology (Latham, 2012; Sachau, 2007). Further, Behling, Labovitz, and Kosmo (1968) pointed out while Herzberg's findings are consistent with others who use the same measurements, the dual-factor aspect of the theory is not supported by other measurements, leading to a question of the validity of the findings.

Further, some critics pointed out there was an oversimplification of the operational definitions of the satisfiers and dissatisfiers and the original research did not provide an overall job satisfaction indicator (House & Wigdor, 1967). Herzberg's theory only provided a loose framework in which employees can identify components of satisfaction or dissatisfaction (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; Herzberg, 1974). Even Vroom, developer of expectancy theory, offered criticism and noted that a factor that motivates may not also be a satisfier, and productive work is not necessarily tied to motivation (House & Wigdor, 1967). Vijayakumar and Saxena (2015) offered another criticism regarding the level at which the employee works; lower level employees may place a higher value on hygiene factors, while someone at a higher level in the company may be more concerned with motivating factors.

Perhaps one of the most prominent criticisms of Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) is his placement of salary as a hygiene factor, meaning that it can mitigate job dissatisfaction, but is not actually a motivator (Sachau, 2007). However, as previously noted, Herzberg (1974) offered a contingency that salary was a hygiene and not motivating factor only as long as the basic survival needs of the employee were being met.

Most recently, literature has emerged which indicates additional attention needs to be paid to the socio-cultural context of an organization, including non-western affects and gender and racial concerns, something that is not addressed heavily in Herzberg's theory (Bassett-Jones & Lloyd, 2005; Hagedorn, 2000; Vijayakumar & Saxena, 2015). In a quantitative survey looking at employee satisfaction and interaction with colleagues, Bassett-Jones and Lloyd (2005) discussed the role that the Anglo-American western worldview played in understanding the application of Herzberg's two-factor theory in their study, finding Herzberg's theory still adequate in a contemporary western context. However, in a study published 10 years later,

Vijayakumar and Saxena (2015) argued that job satisfaction has become increasingly contextual based upon the socio-cultural milieu of the organization and that Herzberg's theory may no longer be a sufficient model for determining factors that impact job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in an organization. There is potentially some validity to this argument as the study conducted by Vijayakumar and Saxena (2015) looked at middle-level managers in central and southern India, outside of a western context. Nevertheless, Khanna (2017) looked at faculty in higher education in India and found that Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory could still be applied in a non-western context.

As the study is conducted in the context of western universities, the socio-economic setting is still consistent with context identified by Herzberg (1966).

Support for the motivation-hygiene theory. Although Herzberg's research has come under some criticism, extensive research has been done using the theory as a framework for workplace motivation (Khanna, 2017; Rich, 2015; Sachau, 2007; Smerek & Peterson, 2007; Weisberg & Dent, 2016). Sachau (2007) argued that the work of Herzberg was consistent with emerging research in positive psychology and continues to have application in organizational theory today. As previously discussed, Bassett-Jones and Lloyd (2005) found that in current organizational climates, Herzberg's original findings have been affirmed, though they offered the caveat that if the organizational climate changes, certain aspects of the motivation-hygiene theory may also change.

Herzberg's theory has also seen broad utility in motivation and job satisfaction research, from education to health care, accounting to social work (Khanna, 2017; Smerek & Peterson, 2007; Weisberg & Dent, 2016). Herzberg's theory has even expanded to application in student motivation in higher education (Chyung & Vachon, 2013; Rizkallah & Victoria, 2017),

specifically as the foundation for at least two student satisfaction and retention inventories. A study conducted by Chyung and Vachon (2013) applied Herzberg's concepts to eLearning courses, identifying motivators as intrinsic factors for students, while hygiene factors might be the academic environment or even the eLearning platform. Rizkallah and Victoria (2017) used Herzberg's framework in an inventory designed to track student motivation throughout their academic career, finding that year to year differences may require different approaches in addressing motivators or dissatisfiers, as they are referred to in this study. Also important to note in this study is that the internal motivating factors played a stronger role in student retention than dissatisfiers.

Herzberg's theory arguably added depth to the study of job satisfaction in fields where employees were already predisposed to work for more intrinsic reasons such as the non-profit and healthcare sectors (Smith & Shields, 2013; Weisberg & Dent, 2016). It has also seen extensive use in higher education, and as the landscape of higher education shifts, the health of the organization may need to be viewed more dichotomously than simply straight factors that consider job satisfaction (Khanna, 2017; Rich, 2015; Smerek & Peterson, 2007). This established use of the motivation-hygiene theory in higher education makes it an appropriate framework for the study.

Alghamdi (2017) found the motivation factors outlined by Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) strongly correlated with job satisfaction, though noted one limitation in Alghamdi's research was that dissatisfaction was not formally considered, so while hygiene factors such as pay and benefits were mentioned, they were only considered in light of job satisfaction. Similar findings emerged in the research conducted by Khanna (2017), which applied the two-factor theory in a quantitative study of academicians in Northern India and validated the use of Herzberg's

motivation-hygiene theory in the use of job satisfaction research in higher education, finding that both motivating and hygiene factors are significant in determining overall job satisfaction. In both studies, job satisfaction correlated with the motivating factors, and though hygiene factors were addressed, they were considered in light of the overall job satisfaction and not measured as factors specific to dissatisfaction.

Studies that looked at job satisfaction in higher education using Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory have not been limited to just full-time academic teaching staff, but also non-academic and support staff as well as adjunct faculty. Smerek and Peterson (2007) used Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory in a study of non-academic staff and found that work environment variables played a significant role in determining satisfaction. The research also indicated a weakness with Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, specifically that it may be overly simplistic in determining job satisfaction, though similar to the research conducted by Alghamdi (2017), Smerek and Peterson (2007) only measured job satisfaction and not dissatisfaction as well, which is a key element of the dual scales of high to no job satisfaction and high to no job dissatisfaction. Rich (2015) applied Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory in a qualitative study of job satisfaction of adjuncts, but again, only measured satisfaction in terms of motivators without also considering the hygiene factors that contribute to dissatisfaction. Nonetheless, Rich (2015) had positive results when considering the motivating factors that contribute to job satisfaction, and his research is significant in validating the use of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory for considering job satisfaction.

Most recently, Felder (2018) used Herzberg as a framework in looking at motivation in non-teaching staff and the feedback processes they receive. Felder (2018) found that the

motivating factors emerged as important to the satisfaction of employees and should be used as a framework for providing feedback for growth.

The preceding section provided a theoretical foundation and basis for the use of motivation theory in looking at job satisfaction, focusing on Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Subsequent sections consider how motivation theory, specifically Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory has been applied in job satisfaction research related to organizational behavior.

Related Research

Latham and Pinder (2005) defined motivation as "a psychological process resulting from the direct interaction between the individual and the environment" (p. 486). Current literature has revealed that there is often a direct relationship between job satisfaction and motivation; the output also influences organizational culture and positive organizational behavior, and satisfied employees usually result in satisfied customers (Biswas & Mazumder, 2017; Kanfer & Chen, 2016; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016). The following sections look more deeply at motivation and job satisfaction, and the influence on organizational behavior in the HEI. Also considered is the context of job satisfaction and motivation in higher education. The chapter concludes with an examination of the valuable role that instructional designers play in the changing landscape of higher education. Although extensive research exists looking at job satisfaction of other key players in academia, there is a gap in the literature looking at the job satisfaction of instructional designers.

Job Satisfaction and Organizational Behavior

The body of literature surrounding job satisfaction considers it from two separate perspectives. The first perspective includes studies that examine the organizational factors that impact job satisfaction. The second perspective includes studies that investigate the effect of high

job satisfaction on organizational culture and output. Research in organizational theory and behavior shows a strong connection between job satisfaction, organizational behavior, and employee engagement (Ayim & Mohammad, 2015; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015) and Biswas and Mazumder (2017) pointed out that employee satisfaction plays a significant role in their engagement and positive organizational behavior, which is a direct result of high levels of job satisfaction. Conversely, high organizational engagement among employees is also directly related to organizational effectiveness (Biswas & Mazumder, 2017; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015; Sawitri, Suswati, & Huda, 2016).

Organizational citizenship is considered engagement and participation in the organization above and beyond what is required, and according to Ayim and Mohammad (2015), "promotes the effective and efficient functioning of an organization" (p. 286). Several studies have found that there is a close relationship between job satisfaction, organizational behavior, and organizational effectiveness. Pouramini and Fayyazi (2015) conducted a study of employees in a public organization and found that there was a direct link between organizational citizenship, job satisfaction, and employee engagement. In a similar study, Sawitri et al. (2016) found that job satisfaction had a positive impact on organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment, while research conducted by Biswas and Mazumder (2017) affirmed organizational citizenship directly impacts organizational effectiveness, with a strong relationship between the two. In these three studies, the trifecta of positive organizational behavior, employee engagement, and job satisfaction had a far-reaching impact on the effectiveness of the organization and customer satisfaction.

As research in job satisfaction and organizational behavior has expanded into higher education, literature has emerged demonstrating the connection between academic job

satisfaction and greater impact on student learning (Rich, 2015; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016). Further, research shows a consideration of job satisfaction needs to be a part of the conversations around institutional effectiveness as HEIs continue to seek ways to ensure they maintain effective and efficient staff who are able contribute to the quality of the institution and student engagement and learning (Hagedorn, 2000). Staff retention should be as important as student retention, and Stankovska et al. (2017) found that in higher education job satisfaction led to longer careers at the same institution and increased productivity in those careers. As turnover is costly in both time and money, the research emphasized that HEIs should look at ways to support the current workforce (Webber & Rogers, 2018).

Job Satisfaction in Higher Education

In recent years, job satisfaction has become a significant area of study in higher education. As noted previously, job satisfaction in academic faculty and non-academic staff has been shown to lead to improved outcomes for students (Khanna, 2017; Stankovska et al., 2017). Further, turnover can be expensive, and maintaining a satisfied workforce also means that less time and money is spent hiring and training new staff. Most of the research in higher education job satisfaction has focused on academic staff (Alghamdi, 2017; Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016; Moradi, Almutairi, Idrus, & Emami, 2013; Mudrak et al., 2018; Nandan & Krishna, 2013; Stankovska et al., 2017; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016), though a small pocket of research also considers non-academic and support staff (Seng & Wai, 2016; Smerek & Peterson, 2007).

Literature surrounding the job satisfaction of full-time faculty and academic staff reveals important values and factors that affect job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Pan, Shen, Liu, Yang, & Wang, 2015). A general hierarchy emerges within higher education: there

seems to be a higher value placed on research faculty, with teaching faculty playing a lesser role, and adjuncts or contracted faculty feeling the least valued (Rawn & Fox, 2018). Findings were consistent with research conducted in non-academic organizations, that job satisfaction of full-time teaching staff affected output (teaching) and affective commitment to the institution (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Trivellas & Santouridis, 2016). Factors that had a direct impact on job satisfaction included the work itself (Alghamdi, 2017; Mudrak et al., 2018), recognition or lack thereof (Eagan, Jaeger, & Grantham, 2015; Felder, 2018; Nandan & Krishna, 2013), culture (Moradi et al., 2013), and working environment (Eagan et al., 2015; Elder, Svoboda, Ryan, & Fitzgerald, 2016; Hill, 2014; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016; Rich, 2015), as well as relationships with colleagues (Machado-Taylor et al., 2016), and even gender and racial disparity (Webber & Rogers, 2018).

Rawn and Fox (2018) studied faculty job satisfaction, distinguishing between research and teaching faculty, and finding that feeling valued was of significant importance to teaching faculty; they acknowledged that there was a hierarchy of perceived value especially in research universities and that faculty whose primary responsibility was teaching still placed a high value on feeling like a productive and contributing member of the HEI. One way that job satisfaction for academic staff differs from other organizations, and for that matter, even non-academic and adjunct staff in the HEI, is in the tenure system, which includes unique challenges but promises a certain level of prestige, as well as security (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Craft, Baker, & Finn, 2016; Webber & Rogers, 2018).

Many of these findings extended from full-time faculty to adjunct and part-time faculty, with satisfaction related to factors such as relationships with colleagues and recognition for the work they do (Elder et al., 2016). However, other factors emerged which caused dissatisfaction

for adjunct faculty, including feelings of disconnect from colleagues and supervisors, a lack of access to the same resources, and a lack of academic freedom (Eagan et al., 2015; Rich, 2015), as well as a lack of access to key resources (Elder et al., 2016). Contrary to popular belief, Eagan et al. (2015) found that the job satisfaction of part-time faculty and full-time tenured faculty was similar at the aggregate level, though once considered at a deeper level, different factors contributing to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction were revealed. The most significant finding was a perceived lack of respect from full-time, tenured peers. This in turn meant that faculty reverted to focusing on working conditions as sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Lack of recognition by peers was one of the most frequently cited reasons for job dissatisfaction for adjuncts and part-time faculty (Eagan et al., 2015; Rich, 2015). This lack of acknowledgement from peers also emerges in a different context as a frustration for instructional designers (Bawa & Watson, 2017; Bongers, 2017; Campbell et al., 2009), which is addressed in more depth later in this chapter.

One theme that emerged on the periphery was benefits and compensation, admittedly important, but often an under-addressed element. While compensation and benefits did emerge in most of the literature reviewed, it was rarely cited as a factor for job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The exception being if it was the main factor considered in the study, such as the research conducted by Quinn and Thorne (2014), or if it signified a deeper issue, such as gender or racial gaps identified by Webber and Rogers (2018).

There may be some explanation for this disparity between the perception of the importance of salary and the research only reporting it as a part of the overall picture of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Machado-Taylor et al. (2016) argued that there is a "mistaken belief that pay incentives alone create effective levels of motivation and thus overall job

satisfaction. Serious research, however, has revealed that the concept of job satisfaction is a complex collection of variables that interact in myriad ways" (p. 542). The research conducted by Machado-Taylor et al. (2016) explored the complexity of job satisfaction research in higher education; specifically, there are elements of their jobs that academic staff can be highly satisfied with, but the sum of the parts do not measure up to full general satisfaction with their work. Quinn and Thorne (2014) presented an alternative perspective related to compensation, finding that perceptions of compensation were tied to perceptions regarding organizational effectiveness and work quality. In all, while compensation was rated as important, it was often less prominent than some of the other themes related to recognition, an idea that reinforces the motivation-hygiene theory.

An additional subset of job satisfaction literature in higher education looks at part-time, online, and adjunct faculty. In addition to some of the concerns common to academic staff in higher education such as salary, balancing multiple and increasing demands, and work environment, part-time, online, and adjunct faculty have a unique set of factors that play into job satisfaction (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Elder et al., 2016; Hill, 2014; Rich, 2015). These unique factors are related to working environment, academic conditions, and job fit. The most prominent theme that emerged was related to feeling disconnect from the institution. Rich (2015) found that adjunct faculty often felt disconnected from the institution, and that factors that motivated them included contributing to student success and development, their own academic freedom, and receiving acknowledgement for their contributions to the institution. The factors all relate to the intrinsic desire to be recognized, and as recognition is one of the factors identified by Herzberg (1974) as contributing to job satisfaction, the findings in these studies are consistent with the literature regarding the causes and challenges of job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction of Non-Academic Staff

A smaller subset of literature looks at the job satisfaction of non-academic staff in higher education (Felder, 2018; Morris & Laipple, 2015; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Smerek & Peterson, 2007). In many ways, non-academic staff in academia are similar to staff outside of academia. Most of the research in this area also drew correlations between positive job satisfaction and the impact on organizational output, i.e. student learning, engagement, and experience. Although their responsibilities may not directly touch students, the levels of job satisfaction of non-academic or administrative staff directly impact the organization and thus have far-reaching effects on the student experience. Morris and Laipple (2015) looked at administration in higher education, with findings that indicated administrators often reported decreasing job satisfaction resulting in significant leadership challenges. Their research focused on how the institution must respond to the need to increase support and thus improve job satisfaction. As discussed earlier, Trivellas and Santouridis (2016) looked at job satisfaction in both academic and non-academic staff, finding that job satisfaction had a strong impact on service quality and affective commitment.

Several studies also considered Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Smerek and Peterson (2007) applied Herzberg's theory in considering job satisfaction of non-academic staff in higher education, and though they found some challenges with it as a theoretical framework because of its simplicity, several of the factors they listed remained consistent with Herzberg's theory. They also focused on recommendations for key areas to improve job satisfaction, namely, that the work itself and the work environment were significant factors in job satisfaction, and opportunities for growth and advancement needed to continue to be available. Quinn and Thorne (2014) discussed Herzberg as an influencing theorist in their study looking at correlations

between organizational effectiveness, quality of work, and total compensation. Their research found higher levels of job satisfaction, but no positive correlations between job satisfaction, organizational effectiveness, quality of work, and total compensation. However, this is partially attributed to the social context of the study, and the fact that the HEIs where the research was conducted were choice employers in their socio-economic area, and thus predisposed to higher levels of job satisfaction (Quinn & Thorne, 2014). In both of these studies, work environment became an important factor in impacting overall job satisfaction.

In the research that was reviewed on job satisfaction in higher education, many of the studies also addressed the nature of working in higher education, as well as the relevant organizational culture that impacts job satisfaction (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016; Moradi et al., 2013). While a few studies addressed non-teaching staff, none of the studies looked specifically at instructional support in the position of instructional designers. With the increase in online learning (Beaudoin, 2015, 2016), which has impacted the work required of faculty and staff (Mudrak et al., 2018), higher education is in a rapid period of growth and change. To understand new challenges to organizational culture and work environment, the next section looks at online learning in higher education, and the role of instructional designers in this new academic environment.

Landscape of Online Higher Education

The advent of online higher education prompted a significant change in the way that institutuons operate and deliver quality instruction to students (Allen & Seaman, 2015, 2017; Allen et al., 2016; Beaudoin, 2015, 2016; Harasim, 2000; Mbuva, 2014; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017; Seaman et al., 2018). The Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, in partnership with organizations such as the Online Learning Consortium (OLC), Pearson, and the Babson Survey Research Group have

produced yearly reports considering the changing face of higher education specific to online

learning, and found that between Fall 2015 and Fall 2016, online enrollments increased 5.6%,

with 14.9% of students taking exclusively distance courses and 16.7% of students taking a

combination of distance and on-ground courses for a total of 31.6% of all higher education

enrollment (Seaman et al., 2018, p. 11). Online or distance education has increased, while

traditional on-ground or face-to-face courses have decreased. Further, a number of students who

took distance education courses were within driving distance of the HEI where they were

enrolled, indicating that online and distance education is increasingly about convenience

(Seaman et al., 2018).

In the early years of online education, Harasim (2000) noted the emergence of online

learning as a viable alternative for students required that faculty and staff in higher education

understand how the factors that impact effective student learning also impact the changing

delivery of content through digital and web-based tools and methodologies. Nearly two decades

later, the same issues of the quality of delivery for effective learning are still at the forefront of

online learning. Beaudoin (2016) echoed similar sentiments, noting "unprecedented innovation"

(p. 10) has occurred in higher education which can enhance learning opportunities for students.

He argued that HEIs are currently in the throes of a significant period when increasing student

enrollment in online programs will continue to push HEIs to offer engaging, innovative online

classes. This perspective is reinforced by the research done by Seaman et al. (2018), who found

that distance education enrollment is steadily growing, and the HEIs that respond to that change

will continue to grow. Research suggests that one of the most important factors in this drive

toward change is academic leadership, which can recognize when change is occuring (Beaudoin,

2015, 2016) and negotiate those changes (Amirault, 2012; Burnette, 2015).

Curriculum Design and Delivery in Online Higher Education

While Harasim (2000) and Beaudoin (2015, 2016) offered an explanation of the needs that emerge in online education from a theoretical basis, it was also clear in the research that the infrastructure of the HEI needed to change to adjust to the changing landscape in higher education. Institutions need to be aware of the unique needs that exist in designing online education and how that impacts the student experience (Costley et al., 2017; Eunmo Sung, 2012; Mansureh et al., 2017; Mbuva, 2014; Richardson & Swan, 2003; Wu, 2016).

A study conducted by Mbuva (2014) revealed that some of the challenges faced by HEIs embracing online learning include equitable access, affordable delivery, issues surrounding computer literacy, unanticipated costs, and the requirement for a different kind of learner who must maintain motivation in spite of limited social interaction. Although he acknowledged the benefits, it is still evident that some of the challenges in online learning are unique to that delivery method. Mbuva's findings were confirmed by Chawinga and Zozie (2016), who studied students in rural Africa, finding that though the students had access to online course work, key resources such as library support were not available to them, which hindered their ability to successfully complete their classes. This speaks to the research posed by Harasim (2000) regarding the definition of quality in online learning and expands to issues of resource availability.

McCombs (2015) offered a solution to the question of quality in online learning by using learner-centered instructional design, based on five main domains: positive interpersonal relationships, facilitation of the learning process, adapting to class learning needs, encouraging personal challenge and responsibility, and providing for individual and social learning needs. All five domains speak to both the necessity of strong course design as well as faculty support for

online teaching. Learner-centered online learning has been supported by numerous studies (Ke & Kwak, 2013; Mansureh et al., 2017; Parker, Baffour, & Cruz, 2018), generally under a broader umbrella of implementing components of quality in online classes. It is important to note that some studies have found a positive correlation between student-centeredness in online education and student satisfaction (Ke & Kwak, 2013). However, Lenert and Janes (2017) reported that although instructors and instructional designers were well-versed in key quality attributes of online classes, they did not always implement these attributes effectively from both design and delivery perspectives.

In recent years, some institutions have also turned to the use of online program managers (OPMs) to fast-track their development of online graduate programs (Czerniewicz & Walji, 2019; Springer, 2018). OPMs can be one stop shops, delivering course content, enrollment, and marketing, or can function in an "a la carte" sense in which the institution determines which services it would like to pay for. This is important for two reasons. First, OPMs provide a much needed service in higher education for those schools who choose not to or are unable to build and maintain online programming in-house. Second, OPMs have increasingly been shown to be problematic due to the extensive financial output for the instituion and the questionable return on investment (Springer, 2018). Some schools have chosen to go this route rather than managing in-house control over their online programs and online program development, but problematic results have called into question the overall effectiveness of OPMs.

While some institutions have opted to sign contracts with OPMs, many have also decided to keep online programming in-house. These changes that emerge in how content is delivered present a host of other staff needs for the university, mainly focusing on the need for solid training for faculty in the facilitation of online learning, as well as additional instructional

support (Bonnici et al., 2016; Brigance, 2011; Lenert & Janes, 2017; Mansureh et al., 2017; Rovai & Downey, 2010; Wu, 2016). Bonnici et al. (2016) looked at student learning preferences in online courses, finding that students preferred asynchronous course delivery for convenience, but that teaching and learning styles influenced student learning in a synchronously delivered online class. Effective course design was articulated as one of the most important needs for students, and in addition to quality assurance and faculty development, is one of the key factors in determining the quality of an online program (Rovai & Downey, 2010; Wu, 2016). In considering these factors, Brigance (2011) noted, "Online learning requires an emphasis on underlying pedagogies and the technological designs that will support these pedagogies. Having professors put their courses online without giving them the necessary support to do so results in ill-structured design that inhibits student learning" (p. 44). Effective online course design requires an understanding of different instructional methods and pedagogy which fit the instructional delivery in order to effectively contribute to the quality of the online program.

One of the most significant challenges related to online learning that emerged in the literature is online course design and faculty who are either unable to design for the online platform or resistant to adopt new methodologies to support online learning (Rovai & Downey, 2010). Mansureh et al. (2017) conducted a literature review that looked at the factors which influence the design and delivery of a quality online course and found that, in order to enhance the effectiveness of an online program, HEIs needed to provide training for faculty and instructors, along with technical support and instructional support to ensure the quality of the classes. Although faculty development for faculty who teach online was a critical component of program success, robust online training programs that support faculty in becoming familiar with online pedagogy and best practices were the exception rather than the rule (Rovai & Downey,

2010). To compound the issue, it is not enough to just teach faculty how to teach online; the content must also be designed and presented in an appropriate format for online learners (Bongers, 2017). Online course design requires a different set of skills, skills which are often found in the role of the instructional designer.

Instructional Design in Online Higher Education

Reigeluth (1983), in his foundational work on instructional design and instructional design theory, stated that instructional design "is concerned with understanding, improving, and applying methods of instruction" (p. 3). Like most fields associated with teaching and learning, instructional design has also had to adapt to a changing landscape of instructional delivery. Although the instructional design role did not originate in higher education, it has adapted more quickly to new learning methodologies to meet the needs of a changing population of students (Merrill, 2007; Reigeluth, 1983; Rubley, 2016). The role of the instructional designer in online higher education varies according to the research, though some commonalities offer a broad view of what the instructional designer does in online higher education. The International Board of Standards for Training, Performance, and Instruction (IBSTPI) (2012) offered a list of competencies for the instructional design field including skills such as effective communication, the application of research to instructional design, determining appropriate instructional content and methodologies, and using appropriate technologies. Instructional designers in higher education often apply these skills to design effective online classes.

Although there are standard competencies for instructional designers in general (IBSTPI, 2012), designing courses in higher education requires unique skills in design, collaboration, technological innovation, and an understanding of the needs of their student population. In two separate studies, Ritzhaupt and Kumar (2015) and Kumar and Ritzhaupt (2017) looked at the

roles and responsibilities of instructional designers in higher education, noting that as HEIs continue to embrace online learning and faculty are asked to do more with fewer resources, instructional designers have become an important link in the chain. Their research revealed significant information regarding the responsibilities of the instructional designer; although the full scope of the instructional designer's work is dependent upon the department they were a part of, their duties were most frequently associated with course design, development, and revision. Further, instructional designers were expected to have a solid working knowledge of technology and a set of technical skills to implement learning technologies (Ritzhaupt & Kumar, 2015).

Instructional designers also articulated that their responsibilities included helping faculty teach, integrating tools to support student learning, aligning content, outcomes, and objectives, and developing instructional materials such as videos and podcasts (Kumar & Ritzhaupt, 2017; Rubley, 2016). These findings are consistent with a larger trend in higher education: academic and non-academic jobs and tasks are expanding to respond to financial constraints – in essence, to do more with less. However, these expanded tasks require additional skills beyond traditional instructional design education, and instructional designers engage in more informal ways of increasing in skills and knowledge (Yanchar & Hawkley, 2015).

The design of instruction is the most fundamental responsibility that instructional designers have articulated in the research (Brigance, 2011; Intentional Futures, 2016; International Board of Standards for Training Perfomance and Instructions, 2012; Klein & Jun, 2014; Kumar & Ritzhaupt, 2017; Pan et al., 2003; Pan & Thompson, 2009; Reigeluth, 1983; Ritzhaupt & Kumar, 2015; Rubley, 2016; Williams, South, Yanchar, Wilson, & Allen, 2011). Brigance (2011) noted that online pedagogy is markedly different from a traditional face-to-face pedagogy, and therefore requires the support of a position that understands the fundamentals of

learning and, more specifically, online learning. Most often, that support is found in the person of an instructional designer. In a survey of instructional designers in higher education, Rubley (2016) found that over 60% of the work done by instructional designers with faculty was assisting them in the design of fully online courses and 34% of the work done was on hybrid courses. Further, 96% of faculty had worked with an instructional designer to design their fully online classes, and 57% of faculty had worked with an instructional designer to design their hybrid course.

A more traditional perspective of instructional designers was presented by Klein and Jun (2014) who found the top five skills rated as most important for instructional designers were aligning objectives and assessments, preparing measurable goals and objectives, collaboration with others, identifying strategies for intended outcomes, and broadly designing a curriculum. However, Klein and Jun (2014) also pointed out "the skill of designing for emerging technologies was considered more important than designing instructor-led instruction" (p. 44), indicating the important role that technology plays in designing classes in higher education. The instructional designer as innovator and technology expert is a recurring theme in current literature (Scoppio & Luyt, 2017).

Instructional design and technology innovation. In addition to their tasks related to designing instruction and collaborating with faculty, instructional designers are increasingly seen as change agents within the institution, understanding technological innovation, implementing new technologies, and supporting faculty in using that new technology. A survey conducted by Intentional Futures (2016) found instructional designers often had to work as a liaison between instructional staff and IT, train on new technology, conduct quality assurance tests, and even remain heavily involved in decisions related to the learning management system (LMS). As

noted previously, instructional designers must not only be technically competent in instructional design methodology, but technologically competent to introduce and support new learning technologies (Intentional Futures, 2016; Klein & Jun, 2014). This was explored further by Sharif and Cho (2015), who found that many of the challenges faced by 21st century instructional designers were related to using technology. They pointed out the variety of roles instructional designers held, and thus the varying skillsets that are needed by instructional designers to be successful. These findings have been reinforced by Sugar and Luterbach (2016) and Costley et al. (2017), whose research expanded the responsibilities of instructional designers to include video creation and multimedia production, as well as Kumar and Ritzhaupt (2017), who identified new technology implementation and training as key responsibilities of instructional designers in HEIs today. Emerging studies have found that the role and responsibilities of instructional designers have expanded from the use of instructional design models to design instruction to include more complex tasks and responsibilities.

     Faculty support and collaboration. Also prominent in the literature surrounding instructional design in higher education is the necessity for collaboration with various stakeholders, most prominently faculty (Bawa & Watson, 2017; Bongers, 2017; Campbell et al., 2009; Kebaetse & Sims, 2016; Pan et al., 2003; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017). As noted previously, when making instructional design decisions, in addition to decisions about the student experience, instructional designers consistently consider faculty as some of the most important stakeholders (Lenert & Janes, 2017; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017). Several studies shed light on a process that can be fraught with conflict and frustration for instructional designers. Bawa and Watson (2017) looked at the collaborative relationship between faculty and instructional designers, coining the acronym CHAMELEON which they considered both a metaphor and an

acronym for the characteristics of a collaborative process of working with faculty. CHAMELEON stands for communication, honesty, adaptability, mentorship, engagement, looping, empathy, oscillating, and networking. Some of the themes that were articulated by Bawa and Watson (2017) also emerged in the research conducted by Bongers (2017) and Scoppio and Luyt (2017); specifically, that a tension can emerge between faculty and instructional designers. The cause is usually ideological, i.e. faculty do not see the instructional design work as valuable or helpful (Baldwin et al., 2018; Bongers, 2017) or faculty do not fully understand the role of the instructional designer (Scoppio & Luyt, 2017).

The relationship between faculty and instructional designers can be complicated. Faculty reactions to instructional designers are mixed, vacillating between finding the instructional designers helpful and questioning the total overall value of what instructional designers do (Rubley, 2016). An earlier study conducted by Pan et al. (2003) noted "that the instructional designer essentially plays a sensitive but tricky role, as pulling tigers' teeth without getting bitten" (p. 300), essentially both leading and supporting faculty in their course design efforts, and Kebaetse and Sims (2016) included coaching as a description of the relationship between faculty and instructional designers. Drysdale (2018) looked at how the organizational structure of the instructional design team also had a direct impact on perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of instructional designers in higher education. The study found that at best the structure of the instructional design team could lead to more empowered instructional designers who were prepared to take on a leadership role in the HEI; however, at worse, the structure restricted the ability of the instructional designer to actually design and initiate innovation within the HEI (Drysdale, 2018).

This balance between leading and supporting also manifests in how instructional designers are increasingly seen as leaders and change agents in the university (Ashbaugh, 2013; Brigance, 2011; Drysdale, 2018; Houareau, 2017). Ashbaugh (2013) studied instructional design competencies for effective pedagogy, but also recognized that a crucial aspect of the instructional designer's responsibilities involved key leadership skills within the institution. Ashbaugh's research affirmed the findings of Brigance (2011), that "Instructional designers have the unique abilities to be successful leaders in this culture because of their understanding of the importance of learning how to learn, as well as their problem-solving abilities and belief that people will learn given the right resources" (p. 47- 48). Houareau (2017) extended this idea of instructional designers as leaders, looking at leadership competencies needed for instructional designers in light of the five practices of exemplary leadership identified by Kouzes and Posner (2012). She found that leadership skills were necessary for instructional designers to be successful in their roles and responsibilities, regardless of whether instructional designers were in true leadership roles or not.

Instructional design and student learning. A necessary component in the study of instructional design is the contribution to student learning (Reigeluth, 1983; Reigeluth, Beatty, & Myers, 2016). Rowland and DiVasto (2013) found that effective instructional design practice can lead to what they have termed powerful learning, defined as an experience that is particularly memorable for the learner due to its quality and impact on the learner's beliefs and behaviors over time, transferrable to other circumstances. In their research, they argued that the instructional designer, due to his or her unique skillset and training, is well positioned to facilitate the development of courses that elicit powerful learning. Other studies and researchers have reported results similar to that of Rowland and DiVasto (2013), finding that instructional

designers are able to work with faculty to design learner-centered courses that increase student learning, improve the student's overall learning experience, and facilitate students becoming more self-directed learners (McCombs, 2015; Moate & Cox, 2015; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017). Although, as discussed earlier, faculty can be reluctant or challenging to work with, faculty have also admitted that the work and support of the instructional designers frees them up to spend more time focusing on students rather than getting bogged down in technological or pedagogical issues and concerns (Kebaetse & Sims, 2016; Rubley, 2016).

As online learning became a more prominent method of delivery, some questions emerged regarding the quality of online learning. As noted previously, online classes require different approach to teaching and learning; faculty who are used to teaching in a face-to-face, residential format often struggle with designing effective online courses (Bawa & Watson, 2017; Kebaetse & Sims, 2016; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017; von Konsky, Miller, & Jones, 2016). Instructional designers are trained in the specific sequencing and organization of course materials, which directly impacts how students meet learning outcomes (Bonnici et al., 2016). Specifically, as it relates to online learning, instructional designers can help navigate some of the challenges that emerge, and increase student satisfaction, and increase student learning through the implementation of valuable instructional resources and methods (Hassanein & Hassanein, 2015; Reio & Crim, 2013; Richardson & Swan, 2003; Wang, 2014).

Instructional designer decision-making. Throughout the instructional design process, the instructional designer must engage in a constant cycle of making instructional strategy decisions (Christensen & Osguthorpe, 2004; Honebein & Honebein, 2015; Yanchar & Hawkley, 2014). Several studies have looked at the decision-making responsibilities of instructional designers, finding that multiple factors influence instructional strategy decisions; instructional

design theory is relevant, but instructional designers also rely on their values, as well as the values of the organization (Christensen & Osguthorpe, 2004; Gray et al., 2015; Honebein, 2017; Lenert & Janes, 2017; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017).

Further research revealed that additional factors influenced the decisions that instructional designers make, including student and user experience (Demiral-Uzan, 2015), faculty needs (Lenert & Janes, 2017; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017), instructional design theory (Gray et al., 2015), and their own values and philosophical assumptions (Christensen & Osguthorpe, 2004; Demiral-Uzan, 2015; Honebein, 2017; Honebein & Honebein, 2015). Taken together, these findings uncover a more constructivist approach to the decision-making process, often based on the established reality of the instructional designer. Although general guidelines and models may exist, instructional designers will make decisions based on other factors, often drawing most heavily from their own experiences (Honebein, 2017; Honebein & Honebein, 2015; Yanchar & Hawkley, 2014, 2015; York & Ertmer, 2016)

Summary

The preceding chapter provided a summary of the key literature surrounding Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and job satisfaction, as well as key literature surrounding online learning in higher education and the role and responsibility of instructional designers in helping to fulfill the strategic mission of the HEI through the design of innovative and engaging online classes that support student learning. As this study looked at the job satisfaction of instructional designers, the review of the literature provides context for the roles and responsibilities of instructional designers in the HEI. Job satisfaction has been tied to positive organizational behavior and output; in the case of higher education, high job satisfaction in instructional

designers may lead to more innovative and engaging classes, as well as increased student

learning.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODS

Overview

The purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study is to describe the experiences of instructional designers in online higher education related to the intersection of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. Chapter 3 (a) provides a description of the design and methodology, (b) summarizes the research questions, (c) identifies sources of data collection as well as (d) criteria for selecting participants and (e) procedures for conducting this study. Data collection methods include a descriptive survey, interviews, and work product descriptions. Data analysis follows the process outlined by Moustakas (1994) to include epoche, phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, and synthesis, which are more clearly explained in the Data Analysis section of this chapter. Methods for establishing trustworthiness are discussed, as well as key issues for ethical consideration, including data collection using online tools.

Design

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) noted, "In its broadest sense, research is a systematic process by which we know more about something than we did before engaging in the process" (p. 5). This study used a qualitative inquiry approach to increase understanding and describe the experiences that contribute to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation in instructional designers working in online higher education. Qualitative inquiry serves to illuminate and capture the stories, perspectives, and lived experiences of the participants; qualitative researchers are more interested in how participants choose to understand and interpret their experiences (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Patton, 2015).

Qualitative inquiry also allows for deeper awareness of the experience that is contextually sensitive (Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2015). According to Moustakas (1994), all methods of

qualitative inquiry share certain commonalities, including recognizing the value of qualitative research and the necessity of alternative ways to capture the whole of human experience which cannot be done through quantitative means, obtaining descriptions through first-hand interviews, and considering experience and behavior as integrated and inseparable.

One method of qualitative inquiry, phenomenology, seeks to understand the shared subjective essence of the lived experiences of the study participants, specifically in their conscious experience and how they interpret or create meaning from that experience (Moustakas, 1994; Schwandt, 2015). Phenomenology draws on philosophical roots regarding the nature of what is experienced and how, as well as the assumption that all experiences have an essence which can be discoverable (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Moustakas, 1994; Patton, 2015; Smith, 2007; Van Manen, 2014). As stated by Van Manen (2014), "At the heart of phenomenology is a philosophically consuming fascination with the question of the origin, sources, and meaning of meaning and meaningfulness" (p. 74).

Phenomenology is most concerned with the individual shared experiences of a phenomenon, which are then reduced to a specific essence of that experience. According to Heidegger (2010), phenomenology is directly related to the structure of being and a deliberate exploration into those structures of being. In the case of this study, the structures of being form the essence that I sought to capture and describe, specifically instructional designers' experience of job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and motivation in higher education.

There are two main approaches to a phenomenological inquiry: hermeneutical phenomenology, as described by Van Manen (2014), which favors an interpretive-descriptive approach, and transcendental phenomenology, as described by Moustakas (1994), which favors a purely descriptive approach. Although all phenomenology falls under the umbrella of capturing

lived experience and the essence of that lived experience, there are key differences between the transcendental and hermeneutical phenomenological approaches that dictate how data are collected and analyzed. One key difference between transcendental and hermeneutical phenomenology is the role of interpretation in data collection and analysis. Whereas transcendental phenomenology is based on the assumption that the researcher can suspend or at least make a concerted effort to suspend personal beliefs related to the research, hermeneutic phenomenology is based on the assumption that the researcher is unable to suspend personal assumptions and beliefs, and thus they are a key part of data collection and analysis (Kafle, 2011).

The selected methodology for this is study is transcendental phenomenology. A transcendental phenomenological study is focused on providing rich textural descriptions; transcendental phenomenology draws on the philosophical work of Edmund Husserl, who was concerned with a philosophical approach to qualitative research, specifically as it dealt with the discovery of meaning and the essence of human experience (Moustakas, 1994; Smith, 2007). Smith (2007) noted "What makes Husserl's theory of knowledge phenomenological is his analysis of the structures of experience that form knowledge" (p. 317). According to Husserl, those structures are intentionality and intuition (Moustakas, 1994). The focus on intentionality is specific to the consciousness of the experience; according to Husserl, most experiences fall into a structured consciousness, an awareness of the existence of something (Smith, 2007). Further, Husserl operationalized intentionality in the system of *noema* and *noesis*. *Noema* is that which is experienced, while *noesis* is the way that the object is experienced, speaking to how sense is made (Smith, 2007). *Noema* and *noesis* also inform the textual and structural descriptions of the experience, which are key elements of data analysis and reporting.

In addition to intentionality, Husserl's focus on intuition refers to the beginning place of knowledge or understanding which exists outside of the experience but is a crucial part of developing understanding (Moustakas, 1994; Thomasson, 2017). Intuition includes a sensory element, specifically the awareness of the physical, but also insight about the meaning of the physical, or the essence (Smith, 2007). Both intentionality and intuition are key elements to Husserl's transcendental phenomenology as they require that the researcher fully immerse herself in the world, setting aside presuppositions and understanding the experience fully for what it is while also leading to a conscious awareness of the experience and the essence of the experience (Moustakas, 1994; Smith, 2007; Thomasson, 2017).

A transcendental phenomenological study was appropriate for this study due to my previous role as an instructional designer and as someone in leadership over instructional designers, experiences which could have influenced my interpretation of the findings. As this study sought to understand the experiences related to feelings of job satisfaction, job dissatisfaction, and motivation, a phenomenological method was appropriate. The activity of bracketing and epoche throughout data collection and analysis required that I consciously set aside beliefs and prior experiences to explore the experiences described by the participants in a new and untainted way (Smith, 2007). Qualitative researchers openly acknowledge that research is values-laden, therefore it is also the responsibility of the researcher to be mindful of those biases and recognize how they interact with and shape the data collection and analysis (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). A transcendental approach allows the researcher to bracket out their own experiences and describe, rather than describe and interpret, the essence of the experience; in this case, job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation of instructional designers in online higher education. Further, the focus of a transcendental phenomenological study is the description, not

interpretation, of the experiences of the participants. While it may or may not be possible to fully remove personal assumptions, the process of data collection and analysis forces the researcher to constantly check those assumptions.

Research Questions

Following are the research questions for this study:

Central Question (CQ): What experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation?

- **SQ 1:** What experiences do instructional designers associate with feelings of job satisfaction?

- **SQ 2:** What experiences do instructional designers associate with feelings of job dissatisfaction?

- **SQ 3:** How do instructional designers describe their motivation in the workplace in light of feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

Setting

This study drew from the pool of instructional designers working in HEIs that offer online classes and utilize instructional designers who work either individually or as a part of an instructional design team to design and develop online classes, introduce innovative practice and technology, and support online faculty. The HEIs represented in this study allowed for maximum variation and offered programs that supported both traditional and adult learners, undergraduate and graduate students. Participants worked at institutions that were private and public, liberal arts and research-based, faith-based and non-faith-based, and three participants came from community college systems that offered online programs and classes to students. All were regionally accredited to ensure a certain level of academic integrity. Within these institutions,

instructional designers worked in a variety of capacities. For-profit institutions were not included in the settings due to the general infrastructure which tends to be less academic.

To be considered "online," the HEI must deliver a course completely through "internet-based delivery and employing internet-based technologies" (Mbuva, 2014, p. 92); while many HEIs offer blended or hybrid courses, fully online classes often require greater administrative and instructional support to design and deliver the content to students (Rovai & Downey, 2010).

Online higher education is a broad setting, and includes large state universities with robust online programs, ranging from over 175 degree programs with over 30,000 online students to just under 50 programs and around 11,000 online students, as well as smaller, private schools, both faith-based and not, ranging from 200 online programs and 63,000 students to 58 programs and 70,000 online students. Community colleges also have begun to develop robust online programs and thus were also represented in this study. They range from large consortiums with several sites, including online, and over 30,000 students to smaller campuses with less than 6,000 students that are attempting to break into an online market.

Commonalities of all these programs include rolling start dates and accelerated courses, many of which are targeted toward working adults or students who could not attend a residential program. All of the institutions considered for this study are regionally accredited through the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS), the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), or the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). Accreditation is an important element of offering online higher education.

Institutions were geographically varied; three HEIs were located in the Western United States, one was located geographically in the South-Central United States, three in Midwestern states, two in the Southeast, and one in the New England region.

The type of institution was also varied, representing two state university systems, four faith-based private schools, one private research institution, and three community colleges with online course offerings. To protect my participants, pseudonyms have been assigned to both my participants and their sites.

One participant came from Mid-Valley State University, an urban, public, four-year state research university in the Northwestern United States. Mid-Valley State University is accredited by the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities and has a total enrollment of almost 31,000 students. Approximately 46% of undergraduate and 31% of the graduate population are enrolled in one of the 88 undergraduate or graduate online programs. Mid-Valley State University has a centralized instructional design model, with an instructional design team dedicated to the online program. Faye, the participant employed at Mid-Valley, exhibited high satisfaction due to the structure of the team, the strong online strategic plan, and her colleagues. She noted significant growth in the ID team related to the growth of the online programs, stating, "We are turning [online course proposals] away. We've had to change our internal system because we're getting so many proposals." This rapid development of online courses and online programs was the exception, rather than the rule, of the institutions represented.

Another participant came from Central Valley University (CVU), also part of a large four-year state university system in the Western United States. CVU was the newest campus in the state university system. With a total enrollment at that campus of just over 8,500 students, less than 2% of the students were engaged in online programming. Enrollment at CVU was the

most diverse, with 54% of the students being Hispanic or Latinx, 19% Asian, 10% White, 8% Non-resident Alien, and 5% African American. The participant, Angie, also noted a large population of first-generation college students at the school. The instructional design team at this institution was small; at the time of the interview, the participant was the only instructional designer on that campus, though they did have the benefit of an instructional design and faculty development consortium in the university system, which allowed for instructional designers and staff throughout the entire state system to collaborate.

Two participants came from Western Christian University (WCU), an urban, private, four-year faith-based institution in the Western United States. WCU has a total enrollment of a little under 8,000 students, the majority of which were a part of the non-traditional continuing and graduate school; 53% of the undergraduate students were enrolled in some or all online classes, and 93% of their graduate students are online students. WCU is less diverse, with 64% of their students identifying as White, 16% Hispanic or Latinx, 10% African American, and 10% making up other ethnicities. However, their online course and program offering is robust, with 97 degree programs, including doctoral offerings. WCU has a centralized instructional design team structure, with a team of at least four instructional designers and multimedia specialists supporting the continuing education and graduate online programs.

One participant came from Green Valley University (GVU), an urban, faith-based institution located in the southeastern United States. GVU is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. It is a smaller institution, with a total enrollment of just over 4,500 students, with only 23% of undergraduate and 17% of graduate students opting to enroll in online courses or programs. It has a slightly smaller online program, offering 19 undergraduate and graduate programs, with a separate instructional design

department that supports the online learning department. Green Valley is also fairly homogenous in its ethnicities; 75% of its students identify as White, 8% Hispanic or Latinx, 7% African American, and 10% making up other ethnicities.

Another faith-based institution, Lakeshore College is a large urban university located in the Midwestern United States. It is accredited by HLC and offers both graduate and undergraduate courses. There are over 17,000 students total, with a little under 12,000 undergraduate students and a little over 5,000 graduate students. Again, online programs play a small but growing role in the institution, with only 27% of undergraduates enrolled in the online programs and 6% of the graduate enrollment taking online courses. Lakeshore College initially had a distributed instructional design model, with instructional designers hired by and assigned to specific academic departments, though it is moving toward a more centralized instructional design model, with instructional designers working in an online learning department.

The final faith-based institution is Riverview Christian University, a small school in a large suburban setting in the upper Midwest. Also accredited by HLC, the institution has a total enrollment of a little over 3,600 students, predominantly undergraduate. It offers 14 online degrees, both undergraduate and graduate, in addition to partnering with school districts in the state to offer dual-credit courses to high school juniors and seniors, who can take the courses either residentially or fully online. Online enrollment percentages stand at 43% for undergraduate and 71% for graduate programs. Riverview also has a centralized instructional design team that supports all the online learning at the institution.

Cityview University is a private research university located in a suburban setting in the Northeastern United States. Accredited by the New England Commission of Higher Education, it has a total enrollment of 5,800, with an undergraduate population of just over 3,600 and a

graduate enrollment of just over 2,100. The student body at Cityview is relatively diverse and international; 46% of the student body is White, 20% are Non-resident Aliens (National Center for Education Statistics, 2017), 14% Asian, 8% Hispanic or Lantinx, 5% African American, and 7% other. The online programs at Cityview are small, with around 20% of the graduate students enrolled in one of the 14 online programs.

In addition to four-year degree-granting institutions, several participants for this study also worked for community colleges with growing online programs. The largest was Eastern State Community College, a multi-campus and a multi-site suburban community college accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Eastern State Community College has an enrollment of over 50,000 students, with 25% of those students taking online classes through the community college. Courses are available in over 60 disciplines. The instructional designers working at Eastern State Community College work under Eastern State Community College Online (ESCC Online), described by the participant as the "hub of online learning." ESCC Online serves all online faculty and students at that institution.

Another institution, South Central Community College (SCC), is similar in that it is a consortium of community colleges with a centralized administrative team. South Central Community College is located in an urban setting in the Southwestern United States. SCC is accredited by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges and has an enrollment of around 5,500 students, 28% of whom are enrolled in the online courses and programs through SCC. SCC has a diverse population of students, with 50% Hispanic or Lantinx, 32% White, 10% Black, and 8% of students categorized as other. SCC has more limited instructional design support, with a small instructional design team at individual campuses.

Finally, Upper Midwest Community College is a midsize institution located in an urban setting in the upper Midwestern United States. It is accredited by the HLC and serves a little under 14,000 students, all undergraduate, and 24% are enrolled in some or all online classes. The population is less diverse, with 62% of its students being White, 14% being Hispanic or Lantinx, 9% African American, and 15% categorized as other. Upper Midwest Community College has a smaller instructional design team, with two instructional designers, centralized to support the entire institution, but who also serve as trainers and faculty support. It also has a graduation or transfer out rate of only 34%.

Within these HEIs, instructional designers may be a part of a centralized instructional design team, such as the Curriculum Design and Development Department ("Curriculum developer," 2018), part of a specific online, nontraditional, or continuing education department, or in a specific academic department ("Learning technologies specialist," 2018). In all cases, however, the job responsibilities were similar in supporting faculty and furthering the mission of the university in developing online courses and curriculum.

Academic programs at the HEIs described in the previous paragraphs vary by length and populations served but share several defining characteristics such as the reliance on digital communication and technologies to delivery courses remotely to students, the utilization of some sort of a digital learning management system (LMS), and the requirement that students have sort of technological skills and access to internet (Allen et al., 2016; Mansureh et al., 2017; Seaman et al., 2018). The most prominent LMSs in higher education include Canvas, Sakai, Blackboard, and Desire2Learn (Hill, 2017). Generally, the institutions in this study are either on Canvas, Blackboard, or Moodle. Further, content is delivered to students through the learning

management system, and is frequently text-based, though there is an increase in the use of multimedia and video (Costley et al., 2017; Paiva, Morais, Costa, & Pinheiro, 2016).

Colleges and universities that offer online classes generally had faculty members who lack extensive knowledge of effective online instructional design principles (Ashbaugh, 2013; Bawa & Watson, 2017). The setting included instructional design support of the online programs, including instructional designers, technologists, and possibly even multimedia specialists. Instructional designers were able to support faculty in technology integration and online design, as well as introduce new and innovative pedagogies to support learners.

The increase of online course offerings requires additional support in pedagogy and learning strategies. According to a survey conducted in 2016, at the time the survey was conducted there were over 13,000 instructional designers in the United Stated (Intentional Futures, 2016). Although this number extended beyond instructional designers in higher education, instructional designers have a significant presence in higher education and often serve as institutional leaders (Houareau, 2017). Selecting institutions which offer online classes provides a consistent experience of working with faculty and subject matter experts to design and deliver online classes, and instructional designers were not widely part of higher education prior to the advent of online learning.

<div align="center">**Participants**</div>

Instructional designers function under various titles in their institution, including, but not limited to "instructional designer," "curriculum designer," "course designer," "online learning consultant," or "instructional technologist" (Intentional Futures, 2016; Sharif & Cho, 2015; Sugar & Moore, 2015). For the purpose of this study, their responsibilities included the design of online curriculum, technological innovation, and the support of full-time or adjunct faculty in the

design of courses. They did not need to have specific credentials in instructional design (Bawa & Watson, 2017). Several studies indicated that many who find themselves in instructional design positions do so circuitously, pursuing careers in other academic fields first (Moskal, 2012; Sharif & Cho, 2015).

According to Creswell (2013), phenomenology requires 3 to 25 participants, or until saturation is reached. For this study, saturation was reached at 11 participants. Maximum variation was achieved, and the greatest number of participants from a single site was two.

Sampling techniques included purposeful and snowball sampling, targeting professional groups that serve instructional designers in online higher education (Creswell, 2013). Participants needed to be instructional designers who worked in online higher education and had been at their current place of employment for 12 months or more as well as having worded as instructional designers for at least 12 months.

In utilizing purposeful sampling techniques, participants were obtained through networking and professional organizations., and participants were obtained through networking and professional organizations. A search was conducted of instructional designer communities and organizations through professional networking sites such as LinkedIn. Exploratory emails were posted to several professional organizations, such as Instructional Design Central (IDC) and Instructional Designers and Curriculum Writers, which are targeted for designers in online learning. Neither of these organizations yielded participants, so additional posts were published via my LinkedIn page and exploratory messages sent via LinkedIn to participants who fit the criteria. This yielded approximately half of the instructional designers who participated in the study.

The other half of participants were recruited utilizing snowball sampling, either through instructional designers who reached out to colleagues or posted on additional professional Listservs. One potential participant was unable to participate, but shared recruitment information through a Quality Matters Listserv.

In participant selection, it is important to note that because this is not a randomized sample but is instead targeting a specific demographic, some characteristics of the instructional designers are specific to the participant pool. For example, instructional designers are naturally collaborative, though those who choose to be active in professional groups online are most likely predisposed to certain beliefs and behaviors toward professional growth and development (Yanchar & Hawkley, 2014, 2015).

A questionnaire was used to gather demographic information, including age, gender, ethnicity, place of employment, length of time at current place of employment, and a job satisfaction survey developed by Spector (1994, 2011) was used for descriptive purposes to determine overall levels of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction (see Appendix A). Spector (1994, 2011) provides permission for use of the survey, as long as statistical results are shared with Spector once the data has been collected. These will be completed and run once the research has been completed for the present study. The survey will be scored using the criteria established by Spector (1997), which contain factors that align with motivation and hygiene factors found in Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg et al., 1959; 1993).

Procedures

The first step was to submit and receive Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval from Liberty University. See Appendix D for IRB approval. Once IRB approval was granted, exploratory messages requesting permission to post on their page were sent to two instructional

design groups that I belong to on LinkedIn: Instructional Design Central and Instructional

Designers and Curriculum Writers. In addition to posting on LinkedIn, I received permission to

post on the Instructional Design Central message board. Halfway through the process of

recruiting participants, one potential participant also shared my recruitment notice to a Quality

Matters Listserv they were a part of. I also made contact with colleagues and peers in online

higher education who worked with instructional designers or in an instructional design capacity.

Several weeks passed without participants volunteering, so I reevaluated where I posted,

reposted to groups and connections on LinkedIn, and began reaching out to other colleagues and

peers who work in higher education as an attempt to broaden my base of participants.

I reached out to potential participants through my connections on LinkedIn. As

participants expressed interest, the letter of consent was provided in addition to the initial job

satisfaction survey. The letter of consent outlined the procedures and methods of data collection.

My initial requests and advertisements for participants yielded no response. After

reevaluating what I was asking from participants, I eliminated one data source, a critical incident

journal, which would have required an additional 2–3 hours from participants over a period of

two weeks. Questions for the critical incident journal were then included in the interview

protocol, and I resubmitted to the IRB for approval. Once approval was granted, I was able to

recruit participants until saturation was reached.

As participants volunteered, they were provided with the letter of consent, as well as the

job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011). Prior to scheduling the interviews,

participants were asked to complete the survey which included demographic information and a

job satisfaction survey (see Appendix A); they were then assigned a pseudonym to protect their

identity and each site was renamed. The job satisfaction survey was used for descriptive

purposes, looking at general levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Interviews were scheduled, conducted, and recorded using the online web-based conferencing software Zoom. During the interview, instructional designers were also given instructions to create videos of at least one key instructional resource or artifact that they designed, describing the purpose of the artifact, the experience of creating it, and their feelings while doing so (see Appendix C). Participants were also asked to recommend colleagues or share the information about the study. One potential participant was unable to participate but did share the information about the study on a Quality Matters Listserv, which yielded several additional participants.

Interviews were all conducted between April and October 2019. Interviews were transcribed using Temi.com and then corrected as Temi.com is voice-to-text and required correction to ensure that the transcripts accurately matched the interviews. All were stored in a password protected Dropbox file and external hard drive until the study was complete. All participants and sites were assigned pseudonyms. Further, throughout the research process I kept a research journal and field notes, which were used as an additional data source and to support the bracketing and epoche process.

The Researcher's Role

As noted previously, I worked in higher education over 13 years, as an individual instructional designer, as part of an instructional design team, and while overseeing a team of instructional designers. In my time on an instructional design team and managing instructional designers, turnover was a fairly common occurrence, with most instructional designers leaving after two years. However, it became apparent that instructional designers who were satisfied with their jobs persisted at the university, maintained better relationships with faculty and colleagues,

and designed better classes that both aligned with the mission and vision of the university and were more innovative in their design.

As a middle manager, I looked for ways to keep the instructional design team motivated and satisfied in their work. I feel strongly that instructional designers can and should support the academic efforts of the HEI in offering online classes. It is this personal relationship and experience with instructional designers in online higher education that led me to select a transcendental phenomenological study to fully bracket out my experiences and let the experiences of the participants speak for themselves. Several participants were known to me, but I had no supervisory responsibilities over them in their current positions.

Remaining consistent with qualitative phenomenology, I am also considered a human instrument (Creswell, 2013; Miles, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014). My previously described experiences had the potential to influence data analysis, and therefore, I was deliberate about bracketing out my personal experiences as both an instructional designer and manager over instructional designers. Although I no longer work in adult online higher education full-time, I selectively shared previous experience with my participants so they felt at ease with my understanding of their work and the field but did not feel hindered by my previous role as a leader.

My previous experience and role in working with instructional designers is also important considering the selected methodology for this study. Transcendental phenomenology requires that I reflect upon and bracket out prior beliefs, assumptions, and experiences in the process of epoche to allow the experience of the study participants to be clearly described and reduced to structural and textual descriptions. The process of transcendental phenomenological research forced me to continually reflect on my own experience as an instructional designer and as a

manager of instructional designers to ensure that those experiences had a limited influence on my analysis and reporting.

Data Collection

Creswell (2013) noted that the primary data source usually relied upon in qualitative research is interviews, but several other types of data also exist and researchers are encouraged to explore additional ways of allowing the participants to express their experiences and the meaning that they construct from those experiences. Data collection is "a series of interrelated activities aimed at gathering good information to answer emerging research questions" (Creswell, 2013, p. 145). To achieve the most comprehensive picture of the phenomenon, multiple sources of data were collected, and these sources used to triangulate findings. Miles et al. (2014) notes that triangulation is the process of comparing and contrasting data from multiple sources to achieve a more comprehensive view of the phenomenon; confirmation of the findings is one of the main reasons for gathering multiple types of data for triangulation. Triangulation can also confirm the integrity of the data itself through cross-comparison of the themes and textural and structural descriptions that emerge.

In the study, interviews were the primary form of data collected, but other sources of data were used to confirm the participant's experiences. There are three main sources of data: a job satisfaction survey used for descriptive purposes, interviews, and descriptions of instructional materials or resources participants designed in either periods of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. My field notes and a research journal were kept throughout the data collection and analysis phase and provided additional insight. These sources of data will be used to triangulate and confirm the findings.

Data collection followed a prescriptive order. Once an instructional designer confirmed their participation, a letter of consent was sent to the participant via email, along with the demographic questionnaire and survey. The participant was asked to return the questionnaire and letter of consent prior to the interview. Interviews were scheduled based on participant availability and lasted between 39 and 112 minutes. During the interview, the work product was introduced, including parameters for completion. Participants were asked to complete a video narrative describing their feelings when developing an instructional artifact of their choice. They were asked to complete the instructional video within two weeks of the interview, though the longest that a participant took was 4 weeks due to issues in her personal life. Throughout the interview and analysis process, I kept a research journal which was used to further inform findings and analysis of the findings. The following sections describe each step of the data collection process with more detail.

The purpose behind asking participants to complete the survey, then conducting interviews, then asking the participant to complete the work product is that it allowed me to get a baseline understanding of the participants' general feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation based on the initial survey and through the data collected in the initial interview. Although I had planned that the work product sample video be produced within a two-week period to not draw out the data collection, in several cases, it did take longer. Participants were given a due date to complete their work product sample and asked to submit the video to a password protected unique Dropbox file. In certain cases, there were challenges with submitting to the Dropbox file, in which cases participants either emailed me a link to the screencast or emailed an mp4 file.

In cases where the participants did not submit by the due date, I sent a follow-up email the day following the due date reminding the participant of the product and asking if they were still able to complete this piece of data. Participants who were not able to submit by initial due date asked for an extension, generally a week, which was granted to them. Overall, data collection took an average of three to four weeks per participant based upon their schedule, with the shortest taking less than a week and the longest about six weeks. As soon as the work product sample was received, and checked to ensure sound and video integrity, participants were sent an electronic gift card to Amazon for $50 as a thank you for their participation.

Job Satisfaction Inventory

Prior to the interview, participants were asked to complete a demographic questionnaire, which included a job satisfaction survey developed by Spector (1994, 2011). The job satisfaction survey was chosen to provide a baseline for the understanding the participant's overall feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The inventory was based on nine facets of job satisfaction: pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, the nature of the work, and communication. Spector's job satisfaction survey was chosen because it was one of the more widely used surveys in terms of job satisfaction, and the facets identified by Spector (1994, 2011) had similarities to the factors identified by Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), and it has been well-tested in terms of reliability (Spector, 1997).

As the intention of the survey was descriptive, only the aggregate score was used to identify participants' overall feelings of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, which Spector (1994, 2011) notes can still give a general understanding of overall satisfaction. The scores indicated participants were satisfied, dissatisfied, or felt ambivalent about their jobs.

Interviews

At the heart of qualitative inquiry is the fundamental desire to understand the process and output of meaning-making for a particular population or individual. As such, one of the only ways to understand the meaning that an individual assigns to a particular experience is to talk to them (Patton, 2015). Salmons (2015) pointed out, "Researchers who want to understand the complexities of human drama often choose interviews as an entrée into another's inner reflections and thoughts, feelings, perceptions, and responses to the external world" (p. 1). Interviews are the primary method of data collection in phenomenological research (Creswell, 2013; Patton, 2015) and were used to address the central research question and sub-question one and sub-question two. Further, as phenomenological research is primarily concerned with the lived experiences of the participant, interviews are a crucial piece to understanding the participants' experiences and interpretations of those experiences.

This study utilized semi-structured interviews, suitable according to Rubin and Rubin (2012), who noted that a semi-structured interview may be appropriate if there are specific questions that are planned but the participants' responses may elicit follow-up, unplanned questions. A semi-structured interview was also appropriate because I was able to use a standard question set, informed by previous research on job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation and using the two-factor theory as a framework (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) note that a semi-structured interview is usually more appropriate when specific information is required from the participant. In the case of this study, the questions are based in the theoretical framework, and therefore require that initial structure. However, in keeping with a constructivist orientation, there needs to be some flexibility to allow the participants to fully express their experiences and feelings. As described by Merriam and Tisdell (2016), "[The semi-

structured interview] allows the researcher to respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic" (p. 111). A structured interview would not have provided the flexibility that was needed to elicit a rich response from my participants, but some structure was needed to ensure certain factors from Herzberg's theory were addressed. The interview was used to inform a response to the central research question – What experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation? – as well as sub-questions one and two: What experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation? and What experiences do participants associate with feelings of job dissatisfaction?

Interviews were conducted using computer mediated communication (CMC), specifically the web conferencing software Zoom. This allowed the interview to take place at a time and location that was convenient for the participant and myself, as well as at a distance. Initial interviews were scheduled for one hour and recorded using the Zoom recording tool, with a backup audio device used to record the verbal conversations and provide the audio file that would be sent for transcription. This additional support was necessary since there was an initial issue with a Zoom recording. A further benefit was that most instructional designers working in online higher education are familiar with the use of CMCs in the communication of information, and therefore it is a method with which the participant is familiar. There are some documented challenges to using CMC to collect data, namely ethical retrieval and storage of the interview as electronic media, which is addressed later in this chapter, and the fact that semi-structured interviews can be difficult based on the medium used and the information that the researcher hopes to gather (Creswell, 2013; Salmons, 2015).

However, the use of web conferencing to conduct and record the videos provided two main advantages. First, web conferencing reduces the feelings of transactional distance and increases the feelings of presence for interviews that are conducted at a distance. The increase in daily use of such technologies has afforded a more robust skillset in that area. Second, the video interviews were recorded, which fostered deeper data analysis not just of the narrative provided by the participants but also of non-verbal communication, which provides additional data (Bezemer & Mavers, 2011; Salmons, 2015).

The interview took place prior to the participants completing a video screen cast of an instructional material they created. A semi-structured interview was appropriate as the questions were constructed around Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, a method suggested by Rubin andRubin, (2012). Following is a list of main interview questions that I used to guide each interview. Probing and follow-up questions were used as needed to encourage more in-depth responses or to further explore emerging themes.

Standard Open-Ended Research Questions:

1. Tell me a little bit about yourself.

2. How did you become an instructional designer? (Or, why did you go into instructional design as a profession?)

3. Describe your job on a day to day basis. What kind of tasks do you usually do?

4. What do you enjoy most about your job?

5. What presents some of the greatest difficulties?

6. What makes you feel successful in your work?

7. Describe the amount of freedom that you feel you have to do your job. Do you feel like you are trusted with responsibilities?

8. Describe the kinds of opportunities that you have for advancement.

9. What other opportunities are provided for you for professional development and growth? How does that make you feel about your job?

10. What kind of recognition do you receive from the people you work with? From your supervisor?

11. How do you feel about your compensation?

12. What are some of the other benefits you perceive that either make you enjoy your job or not enjoy your job?

13. How do policies and procedures support or hinder you in your work?

14. Describe how your feelings about your work and the work environment impact the work that you do.

15. Describe times and situations when your colleagues or supervisor makes you feel valued or appreciated.

16. What kind of freedom do you have to be innovative in your curriculum design? What are some examples?

17. How satisfied or dissatisfied do you feel in your job?

18. When do you feel most motivated in your work?

19. Can you share a time when you felt particularly good or bad about your job? What happened?

20. How did that time when you felt particularly good or bad affect your general feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

21. How did that experience or those feelings affect your feelings about the current project you were working on?

22. What else would you like to share about your job satisfaction and dissatisfaction?

23. What else would like to add regarding your job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, or motivation in your work?

Questions 1 and 2 are introductory questions that were included to put the participant at ease. They also allowed the researcher to get to know their participant better and were important in setting the tone for the interview (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Questions 3, 4, and 5 allowed the participant to describe their working environment and helped them consider levels of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with their work. One of the factors addressed in the literature as influential in job satisfaction is the general working environment (Hagedorn, 2000; Herzberg, 1974; Moradi et al., 2013; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015). Although participants were asked to take a survey indicating their overall levels of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, these orienting questions provided further insight into the environment the instructional designer works in and some of the feelings that instructional designers have about their working environment. Questions 3, 4, and 5 address the CQ, What experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation, and SQ 1 and SQ 2, What experiences do instructional designers associate with feelings of job satisfaction, and What experiences do instructional designers associate with feelings of job dissatisfaction?

Questions 6 through 14 are influenced by Herzberg (1974, 1987) and his discussion of the contributing factors of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and they address SQ 1 and SQ 2. Questions 6 and 7 were posed specifically to allow the instructional designer to speak to the things in his or her work that they find difficult, which may lead to job dissatisfaction, or enjoyable, which may lead to job satisfaction. Because Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) argued that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction exist on two separate but related continuums, asking the

participants to express feelings of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction allowed me to explore the constructs separately with the instructional designers. Questions 8 through 15 were questions specific to the factors within Herzberg's theory that he noted are satisfying or dissatisfying (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg et al., 1959/1993). For example, as motivating factors include achievement and recognition for achievement, question 10 prompts the participants to share recognition that they receive from their supervisor or colleagues (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg et al., 1959/1993). Other motivating factors identified by Herzberg (1966) include the work itself (questions 4, 5, and 15), responsibility (questions 7 and 16), and advancement and growth (questions 8 and 9).

Questions were also posed regarding hygiene factors or specific to the work environment. These questions specifically address SQ 2. They include company policy and administration (question 13), supervision and interpersonal relationships (question 10), working conditions (question 14), salary and security (questions 11 and 12), and status (question 15). Finally, questions 16 through 19 allowed the participant to explore their feelings about their work environment and the work that they do, as well as the freedom they have to be innovative in their curriculum design. Question 19 was posed to allow additional reflection on the working environment and is considered a standard way of completing a semi-structured interview (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Interview questions 19 through 21 further explored the critical incidents that affect job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The purpose behind question 21 was to allow participants to connect their feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction during a particular incident to their motivation, both in general and specifically related to the related project.

Interview questions 16, 22, and 23 address the third research sub-question, How do participants describe their motivation in the workplace in light of feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

As this was a semi-structured interview, additional probing questions were asked throughout the interview process to help me develop a deeper understanding of the experience of the instructional designer related to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, and how that intersects with motivation. These questions were associated with the structure of the team, the planning process related to a strategic plan for online learning, the overall workload in terms of number of courses, and information about the learning management system.

Work Product

The final source of data allowed the instructional designer to use a screen captured video to describe elements of a course or instructional resource that they have created. The description was predominantly open ended, and instructional designers were asked not to make the videos longer than 45 minutes. Although participants were instructed in the protocol to take a minimum of 15 minutes, the videos were more frequently in the 10–15-minute range. Instructional designers were asked to respond to the following:

1. Describe the product or resource. What are the essential components? What instructional needs does it meet, and why was it created?

2. Describe your feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction during the creation of the resource. What did you enjoy the most about creating it? What did you find most challenging? Are you proud of your work?

3. Describe the process of creating the resource. With whom did you collaborate? How did those interactions affect your feelings about the project? What skills did it require? Did you have the resources that you feel like you needed to complete it?

The screen cast of the instructional resource responds to the central research question and the third research sub-question. As the third sub-question focuses on motivation in the workplace as exemplified in a work product that the instructional designers designed, and research has demonstrated that this data may provide insight into how the instructional designers make the connection between their levels of satisfaction at work and the instructional materials that they produce, this is a valuable source of data. Further, Jewitt (2012) pointed out the value of using video in bringing the researcher into the participant's world. By not only allowing the instructional designer to speak to their levels of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction but also make connections between their work product and job satisfaction or dissatisfaction, the work product provided a broader view of the instructional designer and their job satisfaction or dissatisfaction which also gave me greater insight into the work processes and interactions in the lived experiences.

Participants were asked to submit their video within two weeks of the study; those who did not were sent a follow-up email the day after the due date. Due to life circumstances, one participant did not submit their work product until four weeks following the interview. Another participant withdrew from the study when she was unable to complete the work product description.

Participants were given loose parameters around the work product. For my purposes, it needed to be something that they had developed or created. Each instructional designer chose to submit a product that they had previously described in the interview as a part of their jobs: Sadie,

Elliot, Angie, Maggie, and Wendy all chose products that they had developed for in-house training of faculty and staff; Tara, Breanna, Gwen, and Faye chose specific courses that they were working on; Leah shared a course template that she had created, and Levi chose to share an external resource that the instructional design team had developed in collaboration with other departments. The variety of resources that were selected and described demonstrates the variety of tasks that instructional designers are involved in in their institution.

Research Journal and Field Notes

In keeping with the parameters of qualitative research and transcendental phenomenology, a research journal including field notes of the experiences during data collection and analysis was also kept (Creswell, 2013; Phillippi & Lauderdale, 2018). Phillippi and Lauderdale (2018) noted, "The researcher should plan an approach to field note collection that is congruent with the theoretical framework and the methodological approach" (p. 383). The research journal and field notes informed general and elementary analysis for the central research question as well as all three sub-questions. Containing short notes made during the interviews, memos, and longer observations following the interviews – including descriptions and observations of the interviews as well as reflective elements, memos, preliminary data analysis, and notes about steps in the research process – the research journal, including field notes, adds depth to the findings of a qualitative study (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Phillippi and Lauderdale (2018) provide a framework for collecting field notes, including providing contextual information for the research, basic information about the study, and critical reflections. The notes can also contain identifying information about the participants, and thus steps will be taken to protect the identity of participants, and pseudonyms will be used when discussing participants or the site.

Further, the research journal and field notes will contain key observations that contribute to the qualitative research process. To that end, the research journal includes field notes and notes recording the bracketing and epoche process which took place throughout the study, including some preliminary data analysis that was then used during the data analysis process, and provides an audit trail for establishing trustworthiness. The research journal and field notes are used to inform the development of thick, rich descriptions characteristic of qualitative research, and inform data analysis for the central research question and all three sub-questions.

Data Analysis

Miles et al. (2014) noted that all steps of data collection and analysis are influenced by the decisions made by the researcher, and therefore may be impacted by specific biases held by the researcher. Prior to and during data collection and analysis, my experiences will be bracketed out, or set aside, to allow the lived experiences of the participants to come to light. Data analysis is an iterative process that requires consistent evaluation and reevaluation of the various sources of data to develop thick, rich descriptions of the phenomenon. Moustakas (1994) provided several options for method of data analysis; data analysis for this study will follow the modified Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen method, an adaptation of epoche, phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, and synthesis of meanings and essences. Data analysis will be a continual, ongoing process as interviews are conducted, and documents are collected, codes are assigned to the data, and findings are memoed (Miles et al., 2014).

It may be helpful to provide an overview of the steps of data analysis that were utilized as explained by Moustakas (1994). The entire process began with the epoche, the practice of setting aside or bracketing out all understandings, preconceived ideas, and assumptions about the topic. To do this, I had to continually be intentional about setting aside my preconceived

understandings and biases regarding instructional designers in online higher education. A professional transition out of my role overseeing instructional designers was helpful in doing so, as I was able to personally and professionally separate from my area of research. Moustakas (1994) describes the importance of epoche so that new ideas, events, and concepts are allowed to enter the consciousness and be seen again as if they were being seen for the first time. I engaged in this at the beginning of my research, as well as continually throughout the process, so that no prior judgement existed that would influence how I engaged with and analyzed the data, and so that the experiences articulated by the participants had equal value.

Following epoche, phenomenological reduction occurred, in which I spent time reading and listening to interviews and highlighting key ideas and statements. Moustakas (1994) notes that to go through phenomenological reduction is to look at the data, describe what is seen, and look again, always pulling out new or unique statements which exemplify the texture of the experience, and being open to seeing the phenomena that emerge from the experiences being described. Phenomenological reduction also includes the process of horizonalization, the process of continually seeking and finding new perspectives, ideas, or horizons. According to Moustakas (1994), horizons are the expressions of the participant that are relevant to the experience, and can be unlimited. Within phenomenological reduction, all statements are relevant and have equal value in the research process. The statements were used to create individual textural descriptions for each participant, and then used to develop a composite textural description.

Following phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation required that I utilize specific statements and themes to develop individual and composite textural descriptions. In this phase, there was a movement away from the facts of the experience and toward the meaning, reflecting on the various possibilities before settling on the essence of the experience. As noted

by Moustakas (1994), "Imaginative variation enables the researcher to derive structural themes from the textural descriptions that have been obtained through phenomenological reduction" (p. 98). There are four main steps to the process of imaginative variation, including identifying the varying possible structural meanings from the textural descriptions, recognizing the themes or contexts that contribute to the phenomenon, examining the various structures such as time, space, and materiality that contribute to the understanding and construction of the phenomenon, and finally identifying key statements within the data to conduct a complete textural description of the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994).

The final step was the synthesis of meanings and essences, taking the composite textural and structural descriptions and using them to construct a full structural and textural description of the essence of the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994); in this case, job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation for instructional designers in online programs in higher education. It is important to note that the essence may only represent that phenomenon at that given place and time, so it is ever changing. However, the process is such that it should give a fairly complete picture of the essence of the experience.

The overall data analysis process included individual horizonalization, deductive and inductive coding, phenomenological reduction, imaginative variation, and synthesis for each data source. However, throughout the analysis process, constant comparative steps and the triangulation of codes, clusters, and themes occurred to ensure consistency in the analysis and synthesis process. The qualitative data analysis software NVivo was initially used to store, manage, and display data during the analysis process.

Data analysis was conducted manually utilizing hard copies of the transcripts and note cards, as well as utilizing NVivo QDAS (v. 12). Most analysis and management took place

utilizing NVivo as it facilitated a centralized location where all sources could be stored, allowed

for the assigning of significant statements to nodes, and facilitated more efficient grouping of

nodes and coded data. NVivo also allowed for additional efficiency in the data analysis process

as I coded significant statements into nodes, annotated and memoed specific significant

statements, ran collective word searches to triangulate and check findings, and could organize

and display data.

However, additional analysis occurred outside of NVivo, documenting ideas and themes.

As noted by Merriam and Tisdell (2016), it was important to establish and follow a solid plan for

qualitative data collection, storage, and analysis to ensure consistency and effectively manage

data. Formal textual and structural descriptions were not written until after all data were

collected and coded, though preliminary analysis did occur to ensure that saturation was met.

Once saturation point was met, additional analysis took place to synthesize findings, and

composite textual and structural descriptions were developed.

Job Satisfaction Inventory

The job satisfaction inventory by Spector (1994, 2011) was used descriptively to identify

the overall feeling of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction by instructional designers and to

triangulate articulated feelings of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The inventory was scored

according to the scoring criteria communicated by Spector, using the absolute approach of

specific cut scores to identify overall job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

The overall range of scores was 36 to 216; scores ranging from 36 to 108 indicated

dissatisfaction, scores ranging from 108 to 144 indicated ambivalence, and scores ranging from

144 to 216 indicated satisfaction. Even a score that fell within "ambivalent" was valuable as it

indicated the presence of factors that contributed to both high satisfaction and high dissatisfaction.

Interviews

Preliminary data analysis began as soon as the first interview was conducted and transcribed. The audio recording of the interview was transcribed using the web-based voice to text program Temi, and then I reviewed and clarified the transcripts before sending them to participants for clarity. All but one interview took place using Zoom web-conferencing software and were recorded using both an external voice recording as well as the web conferencing software. Attention was given to the transcription process as, as Riessman (1993) noted, the information included in the transcript impacts data analysis and ultimately may have "serious implications for how a reader will understand the narrative" (p. 12). The analysis followed the modified Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen process outlined by Moustakas (1994), explained in the previous section, and included coding as described by Miles et al. (2014). I began with a list of deductive codes based on the work of Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) and the research questions, but this only provided initial codes, which are in Table 2 in Chapter 4.

The process of epoche occurred at the beginning and throughout collection and analysis phases, as I constantly checked my own assumptions to ensure they did not influence the collection and analysis of the data. In the phenomenological reduction phase, I bracketed the focus of the research, and identified and recorded all unique significant statements. I initially refrained from narrowing down or synthesizing any topics or ideas; that occurred after several readings of the transcripts through horizonalization. Non-repetitive, non-overlapping statements were classified as meaning units and assigned codes. Once that occurred, the meaning units were clustered into themes (Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994). Textual descriptions for each

participant were developed based on the themes identified in their interview and then a composite textural description was developed. After an initial read through and listen and review of the interview, I identified specific key statements and narrowed them down throughout the analysis process. I continued to read through transcripts to confirm and verify key statements as a part of developing codes and themes.

According to Moustakas (1994), the next step in data analysis is imaginative variation to determine how the *experience* came to be the phenomenon being studied. The themes were used to identify any and all possible meanings, both individually for each interview, as well as collectively cross-comparing themes and meanings across the interviews. Themes were continually revised and refined and used to inform imaginative variation. Moustakas (1994) noted, "Through imaginative variation the researcher understands that there is not a single inroad to truth, but that countless possibilities emerge that are intimately connected with the essences and meanings of an experience" (p. 97). In this phase, as the textural descriptions were considered, various meanings emerged; throughout the process, all meanings were considered for each participant. These meanings, units, and themes were used to construct a description of the structures and textures of the experience.

Finally, the synthesis of meanings and essences took place. I synthesized the individual and composite structural and textural descriptions of the experience from each interview and developed a structural and textural description of the essence. Individual textural and structural descriptions were used to created composite textural and structural descriptions of the experiences of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation of instructional designers. NVivo software was used to track, organize, and display the data and data analysis (Miles et al., 2014; Moustakas, 1994), though additional analysis and memoing took place outside of the software.

The synthesis of meanings and essences provided an overview of the experiences of the

"phenomenon as a whole" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 99) and allowed me to construct a thick, rich

description of the essence of the experience.

Work Product

For the work product analysis, I began by transcribing the video and then used the

transcription to develop a multimodal transcript. I chose to transcribe the video rather than send

it out to be transcribed because the development of the multimodal transcript required a different

process and included the necessity of adding visual notes and cues and determining how that

should be laid out on the transcript. Additional rationale for personally transcribing the videos

included protecting the identity and institution of my participants, as the work product transcripts

contained information and images that revealed the site. The multimodal transcript was

developed to include comments and notations on key screenshots described by the participants.

According to Bezemer and Mavers (2011), the multimodal transcript includes not only the text of

the spoken words but can also capture what is visually on the screen through additional

descriptions and the inclusion of images from the videos as appropriate to illustrate the point

being made by the spoken conversation. Admittedly, some of the transcription process including

visuals were limited based on a constructivist paradigm and the meaning that I drew from the

images, but the purpose of this data collection method was for the participant to share the

product of their work based on their job satisfaction or dissatisfaction and motivation. Thus, the

video and description were vehicles to allow the instructional designer to describe their feelings

of satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation around the product they had created.

During the phenomenological reduction phase, work product descriptions were coded

based on both previously developed codes, as well as new codes that led to a richer, deeper

understanding of the phenomenon. Data from the work product descriptions were also used within the structural and textural descriptions. Again, I continued to bracket out my own experiences, then proceeded to reduce the findings to horizons and significant statements. According to Moustakas (1994), the horizons are unlimited. Horizons and significant statements were synthesized into larger themes which were used to create individual and collective textural and structural descriptions of the phenomenon (Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994). The multi-modal transcript added an additional layer of analysis, as noted by Bezemer and Mavers (2011), because it was not just the verbal themes that were captured but also the visual features; in this case, the visual cues that the instructional designer identified and chose to share with me. Attention was paid to the emotions and experiences related specifically to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation that the instructional designer expressed as he or she described the work product.

From the work product transcripts, non-repetitive, non-overlapping themes were identified and used to form the meaning units of the experience, and then clustered into themes. Themes were then used to develop textual and structural descriptions (Moustakas, 1994). I followed the process of imaginative variation, including identifying all of the possible meanings that could be constructed from the structural and textural descriptions and the structural qualities of the experience, and then developing structural individual and composite structural descriptions. In the synthesis state, these textural and structural descriptions were triangulated with the other data collected to formulate the essence of the phenomenology; specifically, job satisfaction or dissatisfaction and motivation in instructional designers in online higher education (Creswell, 2013; Ravitch & Carl, 2016).

Research Journal and Field Notes

Throughout the data collection and analysis process, I kept a research journal which included field notes, observations, memos, and reflective notes that I took during interviews and throughout the analysis process. Field notes provide a helpful context for the study, including providing additional information about the context of the research, as well as key information and observations (Phillippi & Lauderdale, 2018). Field notes added some depth to the data, though it served primarily as a vehicle for bracketing and epoche, with some preliminary data analysis. Further, as Phillippi and Lauderdale (2018) note, full disclosure in research journals and field notes can further strengthen the reliability and credibility of the study as the researcher uses them to capture observations, experiences, and pertinent information. However, in keeping with transcendental phenomenology, less emphasis will be placed on my interpretation of the experience, and more emphasis will remain on the analysis of the data as the captured experiences of the participants.

Trustworthiness

There is a level of complexity that exists in establishing trustworthiness in qualitative research. As Patton (2015) noted, "The credibility of your findings and interpretations depends on your careful attention to establishing trustworthiness" (p. 685). Establishing trustworthiness entails the researcher's continual attention to biases and prior experiences that may affect data collection and analysis, but also ensuring that research practices are clearly articulated and transparent. This occurs through several means such as establishing credibility, dependability and confirmability, and transferability, and is accomplished through means such as bracketing, member checking, an audit trail, and data triangulation.

Credibility

Credibility was established through the bracketing of the researcher's own experiences prior to, as well as during, the data collection and analysis phase. Bracketing includes setting aside my own biases, beliefs, and presuppositions so that the experience can speak for itself (Creswell, 2013; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Moustakas, 1994). Bracketing is particularly important in qualitative research, as it is inherently values-laden, and the researcher needs to be aware of how the values affect data collection and analysis. Data triangulation occurred through the use of the job satisfaction inventory, the interviews, and the work product description to capture the essence of the experience. The research journal and field notes documented research decisions, ideas, biases, and personal reflections (Patton, 2015; Ravitch & Carl, 2016).

Dependability and Confirmability

Dependability was established through clear descriptions and rationale of the method chosen, data triangulation, and documentation of the steps of the research process in the fieldwork research journal (Schwandt, 2015). The research process was documented through the research journal, and data were organized and inventoried using NVivo and backed up in multiple locations that are password protected (Patton, 2015).

Throughout the research process, journaling as the researcher was not just used as a way of continually documenting reasoning for decisions, but also to establish confirmability through documenting biases and personal interpretations of the data, as well as providing space for an audit trail (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). The audit trail delineated how the data were collected, analyzed, and interpreted.

Transferability

In qualitative research, transferability is limited based on the nature of capturing the lived experiences of a particular group of people who all share the same experience; however,

transferability will be increased through providing thick descriptions that readers and other researchers can use to make comparisons to other contexts (Patton, 2015; Ravitch & Carl, 2016). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) note that transferability in qualitative research is heightened when the researcher provides these thick, rich descriptions of the settings, participants, and findings, with "adequate evidence presented in the form of quotes from participant interviews, field notes, and documents" (p. 257). They further note that the use of maximum variation can also increase transferability because of a greater range of experiences that are included. Transferability was increased in this study through the use of maximum variation in the participants, as well as the reporting and analysis of the participants' experiences.

Ethical Considerations

In all research, it is important to keep ethical issues at the forefront. Ethical issues can arise at all stages of the research process, from data collection to the articulation and dissemination of the findings (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) further noted that ethical practice within a study begins with the researcher, his or her own biases, and ethical standards. There are several key ethical considerations that are applicable to this study. First, I bracketed out my own experiences in online higher education and as an instructional designer to allow the voices and experiences of the study participants to be heard. Second, steps were taken to ensure the participants' identities were protected, including using pseudonyms for their names and places of work. Any information that could potentially identify them was scrubbed. This is particularly important as their experiences are of great value to the study but sharing specific elements of dissatisfaction with their workplace could be perceived as a risk. The use of the video of the instructional product could also be considered an ethical risk for participants, as they are sharing information about the instructional resources that they have

created, but this risk is mitigated through safe storage practices and choosing not to utilize

visuals while reporting the data, though the visual components of the work product sample

played an important role in the data collection and analysis.

No research was conducted until approval had been granted from the Internal Review

Board at Liberty University, and care was be taken to ensure that the participants understood the

purpose, nature, and risks of the study. Questions about the nature of the findings and how they

would be shared were answered and if a potential participant expressed concern, they were

encouraged to not participate if they did not feel comfortable doing so. This information was

clearly stated in the consent form, and then reiterated throughout the data collection. One item of

particular note is that permission to use the job satisfaction survey is contingent upon being

willing to share the quantitative findings of the survey with the author of the survey. As this is a

qualitative study, the quantitative findings bear no influence on the results of the study. Although

it will not contain any identifying information, participants need to be aware of this use.

Participants' identities were protected, and data collected was stored in password protected

folders and files.

Finally, Creswell (2013) noted that the use of computer technology in collecting data

presents a unique challenge today. As this study used a web-conferencing software for parts of

data collection, additional care was taken to protect the identities and recordings of the

interviews and instructional materials. All information was saved and stored digitally in

password protected locations. One participant withdrew from the study after completing the

interview but prior to completing the work product video, and all information was deleted.

Participants were not compensated for the contribution to this research, though each did

receive a $50 gift card to Amazon as a thank you for their time and effort.

Summary

The preceding chapter outlined the methodology for the study, including the setting, participants, data collection, data analysis, methods for establishing trustworthiness, and specific ethical considerations. A transcendental phenomenological study was chosen as it gives voice to the experiences related to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in instructional designers who are currently employed in HEIs that offer online classes and programs. Several sources of data triangulate the experience: interviews, video description of an instructional product designed by the instructional designer, and a demographic survey on job satisfaction. These sources of data were reinforced though the use of a research journal and field notes. I bracketed out my own experiences prior to and during data collection and analysis to allow the full experience of the participants to be expressed. Trustworthiness is established, with care given to data collection, triangulation, and providing rich, thick descriptions that allow for transferability. Ethical considerations included data collection, especially when using an online method, as well as protecting participant identities and data storage.

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Overview

The purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study was to describe the experiences of instructional designers in online higher education related to the intersection of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. Chapter 4 presents a summary of the findings for this study, including (a) a description of each of the participants in this study, (b) the results of the data analysis, including an explanation of the themes and codes identified as well as narratives that inform responses to the research questions, and c) the responses to the research questions. Several tables are included to provide a visual representation of the data. The following research questions and sub-questions guided the study:

CQ: What experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation?

- **SQ 1:** What experiences do participants associate with feelings of job satisfaction?

- **SQ 2:** What experiences do participants associate with feelings of job dissatisfaction?

- **SQ 3:** How do participants describe their motivation in the workplace in light of feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

Data collection included a demographic and job satisfaction survey, interviews, and work product screencasts in which the participants explored their satisfaction and motivation while creating an instructional resource.

Participants

Participants came from a broad range of institutions and backgrounds, and with varying academic credentials. All had earned at least a master's degree, though not necessarily in an education-related field. Interestingly, several of the participants interviewed had been working at their institution in positions other than an instructional designer before stepping into the ID role. This is consistent with the literature, which indicates that instructional designers in higher education often come from fields other than education and may not even have degrees in an education-related field (Intentional Futures, 2016). Also consistent with the literature were the varying roles and responsibilities that the participants found themselves in, as well as how they perceived their own place in the institution. A total of 11 instructional designers participated in this study. Their general demographic information can be found in Appendix E.

Following are descriptions of each of the participants. Pseudonyms have been assigned to participants and their institutions to protect sensitive information.

Sadie

Sadie was a female in her 40s who had been at the same institution almost 10 years, though in different positions. She had been an instructional designer for only three years. Her department served primarily non-traditional online students and had a centralized instructional design team that served all content areas and subjects in the online department. She had a master's degree in curriculum and instruction, with an undergraduate degree in education. By her own admittance, instructional design had not always been an area of interest, though initially she had pursued a job in education. While working at her institution, she developed a strong interest in instructional design, at which time she made the transition to an instructional design position.

Sadie considered herself an informal leader on her team, in part due to the fact that she had the longest experience at the institution on the team. Sadie expressed some frustration and low levels of satisfaction, though she was careful in how she articulated that frustration. In her interview and work product description, factors that contributed to these feelings included experiencing significant change, a direct supervisor who did not understand the ins and outs of the work that the team did, and a significant workload without the resources to adequately respond to that workload. This resulted in low satisfaction in the quality of work she was able to produce on occasion but also a desire and vision for what would be possible with the right resources and support. In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that she felt ambivalent about her job, which was also reflected in the interview where she stated,

> It's a tough question to answer completely honestly. Because while I love the place that I work for and I have complete buy-in with the institution, because of our turnover over the last three years, it has been tough. And expectations are constantly changing. Roles seem to be changing and so I'm trying to find satisfaction in different places.

Tara

Tara was a female in her 30s who had been working in higher education for over six years, though had only been an instructional designer for a little over a year at the time of the interview. Several organizational experiences were similar to Sadie's in terms of institutional dynamics and the trickle-down effect on work processes and procedures. Tara worked on a centralized instructional design team that supported an online non-traditional and continuing education program.

There were a few institutional tension points for Tara. Although she expressed the importance of her team in terms of support for one another, she also recognized some strain, made worse when her direct supervisor did not address these issues for the health of the team. Compensation was also another point of frustration; although there were additional benefits in terms of generous paid time off and investment in professional development, she recognized that there were consequences to lower financial compensation, such as reducing the pool and caliber of potential hires. Tara had a young family at home and described some challenge with balancing her work and personal life. Thus, she felt valued when her institution was willing to work with her to provide a more flexible schedule.

Tara had an early interest in education but did not originally pursue it as a career. Tara noted that she struggled with making connections in the classroom but found a niche in instructional design which allowed her to connect with something she loved: education. She explained,

> [E]ducation was something that I did in my undergrad and I've always thought I'd be a teacher, but then just never could find a great way to connect with actually teaching in the classroom. So, in my opinion, instructional design and curriculum development is an awesome way to still be in that field and connect with things that you're passionate about but not have to do it in a classroom setting.

Tara also received a master's degree, but her degree was in leadership. In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that Tara felt ambivalent about her job, but on the low end of ambivalence, indicating that factors contributing to dissatisfaction were still significant. She described her experiences with job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as "ranges" of feelings on a day to day basis.

Breanna

Breanna was a female in her late 20s. She had been working in higher education for over five years, though only a year and a half in instructional design. She became an instructional designer following a conversation with a colleague at her institution, and then did as much on-the-job and peer training as possible. She indicated that her institution more or less "took a chance" on her, and she was glad they did because "now that I'm having to move on, you know, that's been a whole world that's open to me…I think that the skills are transferable." As an instructional designer, Breanna articulated both a love of learning and an appreciation for the relational aspect of being an instructional designer. She expressed excitement and motivation when she was working with someone who was excited about his or her content and the course she was working on with them. She also loved the culture and the opportunities that working in higher education afforded. Shortly after the interview, Breanna would be transitioning away from her position at her institution due to some institutional circumstances.

Despite her imminent transition away from her institution, Breanna provided insight into the experience of an instructional designer working in online higher education. For Breanna, her departure from her institution was based on position availability; the institution was restructuring, and she found there was no longer a position available in the field she wanted to pursue. Reapplying was an option, but the new position available came with a significant pay cut. When talking about leaving, she explained, "it's one of those things like I'm … I don't think I made the wrong decision, but it definitely didn't work out in my favor."

In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that Breanna felt ambivalent about her job, though in the interview she was clear that she still enjoyed her job and the work she got to do as an instructional designer.

Leah

Leah was a female in her late 30s. She had been working at her current institution for approximately five years and in instructional design for around ten years. Leah had a master's degree in fine arts, and although she had engaged in professional development and training related to instructional design, she did not receive any formal education in the field. Leah became an instructional designer when a position opened and she was encouraged to apply for it, despite having no previous history working in instructional design. However, she had shown some aptitude for and interest in the work.

Similar to Breanna, Leah was finishing her work at her current institution and preparing to transition to a new institution. Leah's institution had two organizational models in terms of how instructional designers were utilized: both a centralized team and instructional designers in specific academic departments. Leah was a part of a specific academic division rather than a centralized team, which caused some dissatisfaction and frustration as there were times when institutional siloes and red tape prevented her from being able to do her job. Leah was frank about her transition to a new institution; it was not necessarily one single event that led to her wanting to pursue work at another institution, but rather a general feeling that she had reached her peak: "I feel proud of what I've accomplished… in the online programs. Um, but I also felt sort of like my skills had kind of stagnated and I was really looking for the opportunity to do different and more interesting work."

In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the responses indicated that Leah felt ambivalent about her job; that the presence of elements that led to satisfaction did not outweigh the absence of factors of job satisfaction that would keep her at the institution. Leah found a lot of satisfaction in being able to do a good job and contribute

something of value to her institution, thriving on positive feedback. However, Leah found herself most frustrated with the setting of the institution. She was disconnected from departments that could provide support, such as IT, didn't feel she had institutional support, and received pushback from faculty. Leah expressed overall satisfaction with her work when asked outright, though, throughout the interview, she articulated specific areas, such as opportunities for growth and "expanding [her] horizons" more than she was able to at her current institution, that pushed her to look at jobs in other institutions.

Levi

Levi was a male is his late 30s working at a private, faith-based institution in the Midwest. While he had a PhD, it was in a field not related to instructional design or education. He had been an instructional designer for 13 years, and at his current institution for 4.5 years. The instructional design department at Levi's institution was what he described as a "one-stop shop" in meeting the instructional needs of the entire institution, but was focused primarily on the non-traditional, online departments.

Like the other participants in this study, he became an instructional designer by chance when a position opened up at his previous institution while he was working on his doctorate. He found he enjoyed the work and had an aptitude for instructional design, noting,

> I also really love the intersection of education and technology that instructional designers deal with . . . as well as, uh, pedagogical practices. Um, just something that most doctoral programs don't really get into…if you're not in education just, most of it's just so focused on what you're teaching instead of how you teach it…

Unlike the other instructional designers, Levi had some team-leadership responsibilities in addition to his work in instructional design, and thus provides a unique perspective for

instructional designers. Levi also taught in an adjunct role. Levi's feelings of satisfaction rested in his ability to make a valuable contribution to the institution, as well as his confidence in the team that he worked with.

In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that he felt satisfied in his job, which was consistent with what he shared in his interview.

Elliot

Elliot was a male in his later 30s working at a private research institution. The school enjoyed a significant reputation as a high-quality institution for its traditional, on ground academics, while the online programs rested predominantly in a department of graduate, professional, and continuing studies. Similar to other participants, Elliot's route toward becoming an instructional designer was circuitous. It was only after he began working in online instructional design that he chose to pursue additional formal education in the field. In addition to his work as an instructional designer, Elliot was also an adjunct faculty member, teaching classes both at the community college level, as well as at a larger predominantly online university. He was also working on a doctorate in an education-related field.

The instructional design department at Elliot's institution was specific to online learning, though Elliot noted that the institution did not have a strong strategic plan for online learning, a source of some frustration given his understanding of education and online learning in general However, overall, Elliot expressed high levels of satisfaction in his work and his job, in part because of his love of learning and relationship with learning in general. Elliot recognized the importance of the relationships that IDs build both with faculty and other departments within the institution and enjoyed the kinds of relationships that he was able to develop. Elliot also

articulated a strong preference to be an instructional designer in an institution that allowed him to build those relationships rather than a position that was purely course design.

In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that the participant felt satisfied in his job. Elliot's satisfaction was evident in the way that he described elements of his job, using words like "rewarding" and "exciting."

Angie

Angie was a female in her mid-50s, working at a large state university system in the Western United States. She had a Master of Science degree in education and a graduate certificate in instructional design. She had been an instructional designer for a little over three years, and at her current institution for a little under a year and a half. She became an instructional designer like several other participants: while working at a previous institution in a different position, another colleague suggested to her that instructional design might be a job that would interest her. The institution paid for her to get her certificate in instructional design, and she found that she had an aptitude for the work.

As a first-generation college student herself, Angie had a unique relationship with learning and higher education. She stated,

> Well I think that, um, it's a, in an environment that respects diversity and inclusion and, um, it's not like the corporate world in that way. And I have happened upon my way into academia. I really had no, um, I'm a first-generation college student, so yeah. So I was like really quite like intimidated by all the professors and all of that … I kept getting opportunities to learn and grow and get new information and you know, like with implicit bias and hiring and all those kinds of things… I felt like this was a better fit for me.

In her current position she experienced some frustration with not having enough work to do and was in the process of applying for other positions at institutions nearby. It is important to note that her institution, as a part of a larger state university system, was limited by some of the politics of higher education, specifically as it related to online learning in higher education. This was another point of tension for Angie, as it represented some barriers to her work. Angie expressed higher levels of satisfaction and motivation when having a robust project that she could "sink her teeth into," something she did not have at her current institution. According to the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that the participant felt satisfied in her job. Specific to this participant, the most frustrating element was not the work or colleagues; rather, it was a lack of work that she was experiencing.

Gwen

Gwen was a female in her mid-50s working for a community college in the Eastern United States. She has been an instructional designer for four years, working at her current institution for four years; prior to her current role, she worked at another institution as a faculty member and instructional technology support. Her movement into instructional design was partially borne out of a desire to take a break from teaching, and she saw a specific need for more distance learning support when working at a previous institution. She began providing distance learning support while still teaching full time and pursued a second masters that allowed her to be more credentialed in the work that she was doing. She had also recently finished a doctorate focusing on leadership in the community college. Gwen provided a unique perspective, noting she did not think she "fit the ID mold," that her interest in instructional design was related to understanding another function of higher education, and that she "used being an ID as a stepping

stone to other things." In her interview, she highlighted some of the more tedious aspects of the work that instructional designers do, sharing,

> I thought it would be a welcome relief from the routine of teaching and the demands of teaching . . . I just grew weary of it. It wasn't that bad when I was on site and I could engage with people more. It's just this remote stuff I think has gotten to me and made me really highlight what I don't like about the job.

However, Gwen also later addressed that the opportunity she had to describe her work product also highlighted her passion and desire for supporting and improving the student experience.

The institution where Gwen worked had a centralized online division in addition to regional locations, and as such, instructional designers all serve in the online division, a team of around 12 instructional designers. Gwen worked 100% remotely, away from the team and the campus. In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that the participant felt ambivalent about her job, though on the high end of ambivalence.

Maggie

Maggie was a female in her early 50s, and like several other participants, a relative newcomer to the field of instructional design in higher education, pursuing the role based on the recommendation of a colleague. She worked in a community college system in the South Central United States in the role of an instructional designer, though her responsibilities included not just course instructional design but training faculty in best practice in online learning, some accessibility support, and technology recommendations. Her own experiences as a learner, as well as her children's experiences in online education, influenced her approach to instructional design in online education, focusing on solid pedagogy over technological innovation. She

explained, "Technology is what I say I work in, but I'm an educator when it comes down to it."

A recurring theme or idea that Maggie continued to return to was that it did not feel like the institution had a strong understanding of the role of the instructional designer, a source of frustration as she had a strong desire to improve the learning experience for students. In addition to her work in instructional design, she was also an adjunct faculty member, teaching business and communication classes. Maggie was in the process of finishing a doctorate in educational leadership, focusing on online higher education.

Although there was a centralized online learning division, there were also instructional designers at individual sites or centers, though their interaction with one another was limited. This was a source of frustration for Maggie. In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that the she felt ambivalent about her job, and the score fell on the lower end of the spectrum, indicating an overall leaning toward dissatisfaction. Maggie provided some insight into this scoring when she explained that she loved her job, but she did not love the institution.

Faye

Faye was a female in her mid-60s, working for a large state university system in the Western United States. Faye provided insight into the overall experience as an instructional designer, as she had been working in higher education for over a decade, but prior to her work in online instructional design in higher education, had spent over two decades in instructional design and training in the corporate sector. Faye had two master's degrees, one in organizational management and the other in educational psychology, both earned while working in the field as a professional. Her own experiences also influenced her ongoing desire to provide a solid, engaging educational experience for students.

The institution where Faye worked had a robust online division with a centralized instructional design department. Faye noted that the instructional design department was thriving, and they were in the process of hiring new instructional designers. In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that the participant felt strong satisfaction in her work. This was consistent with the interview, in which she continually identified what she loved about her job and why, including strong support and vision within the HEI for online learning and the work of the instructional designers.

As someone who had been an adult non-traditional student herself, she had a particular relationship to learning. During the interview, she shared some of her motivation "I'm passionate about, that everybody deserves world class education. If they want it, they deserve to get it. And that's why I love doing online learning because I want to contribute to that." Faye was passionate about her work as well as the institution where she worked, highlighting the importance of a positive working environment overall on satisfaction and motivation.

Wendy

Wendy was a female in her late 30s, working for a small community college in the Midwestern United States. The roles and responsibilities that Wendy fulfilled included not only instructional design and instructional design support but also instructional technology and accessibility support for online courses. She was part of a small team of instructional designers and instructional technologists that served the community college, though worked predominantly with faculty to move face-to-face classes into an online environment. Wendy had been at her current institution for eight years. Similar to other participants, Wendy did not set out to become

an instructional designer but found herself well-suited to the role, taking a job when she was a student to support faculty who wanted to build their own course websites.

At her current institution, her role and responsibilities included helping faculty prepare their online courses each semester, working with the new development of online courses, and facilitating classes and training for the faculty who teach and develop online classes; in many ways, a catch-all for anything instructional for online teachers. In the job satisfaction survey published by Spector (1994, 2011), the aggregate score of the response indicated that the she felt dissatisfied in her job, something that she did not report, but alluded to in mentioning that she was willing to look for another job. Wendy was able to articulate key feelings of frustration and discouragement related to key incidences when she felt like her institution did not fully support her or allow her opportunities for growth and professional development. In one specific event, she was told that she was not allowed to go to a conference that she had been scheduled to present at, noting, "I wanted to be there. I was extremely excited . . . my hopes and dreams were just crushed."

A Portrait of an Instructional Designer

This sample of instructional designers provides a comprehensive and consistent view of the instructional designer in higher education based on the literature. None of the participants initially set out to be instructional designers, but each stepped into the role out of need, skill development, or because they found they had an aptitude for the role. All of them received advanced degrees, though not necessarily in education (Intentional Futures, 2016). Their tasks all include working with faculty in some capacity, both full-time and adjunct, though primarily adjunct (Houareau, 2017; Kumar & Ritzhaupt, 2017; Ritzhaupt & Kumar, 2015). Roles and responsibilities vary, though all work within the LMS and provide support for faculty, including

training on best practice and online learning, in addition to the support they provide in the actual design of instruction (Bawa & Watson, 2017; York & Ertmer, 2016). Interestingly, several participants also discussed ways they engage with the institution at large, supporting research and other projects.

Participants articulated a desire to feel pride in their work, to feel that it mattered and contributed overall to the institution. When that was challenged, it fostered feelings of frustration. It was important to them to feel like what they do is of value and is contributing to the positive experiences of students and faculty. While innovation emerged in some conversations, participants emphasized that innovation existed within the parameters set within the institution and were specific to meeting the needs of students and facilitating the work that faculty did.

One thing all participants also noted was their desire for professional growth and advancement, as well as a desire for respect for their knowledge and abilities in teaching and learning. They all described themselves as learners, and had, as one of the participants described it, a particular "relationship" with learning and education.

Their institutions provided the context for the work; participants felt varying levels of satisfaction and dissatisfaction depending upon the freedom they felt within their institution, how they were able to contribute to the overall experience of students and faculty positively, and how their institution communicated they valued them. As their work was inherently collaborative, relationships were particularly important, from having a solid working relationship with faculty and SMEs to a supportive team and supervisor.

Results

Data collection and analysis followed the protocol outlined in Chapter 3 to ensure trustworthiness and validity in the analysis process, establishing credibility, dependability and confirmability, and transferability. This was accomplished through means such as bracketing, an audit trail, and data triangulation (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Patton, 2015).

Purposeful criterion and snowball sampling techniques were employed to recruit participants. Advertisements were posted on professional sites such as Instructional Design Central, as well as social networking platforms such as LinkedIn. Additional participants were recruited through snowball sampling. One instructional designer who was unable to participate in the study still shared the details of the study on a professional Listserv which also yielded several participants. Potential participants were vetted using specific criteria, including a minimum length of time as an instructional designer (12 months), a minimum length of time in their current position (12 months), and working predominantly on online courses in online programs.

Interviews were scheduled according to the convenience of the instructional designer, though prior to participation in the study, instructional designers were asked to complete a job satisfaction survey for descriptive purposes, and sign the letter of consent, both of which were returned prior to the interview. All interviews except for one were completed and recorded utilizing Zoom video conferencing. One participant was local and able to meet in person. Following the interview, instructional designers were asked to develop and submit a video screencast of a work product, discussing their job satisfaction while creating the product. All instructional designers chose to describe a project they referred to during the interview, which allowed for additional triangulation of data from the interview.

Data collection took place between April and November 2019, and transcription of the interviews and work product videos took place between July 2019 and February 2020. Multimodal transcripts were developed from the work product descriptions, which allowed for an added depth of data analysis, as not only the words that instructional designers used but the visuals that they chose provided an added layer of data. While the visuals provided important data, in order to protect participant identities screenshots are not included. Transcribed interviews were sent to participants for review and to clarify points made during the interview.

Theme Development

Codes and themes were developed in this study in two parts. First, in light of the recommendations made by Miles et al. (2014), which was to allow the theoretical framework to inform some of the preliminary codes identified, initial deductive codes were identified. These codes can be seen in Table 1.

Interviews were transcribed using the third-party transcription tool Temi, which utilized voice-to-text technology and required review and editing of the transcript to correct unclear and incorrect transcription. Preliminary analysis occurred during the transcript check, when significant ideas, key words, and key statements were identified and captured on notecards and in the research journal. I transcribed the work product videos, first creating a straight transcript of the video, and then using screen captures and annotations to capture the visual components discussed by the participants. Again, preliminary analysis, via the research journal and notes, took place during the transcription phase of the work products.

Table 1

Preliminary Deductive Codes

Deductive Codes
Salary*
Compensation*
Responsibility*
Achievement*
Growth/Advancement*
Interpersonal Relations – Superior*
Interpersonal Relations – Subordinate*†
Interpersonal Relations – Peer*
Policy and Administration*
Working Conditions*
Work itself*
Personal Life* (This code should be considered in light of the flexibility that is offered to IDs)
Status*
Job Security*
Organizational Structure
Students
Technology and Technology Use

Additional codes and themes were developed based on the process of horizonalization and coding, and these codes were further refined based on the responses of instructional designers as they described their experiences. Codes were saved and catalogued using NVivo, a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS), which allowed for an initial comprehensive list of codes to be identified. As noted previously, the use of NVivo allows for a centralized location to code, sort, and retrieve data (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Over 200 codes were identified and then refined based on the collected data. Interviews and work product videos were reviewed multiple times and transcripts were read and reviewed repeatedly to ensure that all significant statements and horizons were identified, allowing for triangulation and confirmability of the codes and themes. Interview transcripts and the work product transcripts

were reviewed multiple times, and codes were reviewed, refined, and triangulated based on the key ideas and statements identified. In several instances where codes appeared specific to one participant, the significant statements and horizons were reviewed and compared with potentially similar codes and then refined, discarding some. Codes and significant statements were then lumped into themes and meaning units as described by Creswell (2013). The main themes and their subthemes are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Themes

Theme	Sub-Theme
Work IDs value variety and struggle with tedium.	Course Design Training Technical Support/LMS Support Conferences, Presentations, Extra-Curricular Work
Relationships IDs consider a primary role to be related to building and maintaining good relationships.	Faculty and SMEs ID Teams, including colleagues and supervisors Other Departments IDs at other institutions
Institutional Context IDs expressed that they loved the work that they did but struggled with the institutional context in which they did it.	Organizational Structure Online Learning Strategic Plan Opportunities for Advancement Benefits and Compensation Professional Growth
Values and Motivation Elements within their roles provide avenues for intrinsic motivation.	Students Personal Growth Feedback Professional Competency

*According to Herzberg (1966), working relationships are technically considered hygiene factors, though for the sake of this study, I argue that they are actually motivating factors per the responses of participants.

Individual and composite textural and structure descriptions were developed in a separate document as a part of the refinement of codes into themes and subthemes. Structural and textural descriptions are an important part of the analysis process as described by Moustakas (1994) and allow the researcher to more deeply understand the essence of the experience. They were also used to develop thick rich descriptions of the instructional designers' experiences related to the phenomenon of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. Per the process for refining and "winnowing" (Creswell, 2013, p. 186), codes were continually reviewed and synthesized. After additional evaluation and refinement, and consideration of the textural and structural descriptions, data were distilled into the following 4 themes and 17 subsequent subthemes. While each of these themes is unique in the role it plays in how the instructional designer experiences job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation, there is some natural overlap in the overall experience.

Theme 1: The Work that Instructional Designers Do

One of the main themes that emerged in the experiences of participants was the actual work they do. In light of the theoretical framework, Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) would categorize the actual work that instructional designers do as a motivator, that is, as something that can increase personal satisfaction due to how it fosters a sense of self and accomplishment in the life of the participants.

If the participants did not enjoy the work they did, they reported overall lower levels of job satisfaction. One participant, Gwen, was a prime example of this. She became an instructional designer because of her interest in distance learning, and she desired a break from teaching and saw it as a steppingstone to other positions within an institution. While she liked the institution she worked for and appreciated the benefits she had, she struggled with the work

itself, explaining, "I think the situation that I'm in where I have very little control or power over the curriculum makes me dislike it even more." Gwen's explanation of the tedium of the work and the lack of control highlights some of the struggles that IDs feel in their day to day work related to the work that they do, but goes deeper to express key ideas related to areas of their work that cause low satisfaction. This is specifically related to perceived constraints and lack of control in their own work.

In addition to the interviews and the job satisfaction surveys that were collected from participants, they were asked to complete screen casted videos of work products they had created. The screen casts added extra depth to the understanding of how instructional designers felt overall about the work that they do, the pride they take in that work, and how the process of creating those resources ultimately contributed to positive or negative feelings about their job. Participants perceived their work as an extension of their professional competency – what they are capable of and how they see limitations to their capabilities – which ultimately had a direct impact on their overall feelings of motivation.

Course design. Central to the work of the instructional designer is the design, development, and support of learning experiences, specifically within the context of individual course design. Within the scope of the work that participants did, course design was either something that was done by participants based on content delivered by the faculty member or subject matter, or it was a collaborative process that participants engaged in with faculty to produce a final product. In both cases, instructional designers were responsible for integrating best practices while working within the parameters set by the institution.

Participants articulated in various ways that course design was what they were trained to do as experts and professionals. The utilization of those best practices contributed to their

feelings of satisfaction and success. When asked about what made them feel successful, all of the participants identified a well-designed course that received positive feedback from students, faculty, and even peers as one of the things that made them feel successful. Levi explained, "I think also it's satisfying when I hear that a course went really well or something that we tried out was hugely successful." Breanna described a similar sentiment when a course she designed was used as an example for others, and Tara, Faye, Elliot, and Wendy all expressed the same feelings in terms of getting positive feedback on courses that they designed.

Alternatively, participants articulated frustration and low satisfaction in situations when they were not recognized for their professional skills and abilities or the contributions in course design they could make to the institution. Participants who described lower job satisfaction, such as Maggie, did so when they were not able to fully utilize the scope of their skills in course design. She stated,

> There's definitely a big gap between administration realizing what the role of an instructional designer is … and a lot of them tend to think in the old way of, you just need somebody who can put stuff online and that's just not it.

The fact that most participants went through the training and education, both formal and informal, to be professionals and experts in their field contributed to their desire to utilize their skills to improve the learning experience for students. When they did not feel like their professional competency was understood or appreciated, they were less likely to experience feelings of high job satisfaction.

Training. Although course design emerged as the primary way that participants were able to impact the student experience, faculty were also impacted through the direct work participants did with them and the training that participants developed and provided. The role of

the participants in training was usually associated with imparting best practices of both designing

online courses and teaching online. Tara, Breanna, Elliot, Angie, Maggie, and Wendy all

discussed different aspects of training that they developed and implemented to support faculty in

best practice and pedagogy.

At the institutions where Elliot, Maggie, and Wendy worked, full-time and adjunct

faculty who taught and developed classes online were required to participate in the training

developed and facilitated by participants. Developing and facilitating the trainings were also

sources of satisfaction for participants. Elliot explained,

> To know that the role that [training] had in my learning and to know that I can help others
>
> with … making that leap from face-to-face to online or just thinking more, uh, more in
>
> depth about the meaning of online learning and how it should be done is, um, just a very
>
> valuable experience.

The opportunity for instructional designers to exercise and demonstrate their own

competency in best practice and pedagogy, as well as the experiences in helping and supporting

faculty, was rewarding and thus a cause for satisfaction. Related to his experience with the

training, Elliot later stated, "I do tend to be proud of it, I do tend to think it's a good example of,

you know, instructional designer, the work they do, and how they connect it, uh, to what the

faculty do."

Technical and LMS support. In addition to training in best practices, Leah and Breanna

described their responsibilities in terms of also training faculty and peers on the LMS, though it

was more informal and the direct result of the participant's familiarity with the LMS as one of

the tools of their trade. This also extended to technical and LMS support. In some cases, work

within the LMS was related to course design, such as the work that Tara did with a publisher

integration and the LMS, and in other cases, the technical support accompanied training faculty and other non-instructional colleagues. In discussing her role in working with the LMS, Breanna described herself as "the SME for the LMS. So, um, if we do have issues, like people always come to me to get those fixed."

As they described their experiences in working with learning management systems and providing technical support, participants often took that work in stride as a part of their responsibilities. Participants considered LMS support under the umbrella of improving the student learning and the student and faculty experience. Angie, Breanna, Maggie, and Wendy all spent time discussing how their work with faculty in the LMS extended the faculty experience and impacted students positively.

Technical and LMS support could also be expanded to include the work of converting content from one learning management system to another. While participants overall didn't mind the work in the LMS, the task of converting courses from one LMS to the next was one of the most challenging in terms of the constraints and limitations for instructional designers and a cause for lower levels of satisfaction. This work was some of the most tedious for participants, especially when deadlines prevented the instructional designer from making improvements in the class. Breanna, Leah, Angie, and Gwen all identified experiences related to converting or transitioning from one LMS to another, the difficulty of it, and the subsequent feelings of low satisfaction. In most cases, conversion projects included working long hours, monotonous tasks such as copying and pasting from one platform to the next, and learning and working within the constraints of a new LMS. Satisfaction became even lower when participants were not able to produce or redesign something so that it adhered to understood best practices.

Institutional representation. A much smaller subset of the work that participants identified could be considered institutional representation, specifically as it related to external conferences. However, as conferences and professional development play an important role in participant's perception of how their institution values them, when they had the opportunity to represent their institution and their field, participants considered those responsibilities an important part of their work and responsibilities. At her institution, Faye noted that there were extra goals for their department to represent the work of the institution and the department:

> It is one of our, um, like objectives for our unit is to represent [Current Institution] and our accomplishments, you know, in the public eye or you know, nationally and regionally. You don't always have to be a presenter … so it could be a … poster or something like that … I think that's really cool.

For participants like Faye and Elliot, who also expressed that he spent part of his working time preparing for and running regional conferences, these opportunities were two-fold; first, it communicated to the participant that they were professionally competent, and second, it also provided a benefit to contribute overall to the satisfaction of the participants; specifically, through collaboration with other professionals.

Institutional representation captured several of the key elements of job satisfaction that participants described, including the opportunity to demonstrate their own professional knowledge and competency, as well as opportunities to engage and collaborate with peers, the next theme to be explored.

Satisfaction was lower in certain instances when participants were limited in what they were doing. Wendy was told she was not allowed to travel to a conference where she was scheduled to present as a punitive measure for having incomplete weekly reports, an experience

she considered "crushing." While Leah was preparing for a conference, she experienced disappointment, recognizing she was being asked to present on something she felt she had not accomplished well in some of the courses she designed.

Theme 2: Relationships

Instructional design is an inherently social job. Instructional designers rely on a variety of relationships to get their jobs done, from faculty and subject matter experts (SMEs) to their supervisors, other departments within the institution, and even other instructional designers outside of the institution. Participants expressed the ability to interact, network, and collaborate with others as central to the feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction that they felt in their jobs.

All of the participants interviewed for this study articulated the social nature of their work. When asked about her job on a day to day basis, Leah explained, "there are two main components to my job … a big part of it, I would say is building and maintaining relationships with people." Sadie identified that part of her responsibility in her instructional design is as a "peacekeeper," and stated, "it's this potpourri of personalities and trying to work together, but I think the instructional designer assumes most of the responsibility on that end." Levi described the collaboration between different departments as one of the most enjoyable parts of a recent project. Working relationships for the instructional designer took on many different forms, including faculty and subject matter experts, their team, other teams in the institution, and peers outside of the institution, and had strong influence over participants' positive or negative feelings about their jobs.

Faculty and SMEs. Most prominent and central to the role of the instructional designer was the working relationship that instructional designers had with faculty and SMEs. In this context, most participants worked with adjuncts who served as subject matter experts for the

institution. Participants accepted both the positive and negative interactions with faculty as just a part of the job. Gwen counted interactions and collaboration with faculty as one of the things she enjoyed most about her work, stating,

> I like to talk to them [faculty]. I like to talk about – I like to make the plans, I like to brainstorm and figure out ways to translate these great face-to-face experiences to an online, um, experience that has similar impact. You know, that's the stuff I like.

Leah expressed a similar sentiment regarding the work that she does with faculty, "I like working with faculty, I like working with people who are really passionate about what they do. And you don't get to be a professor without … having some vested interest in whatever topic you're looking at." Participants enjoyed the collaboration and work they got to do with faculty and SMEs, especially when those faculty and SMEs were passionate about their subject matter, and passionate about sharing it.

Even faculty who could be somewhat problematic or resistant to online learning offered opportunities for participants to feel satisfaction or pleasure when those faculty experienced a change of heart. For Maggie, it was a high point to see that:

> What I really enjoy is when I'm working with a, a what we would call a problem child faculty who had a lot of resistance and you know, was very boisterous and bold and loud … when I get those ones and I can see the turn in the change occur almost like, you know, when you're in the classroom and you see the light go on with the, with the learner, it's the same when you're working with faculty.

Even when the interactions were negative, instructional designers generally accepted those challenges as a part of the job and opportunities to learn and grow, rather than obstacles they had to overcome. Faye explained,

Initially I was annoyed with the professor and wanted her to let go of her control of doing

her way… however these feelings did morph into an appreciation of her commitment to

her students, to evoking out of those students their creativity and giving them variety.

Faye's experience was similar to others' in that, for instructional designers working in a

coaching and design context, the desire is to reach a point where the course can be executed

online in a meaningful and engaging way.

ID team. While participants expected difficult interactions with faculty to be part of the

job, they needed positive relationships with an instructional design team to experience high

levels of satisfaction in their jobs. Levi, an instructional designer who also had some

management responsibilities, regarded his team as foundational to his own satisfaction with his

work and in his job. He described one specific project the entire team was responsible for:

Sure we'll talk to each other about a course we're working on, but working together on

the same project, saying, like, hey, you're gonna take care of this part today and I'll take

care of this other part tomorrow. Um, having that connection was really enjoyable.

Teams were the context in which participants did much of their work, and the shared

experiences within an institution was not just enjoyable but important to maintaining morale and

satisfaction. Tara shared that the work would be a lot more difficult without her team:

Within our team we try really hard to help each other out and so everyone's really

appreciative of that and recognizes it and tries to really acknowledge it. It's huge. We

probably wouldn't get by if we didn't do that.

Breanna, even though she was leaving her institution, still talked about the impact of her work on

the team. She stated, "I care about it and … I still want it to be good… I don't want to have the

people that … would have to take it over … they're friends so I don't want to …leave them in the

lurch." Even as she was considering what she would be doing after she left her institution, she was present enough to care about what she was leaving behind and the potential impact on her team.

The lack of a robust instructional design team was equally influential. Leah, one of the instructional designers who was transitioning to a new job, was in a position where she did not have an instructional design team around her. As she talked about her transition to a new institution, she stated, "I'm looking forward to the opportunity to work on a team of instructional designers. I have had a partner for the past couple of years, but I haven't really felt like a, like a, like part of a team."

In addition to their relationships with their teammates, the relationship that participants had with their supervisor was important, though often more tenuous. Participants who had negative experiences were more vocal about the problems that poor leadership caused for them personally and for their team. Wendy, Tara, and Sadie all expressed frustration with those in supervisory roles over them when their supervisors tended to not be supportive of those they supervised. Sadie noted, "It is an interesting place to be in when you work for a director who is saying, what can you do for me rather than, what can I do for you?" Tara experienced a change in leadership and described how a new supervisor who took a more remote approach to leading and managing the team affected her feelings of job satisfaction overall.

Alternatively, when instructional designers described positive relationships with their supervisors, not only did the instructional designers articulate a more positive experience, but they also felt more empowered to do their jobs. Elliot, Gwen, and Leah expressed various experiences where their direct supervisors made them feel appreciated and recognized the level

of work they were doing. Further, it was important to participants that their supervisor understood their experience and the nature of their work.

Instructional designers at other institutions. It was not only relationships with their own team that were important to participants; being a member of a community of practice was also important. Participants described the value they found in interactions with other instructional designers as those interactions allowed for networking, exposure to new and different ideas, and opportunities to discuss best practices and even collaborate on projects. Maggie counted IDs at other institutions and previous colleagues as an excellent resource when developing training. She stated,

> That's a great thing that I admire about the work that I do…there is a level of transparency amongst the instructional designers, at least all the ones that I've been able to contact with and, and there is a real level of understanding that we need to remain and maintain this, this, uh this ability to share and be transparent with everything that we've got.

Participants in this study described their interactions with instructional designers at other institutions in terms of engagement and learning from one another, thriving, and growth. Breanna, Elliot, and Angie all described various opportunities where they were involved in collaborative learning groups with instructional designers from other institutions, and expressed the value they found in both the opportunities that emerged as well as the intellectual growth that occurred. Instructional designers did not really address low satisfaction with their interactions with IDs at other schools or campuses, though Angie wondered if her community of practice was not as effective at affecting change within the college system as it could be. However, even those concerns were minor in the grand scheme of the discussion.

Other departments within the institution. In addition to their relationships with their teams and other instructional designers at other institutions, participants developed and maintained strong relationships with other departments within their institution as well. Part of this context was within the work that they did. Depending upon the organizational structure of the institution, participants were either part of a centralized instructional design team for an online department or a part of a specific academic department. In this study, participants represented both structures. It is important to understand the organizational structure in light of the relationships that participants formed with additional teams in the institution.

Relationships and work with other departments presented the opportunity to add more value to the work that participants offered to their institution and helped validate their role. Levi counted working with other departments on projects as "enjoyable" and "fulfilling," especially when those projects met a specific need of the institution and created a positive experience for the students. Elliot described the value in working with other teams in the institution, taking into account the publicity that it brought to instructional designers and the value they add to the institution. When talking about his own work, he described working with departments on instructional projects other than his own as "fun" and "interesting." He went on to say,

> Also in terms of promotion, in terms of reaching faculty, in terms of, you know, getting faculty interested in certain parts of our campus, we [instructional designers] may not be known but the library is, and so, you know, if we're doing a collaboration with the library, it increases the chances of getting that engagement with them just finding out about us and the things that we offer.

Interactions with other departments were not always positive, especially when those departments established processes and procedures that hindered instructional design teams from

accomplishing what they needed to accomplish in terms of supporting faculty and students. Participants attributed these challenges to a perceived lack of understanding of what their job entailed or a lack of regard for timing, processes, and procedures. Tara described interactions with one specific department that frequently went rogue or would disrupt the work of the instructional design team by following their own internal protocols that operated independently of established dates and timelines. At her institution, Wendy's interactions with the tech department were often fraught with frustration as the department further separated itself from the day to day operations of the school. She described the situation and interactions this way: "They don't understand how things work in an academic setting… They're in their, their own, like, cube farm and they're oblivious to like the rhythms of, like, an academic school."

These observations by instructional designers highlight the importance not only of the people with whom they work on a daily basis but of the context, specifically the institutional context in which they did their work.

Theme 3: The Institutional Context that Instructional Designers Work In

As participants described their experiences, the institutional context was also important in contributing to their feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. The subthemes that emerged related to the institutional context included the organizational structure and encompassed the role the instructional designer played in instruction, the online strategic plan, benefits and compensation, opportunities for advancement, and professional growth and development.

Organizational structure. The organizational structure refers to how the instructional design department functions within the institution. Three main organizational structures emerged from the participants interviewed for this study: 1) instructional designers attached to a specific

department (Leah); 2) instructional designers that work predominantly on online classes but support the institution at large (Levi, Angie, Maggie, Wendy); 3) and instructional designers that worked in a specific online department as a part of an online graduate and professional studies group (Sadie, Tara, Breanna, Elliot, Gwen, Faye).

Leah, as the only instructional designer who was part of a specific academic department, described some of the greatest challenges in terms of technological barriers and feeling disconnected from the rest of the institution compared to other participants. She had experience at a previous institution with being part of a more centralized team, and as she was looking to transition to a new role, her motivation was twofold: first, she was looking forward to the opportunity to work with a larger team, and second, she was looking forward to working on projects in different subject areas. As a part of an academic department, she also experienced limitations to her administrative access to technology, which in turn affected her ability to support students and faculty in the learning management system.

Alternatively, Levi, Maggie, Wendy, and Angie all worked in departments that supported their institution at large with putting courses online and encountered a different set of challenges, most prominently a greater institutional resistance to online learning in general, specifically in terms of what the faculty were doing as well as the kinds of resources and institutional investment in technology that were available. Maggie noted, "It's a little disheartening 'cause I do see the successes that are out there and I see how far this goes. But I think what I've got at my institution now is more of the norm that's out there."

Finally, Sadie, Tara, Breanna, Elliot, Gwen, and Faye all worked at institutions that had specific online departments. Within the online departments, there were both advantages and disadvantages. There were still issues with technology, specifically Sadie and Tara both

described situations where outdated technology limited their productivity. Gwen and Breanna both described constraints to their ability to be more creative based on their templates and the LMS they used. However, within this organizational structure, participants also described a greater dedication to online offerings and wider acceptance of online education.

O**nline strategic plan.** The organizational structure and the strategic plan for online learning in the institution often went hand-in-hand. Stronger strategic plans for online learning and education had a direct impact on the resources made available, the development of policies and procedures that supported the work of instructional designers, and staffing.

With a well-articulated and well-executed strategic plan, participants like Faye and Levi found they had more resources, and more policies and procedures in place to support their work. In Faye's experience, her institution recognized the value that online programs added overall and established plans, policies, and procedures that supported the work of the online team in general, and instructional designers specifically. An online strategic plan gave direction and credence to the work being done by participants in their institution. Further, institutions with strong online strategic plans often incorporated the use of templates as a consistency and quality measure, something that instructional designers like Levi and Angie felt contributed to the overall ability of the instructional designer to produce quality work.

Instructional designers who worked at institutions that did not have solid online strategic plans, or were unable to execute those strategic plans, generally had lower feelings of satisfaction in those areas. Elliot, who overall experienced high satisfaction, explained one of his greatest challenges in his work was being at an institution that did not have a strong online strategic plan. His reasoning was directly related to his professional competency, that he "felt like he had more to offer" but there was not an avenue for him to do so in the current programmatic offerings.

Even when an online strategic plan was in place, if it was not effectively executed, instructional designers ran into roadblocks. These frustrations included levels of resistance for online learning, both administratively and in the faculty body, as well as policies and procedures that hindered, rather than supported, a strong online program. Gwen expressed that it felt like "everything seemed so reactive as opposed to having a proactive plan." Angie, Maggie, and Wendy described institutional resistance to online learning as a major frustration, especially in terms of not using templates, and policies and procedures that ultimately affected the student experience and the instructional designers' ability to do their job well.

Opportunities for advancement. Organizationally, opportunities for advancement in instructional design teams in higher education were generally limited. Breanna noted, "As I've seen in higher education, if you're not faculty… I don't feel like there's really any way to go up now." Elliot explained further, "You find in Higher Ed in the [online] area, advancement can be pretty challenging because usually institutions have one instructional design team…And it's usually like, you know, the director and maybe one or two instructional designers under that person." This limitation was a challenge for some of the instructional designers to navigate and often caused them to look elsewhere. Leah explained that this was one of the reasons that prompted her to look for positions at other institutions, "I think that's part of why I looked for something else, you know? Cause I just didn't feel like there was a lot of growth, you know, I felt like this was it."

There were a few exceptions. Sadie, Tara, Levi, and Gwen all shared experiences at their institutions where the team was structured to allow for growth within the team and they had been able to take advantage of the opportunity. Gwen shared, "I think a lot of IDs don't know about the possibilities for advancement, et cetera in our college… They're there. I've taken advantage

of several. I'm very grateful, very grateful for those opportunities." Levi had also been able to take advantage of similar kinds of opportunities and did not feel the same limitations that others expressed.

Additional opportunities were described that could allow participants to step into roles that included more leadership. Elliot, Sadie, Levi, and Maggie were willing to explore these types of roles, though in some cases, these positions needed to be created. Sadie explained that she had experienced several opportunities for promotion, but it was complex because the process was not fully defined and more often "the trend seems to be when there is turnover on the team, there is opportunity for promotion, but that does not necessarily secure promotion." Further, the creation of said roles often involved conversations with leaders and included conversations around budget and performance expectations.

Both Sadie and Wendy expressed a desire to advance, but at one point had been told that they did not have the experience or the vision to advance within their institution. This caused them to recognize just how limited their opportunities for advancement could be, and for both of them, this experience was discouraging and led to certain levels of dissatisfaction. In Faye's situation, there were limitations in the kinds of opportunities that were available; she was not necessarily interested in a leadership position.

As advancement is explored, it needs to be recognized as complex and must be considered in light of both whether the opportunities exist and whether they are the type of role that an instructional designer would be interested in pursuing.

Professional development. Almost all of the participants described a love of learning and a desire to continue learning and developing. Therefore, they placed a high value on opportunities that allowed them to further their education and learning, as well as further refine

their own craft and abilities. Professional growth and development, as described by participants, included everything from reading books and self-directed training to conferences and tuition reimbursement.

At the most basic level, all of the participants had access to online or on-demand training through tools such as LinkedIn Learning (previously Lynda.com). Participants recognized the value of such training in enabling them to respond to immediate needs in terms of tools for course design, including but not limited to Storyline and Adobe InDesign. On-demand training allowed them to become better practitioners within their learning management system. Several participants were also Quality Matters certified, and able to be reviewers which contributed to their toolbox of skills. However, this training was not necessarily considered a benefit by participants, but rather a tool and requirement for them to do the job that was set in front of them.

Participants also had funding to attend conferences, though funding was often limited based on budget, which forced instructional designers to explore other avenues of supplementing the funding, sometimes out of their own pockets. Elliot described how he would often get on committees or volunteer at a conference in order to attend for free or at reduced cost, and Maggie would pay out of pocket and utilize a student discount, asking her institution for reimbursement of the conference fee later. Regional and national conferences were considered helpful, though generally regional, more focused conferences more so.

The value added for the instructional designers was two-fold and had an impact on instructional designers' feelings of motivation. The ability to participate in conferences and other professional development groups gave Elliot "further colleagueship beyond even here and again… connecting with those people and really learning and thriving by being on their learning networks." Wendy shared that she felt most motivated after attending a conference because of

the opportunity to both engage with other instructional designers as well as learn new things she could apply back at her institution.

Overall, instructional designers equated the investment in professional development with how their institution valued them. Therefore, it was important that the institution provide funding to support this development. Tara noted, "It's always good when an employer is willing to invest in you and keep you up to speed and relevant." Faye shared that the investment in professional development opportunities at her institution made her feel "appreciated" and "valued." Alternatively, when the institution did not invest in or provide funding for professional development, instructional designers felt devalued and underappreciated. However, it was not only through professional development that instructional designers felt their institutions were willing to invest in them.

Benefits and compensation. In the previous section, professional growth and development was addressed with consideration to how it communicated to participants whether they felt valued or not. Within the scope of understanding job satisfaction, it is important to discuss the benefits and compensation that participants receive. Instructional designers considered benefits to extend beyond salary to include schedule flexibility, remote work, vacation and paid time off, and tuition reimbursement.

In the literature, support staff in higher education feel their salaries are below what they could be earning in the private sector. Participants confirmed this for the most part, noting that although their salary was lower in terms of what they could make as instructional designers elsewhere, including in the business industry or private sector, they wanted to be in higher education and so there was a certain trade-off. Leah and Sadie recognized that their opportunities to make more money would be more likely to occur if they changed institutions, and for Leah,

Angie, Gwen, and Breanna, changing institutions did bring an increase in salary. However, all chose to stay in higher education.

According to Herzberg (1966), salary is a hygiene factor, unless it is perceived in terms of the value that instructional designers had at their institution. In Breanna's, Maggie's, and Wendy's cases, they saw their salaries, or lack thereof, as representative of a larger issue in the institution, specifically, that the institution was not willing to make the investment in them as employees, an extension of some of their frustrations related to professional development.

Instructional designers also looked at benefits and compensation in terms of other benefits they valued that could be offered by the institution. A major benefit identified was additional flexibility in their work and the ability to balance their work and personal life. For employees like Wendy, Leah, and Tara, who all had young children at home, the flexibility, or lack of flexibility, contributed to their feelings of high or low satisfaction, and whether they would ultimately be able to balance their personal and professional lives. Leah explained, "I think that, um, for where I am right now at my point in life, like being able to, um, to meet the demands of my personal life, um, is really important, you know?" Tara's perspective added to this:

> I could tell that my employer valued me because they were willing to help and compromise what I never thought they would in terms of letting me work from remotely in order to let me keep my job and keep working full time.

In contrast to both Tara and Leah, Wendy experienced a lack of flexibility in terms of being able to balance her work schedule with her family life, especially in the summer. She explained,

> Your office has to be open Monday through Friday, eight to five in the summer. This does not matter that like we are teaching fewer and fewer courses during the summer and

so literally I can go days without even hearing or seeing a faculty member. I have to be

there in the office or someone does…

Even for those employees who did not have young families, moderate flexibility, from

adjusted working hours to remote work, afforded them some opportunities that they might not

otherwise have. For example, Gwen recognized that her institution was more "progressive" in

allowing her to work 100% remotely, though she noted she was an exception rather than the rule

at the institution.

Considered a benefit and an opportunity for growth, participants also identified tuition

reimbursement as a benefit and way that their institution was willing to invest in them. Breanna,

Faye, and Wendy all discussed being able to take advantage of this. However, when an

institution did not offer degrees, or there were limitations placed on that reimbursement,

participants did not necessarily continue to consider it a benefit they could take advantage of.

Faye noted that reimbursement was only issued for classes that earned a letter grade, so if she

were to pursue her doctorate, she would have had to pay for a portion of it out of pocket. Elliot

noted that institutions considered reimbursement a benefit, but for him and instructional

designers like him, if the institution did not offer the degree that he needed, he could not take

advantage of that benefit.

Participants all considered benefits an important part of their experience in working for

an institution. Benefits impacted not just how the participant perceived their work but also, in

some cases, how they perceived the institution valued them as employees.

Theme 4: Instructional Design Values and Motivation

The final theme that emerged during interviews was the "why" for what instructional

designers do. In a later section, the experiences that relate specifically to job satisfaction and

dissatisfaction and motivation will be discussed in more depth; this section specifically addresses the intrinsic reasons, or values, related to why participants do their jobs. As participants talked about certain experiences, they would use terms like "fulfilling" (Tara) and "gratifying" (Faye) to describe their feelings.

Positive and engaging student experience/students. All participants mentioned giving students a good experience as a primary factor in their motivation to do a good job and even innovate within the scope of their work. Student experience was also identified as one of the areas where participants felt like they could be more successful. As she talked through her work product, Leah frequently referenced things she did to make things more "student-centered" in terms of course navigation, and "easier" for the students overall, and Gwen talked about her instructional design work in terms of something that was "pleasing, simple, and efficient for students." The work that Levi did with his team, collaborating with external teams, was centered on delivering information to students that they had not previously had access to, which, although it wasn't purely academic, was still an instructional need meant to improve the student experience overall.

The desire to make the experience easier for students is an interesting perspective in light of the fact that participants rarely received feedback from students on the learning experience overall. Maggie explained why it was important for her to work with students, although she did not get to do it often, in that it kept her fresh in terms of who she was ultimately working for. She stated, "You want to see students succeed. You want them to learn to get out there, apply the knowledge, what have you…"

However, as Maggie and other participants pointed out, there was a tension: although the student experience was a primary motivating factor, instructional designers rarely received that

feedback directly from students. If they did, it was usually provided through feedback from faculty or broad anonymous student surveys. Breanna explained, "I haven't ever had a specific feedback from students. You know, I, I don't interact with students very often just because we're kind of removed." Gwen noted that the lack of a solid feedback loop reduced her satisfaction overall. However, an interesting paradox emerged related to students and student feedback. Although participants count a positive student experience as one of the motivating factors, they also recognized the challenge that came with not always receiving that positive feedback from students.

These experiences become even weightier considering how participants perceive feedback in terms of contributing to their overall feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Feedback for encouragement and growth. Participants also felt valued and more motivated when they received positive feedback from their supervisors or peers, though it must be noted that how each participant received that feedback was individualized and depended on the participant themself. Some participants appreciated being recognized publicly in front of a group; others found intentional one-on-one feedback more authentic. However, the positive feedback and encouragement was often motivating. Angie, Leah, and Maggie each described how the positive feedback they received from their colleagues, peers, and supervisors gave them greater confidence in their professional abilities and pride in the work they were able to do.

While positive feedback was usually appreciated, participants also expressed their desire for constructive feedback. In terms of their own professional development and growth, instructional designers wanted feedback on ways they could improve. Angie, Elliot, Maggie, and Sadie all talked about the importance of solid constructive feedback. Most participants addressed

the importance of feedback in making their work products better, and they would intentionally seek it out.

Personal growth and love of learning. Related closely to their opportunities for growth and development was the intrinsic love of learning. When asked what they loved about their jobs, all of the participants considered the opportunity to be exposed to different subjects and content areas as a highlight. Breanna noted, "I fell in love with this job because I'm learning as I'm going," and Sadie explained further, "I'm very curious and I love the learning process. And so with each course I work on, I think I gain a little bit of knowledge and, and that excites me." For Leah, one of the things she was looking forward to in her new position in the new institution was the opportunity to engage with different subject areas. For participants, while they appreciated the practice of instructional design itself, they also discussed how the position ultimately fed certain internal needs for personal growth and learning.

However, it was not just the exposure to different subjects that instructional designers valued but also the opportunity to think about and engage with learning overall. When asked what he enjoys about his job, Elliot explained, "So I'm a nerd and I enjoy learning and this job is so much about learning in many different ways."

As instructional designers identified themselves as learners and educators, one of the things that excited them most was their opportunity to continue learning, and they valued working in an institution that allowed them to continue to grow, learn, and engage with multiple disciplines. Instructional designers expressed lower satisfaction if they were not in an environment that fostered that growth and transferability. Maggie expressed her frustration at her own institution: "I want to grow… if I don't get out of this, then I may be pigeonholed here for a while."

Demonstrating professional competency. One of the other themes that emerged in terms of the intrinsic motivation for participants was their understanding of their own professional competency and their desire to demonstrate that competency in the work that they do. Participants expressed that this experience of their own competency took various form, from being perceived as a professional in their field to opportunities when others experience success based on the work of the instructional designer. Feelings of success and fulfillment stemmed from the realization of their professional competency and the freedom given to them to achieve that competency. These feeling were generally tied to the positive experiences of others – participants counted both the faculty member who realized greater student achievement and the students who had an engaging learning experience through their online courses as key elements of their satisfaction and motivation. This is related to the feelings of value that instructional designers crave but extends to their own confidence in what they know and can do and the responsibilities that are given to them.

Angie expressed part of her job satisfaction in being able to use and leverage competencies she had developed over time, and she noted a collaboration with colleagues when she felt validated and "like a legitimate professional" in the field. Gwen described her satisfaction as stemming from "helping, mentoring, or coaching somebody."

Response to the Research Questions

The above-mentioned themes emerged as participants responded to questions related to their job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. As participants discussed their experiences working in online higher education, they provided important data related to their feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. This study posed the following questions related to

the experiences contributing to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation of instructional designers in online higher education:

    CQ: What experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation?

- **SQ 1**: What experiences do participants associate with feelings of job satisfaction?

- **SQ 2**: What experiences do participants associate with feelings of job dissatisfaction?

- **SQ 3**: How do participants describe their motivation in the workplace in light of feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

    The following sections present a response to each of these questions based on the findings from the conducted research.

Central Research Question

    The central research question examined the overall experience of the instructional designer related to his or her job satisfaction or job dissatisfaction; specifically, what experiences contribute to instructional designer job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation.

    Instructional designers expressed feelings of satisfaction related to the work that they do and what they are able to accomplish (Theme 1), as long as they are able to complete the work to a certain level of quality and feel as though that work was contributing to the overall success of students and faculty (Themes 2 and 4). The quality of work was a particular point of importance to participants as it also allowed them to demonstrate their professional competence in their work (Theme 4). When participants were able to demonstrate their professional competence, they also expressed greater motivation.

Frequently, positive interactions with colleagues and faculty emerged as an important factor of high or low satisfaction in the working experience (Theme 2); participants such as Leah who were not in collaborative environments or did not have good relationships with their teams still spoke of strong teams and working relationships as important to their work and overall satisfaction. Even participants who did not express high satisfaction, such as Wendy, counted "the people she work[s] with," in her case mainly faculty, as the thing she enjoyed most about her job.

In terms of their relationships with faculty, instructional designers generally expected that there would be tension, but expressed high satisfaction that they could contribute to the success of faculty or when faculty expressed they had learned something new (Theme 1). However, experiences that significantly reduced satisfaction came from "ugly" (Gwen) interactions with faculty. Often this occurred when an instructional designer's competence (Theme 4) or value in contributing to the faculty and student experience (Theme 1) were called into question. So, while good relationships with faculty was one of the factors participants mentioned as contributing to high satisfaction and enjoyment of the job (Theme 2), conversely, it was also one of the factors that was noted as most challenging in the work of instructional designers.

In additional to external relationships, instructional designers spoke to the opportunities available to them in terms of learning and professional growth. They were more motivated to work for and in an organization that they felt valued and invested in them (Theme 3). Motivation waned in situations where participants did not feel valued or challenged.

Sub-question 1

The first sub-question of this study was What experiences do participants associate with feelings of job satisfaction? Throughout the interviews and their work product descriptions,

participants cited several experiences that contributed to feelings of satisfaction. These were experiences that allowed instructional designers to demonstrate and be recognized for their professional competence in their work (Themes 1 and 4), experiences that allowed them to feel valued by their institutions (Theme 1 and 3), and experiences that included positive interactions with faculty, peers, and colleagues (Theme 2). Sadie expressed the importance of finding satisfaction in the work that she does, and what she produces – that it is something she is "personally involved and invested in." Even in the face of other elements that reduced their satisfaction, instructional designers sought to find experiences that fostered their satisfaction.

Experiences where instructional designers felt valued by their institution.
Participants expressed strong feelings of satisfaction within experiences that allowed them to feel valued and like they were contributing to the overall good of their institution (Themes 1, 3, and 4). Leah explained, "It's really important to me for my job satisfaction to know that what I'm doing provides a, a valuable practical service to people. I like that part of it." For Elliot, the experience was the same: "I'm still finding a way of helping to improve that classroom experience for students … and even for instructors and helping them either change lenses or feel better about or better understand different ways of approaching it and seeing the impact."

When they discussed the work that they did, participants were asked what instructional needs it met. As participants described their work and expressed pride in it, that was usually the result of successfully meeting a need for the institution. In light of her work product, Maggie expressed, "What I enjoyed most about creating this is that I knew that I was giving something to this institution that they didn't, they didn't have before." Levi indicated a similar feeling in contributing something to the institution that met a specific student training need the institution

had. Data indicated that instructional designers desired to have a lasting impact and add value to their institution.

However, it was not just in being able to demonstrate their value that instructional designers found significance, but also in how the institution expressed that they valued the instructional designer through positive feedback and investment (Themes 3 and 4). In terms of positive feedback, it was particularly meaningful when instructional designers' supervisors and colleagues recognized the valuable contribution that instructional designers made. Sadie pointed out that she did not just appreciate receiving the positive feedback, she "thrived" on it, stating,

> I am one of those employees in just, I think my personality is if I hear positive feedback, be it from an academic dean or the program director or students sending in evaluations about how much they enjoyed the course, that makes me feel like I really succeeded. I did my job well.

Experiences that allowed them to continue to learn and grow. In addition to wanting to demonstrate their professional knowledge and competence in contributing to their institution, instructional designers articulated greater satisfaction in their jobs when they were encouraged to learn and grow (Theme 4).

This growth included learning new skills that could be transferred. Angie expressed job satisfaction as she began to learn to create specific resources for faculty, allowing her to expand her knowledge and understanding of the different kinds of tools that were available, and for Wendy, the experience of creating the educational tools for faculty gave her the opportunity to learn new tools and utilize skills and talents she may not always be able to due to time and job constraints. Tara expressed satisfaction in not only the end product of her instructional design

work but also the process that she engaged in while creating the instructional resource, which included the opportunity she had to learn during the process:

> I would say that what I enjoyed really the most was just learning a new system. Overall, I enjoyed exploring the resource but I also enjoyed creating modules and faculty guides needed to operate the new version of the course. Learning ins and outs of the tool had many opportunities to try out new things, see what works, see what wouldn't.

Faye shared Tara's experiences when she felt encouraged to learn and try new things in the curriculum that she worked on, a unique course that utilized tools and methodology that Faye was initially dubious about. Faye described her satisfaction in the project in both her own growth and development in being challenged to rethink how she thought about course design, as well as the opportunity to provide a more creative and engaging learning experience for students.

Experiences related to positive relationships with those they work with. In addition to improving the learning experiences for students and faculty, instructional designers found deep satisfaction in their positive relationships with peers and colleagues (Theme 2). Positive relationships were described as mutually respectful and creative, and generally resulted in a much more powerful learning experience for students in terms of their learning and classroom engagement. When describing the process of developing the work product, Tara noted, "Instructional design most often is a very collaborative process and being able to engage in that collaboration is really important for…for me for job satisfaction."

Instructional designers viewed their work as fundamentally relational (Theme 2), and as such, the instructional designer's job satisfaction stemmed from positive interactions and relationships. Levi even went so far as to describe positive relationships with his team as central to his job satisfaction within his work:

I think that key to instructional design satisfaction is a good teamwork – working with

you.… it would not matter anything about my superiors, what they thought of my work,

if the people I work with day in and day out, we did not have a good rapport. I think that

my satisfaction [would] be a lot lower than, um, but we have a great team so we, when

we hire, we try to really vet people to make sure they would be a good fit for the team.

Each of the instructional designers interviewed counted positive interactions with faculty as one

of the things they found the most satisfaction in, and they engaged with the faculty, both full

time and adjunct, in various capacities related to course design, training, and technical support

(Theme 1).

Sub-question 2

The second sub-question of this study was What experiences do participants associate

with feelings of job dissatisfaction? In the data collected, instructional designers generally

expressed satisfaction and pride in their work. Feelings of dissatisfaction were expressed based

on experiences related to how they were treated, the amount of control they had in their work

(Themes 1 and 2), and institutional tensions they felt impeded their ability to do quality work

(Themes 1, 3, and 4). These experiences generally called into question the professional abilities

of the instructional designer or made them feel as if they were not a valued member of the

institution.

Relationships and control. Much of the literature regarding frustrations in the jobs of

instructional designers identified faculty pushback as one of the most prominent issues that

instructional designers expressed. In this study, instructional designers generally expected some

friction and pushback from faculty; they considered it just a part of their job and the job

experience (Theme 2). Gwen noted, "even though faculty are notoriously, can be difficult or

whatever, you know, I'm faculty too and … I want to please them and help them and I want to help make their job easier cause I know they do a lot." Faye and Angie expressed similar sentiments, accepting that some pushback and friction with faculty was just a necessary and accepted part of the job.

Instructional designers' experiences with faculty that did cause dissatisfaction occurred when faculty called into question the professional abilities of the instructional designer, or when the actions of the faculty prevented the instructional designer from being able to do their jobs and do them well (Themes 1 and 4). Angie noted, "The problem is that the faculty have so much power over what happens," and Leah explained, "They're not interested in doing things online and they're definitely not interested in hearing someone tell them how they should do it." In this case, and in others, it was not the resistance of the faculty member on the whole that was the issue for the instructional designer, but more specifically that the instructional designer could not do their job because of the faculty resistance. Gwen expressed her own frustration with the attitudes of faculty members,

> There's this unequaled distribution of power where faculty are sort of the, um, uh, exalted subject matter experts. Um, and we are somehow not looked at as the professionals we are, who are schooled in educational, um, tech, uh, technology and psychology and learning theory and all of this.

For Gwen and others in this study who expressed this frustration, low satisfaction occurred when instructional designers felt the resistance was so great they were unable to actually do their jobs.

Sadie expressed an overall concern with the impact of working with difficult people on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Gwen, Faye, and Wendy described specific incidents where the negative experiences felt like personal attacks. Gwen noted she felt "particularly bad if … an

instructor is just so rude and ugly … that really takes the wind out of my sails and really, uh, puts me on the defensive and I don't, I don't like it." In Faye's situation, she was "fired" from working with one faculty member on the faculty member's request because they didn't see things eye to eye in terms of course design. For Wendy, it was a pervasive attitude in terms of how certain faculty perceived her and treated her:

> When I'm not valued, faculty – some people don't know what I am or what I do. And they don't know that I actually have, like, a degree in education. They think I'm there to like make copies for them… Well we have some curmudgeons that need to leave because they're mean to their colleagues in other departments. Don't turn that on me. I don't get paid enough for it.

In these situations, negative experiences extended beyond professional differences to encompass interactions that the instructional designers felt were personal. Many of these situations were not ongoing or pervasive attitudes and experiences but rather specific, punctuated events that had an impact on the instructional designer's feelings of dissatisfaction.

Institutional tensions. The experiences described by instructional designers pointed to another case and situation where instructional designers tended to have feelings of dissatisfaction: when they experienced themselves to be devalued by their institution and when poor leadership made the work of the instructional designer ultimately more difficult (Theme 3). Institutional tensions also included policies and procedures that instructional designers considered barriers to the work that they did (Theme 1). For Maggie, these institutional tensions communicated to her that the institution did not value her overall. She frequently used words like "devalued" and "disheartened" when referring to specific times that the institution did not support her or the work she was doing. In one specific case, Maggie walked in on a conversation

where her office was being moved, and she had not been consulted at all. She described her dissatisfaction as the result of not being communicated with, something that made her feel devaluated, rather than the fact that she was being moved.

Sadie expressed that she felt undervalued, especially in situations when the work she was doing did not meet the standards of quality that she established for herself. She noted,

> We can sometimes feel like a work mill. To be honest, we churn and churn and churn and produce, produce, produce and sometimes quality can suffer because of that, because we are expected to meet demanding timelines and sometimes it takes courage to speak up and say, "I don't think that's the best thing right now. I don't think that's in our best interest because the quality's going to suffer." But sometimes we were told that does not matter.

Sadie's experiences were similar to those expressed by Leah, who used the term "factory work" and expressed that these experiences made her realized that "she wasn't going to try anything fancy." These experiences resulted in low satisfaction because the instructional designers felt they were limited in what they could do.

No challenge to the work. Similar to the institutional tensions that were experienced by participants, the nature of the work participants did was also a cause for dissatisfaction (Theme 1). Angie was in a unique situation in that she frequently did not have enough work to keep her busy. Although initially this seemed like an outlier in terms of the work done by participants, Angie's frustration stemmed from being underutilized and not being challenged in her work. This was consistent with Gwen's feelings of dissatisfaction in terms of the kind of the work that she was doing in transitioning from one LMS to the next, something Gwen described as "tedious and boring." Levi described working too long with a specific project as getting "stale."

Combined with some of the issues addressed in a previous section regarding institutional tensions and the quality of the work that instructional designers were being asked to produce, instructional designers also expressed dissatisfaction regarding the limitations that were placed on them for greater innovation in their classes (Themes 1 and 3). Sadie explained that at her institution, innovation was difficult because of the time restrictions placed on instructional designers, and Leah expressed similar frustrations. Wendy discussed the desire for more time and opportunities to use more eLearning tools, but that the time and opportunities to do so did not really exist.

As participants discussed both the experiences that led to satisfaction and dissatisfaction, they also discussed their feelings of motivation in terms of whether experiences were satisfying or dissatisfying.

Sub-question 3

The third sub-question of this study was How do participants describe their motivation in the workplace in light of feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction? Motivation for instructional designers was a complex idea, including both intrinsic factors like wanting to do a good job, engaging in pleasing and interesting work, and being able to try something new, as well as extrinsic factors such as deadlines. As participants described experiences that contributed to feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, the discussion also included how those experiences affected the motivation in their jobs.

Motivation and how it contributed to the quality of work and organizational engagement depended on the factors related to satisfaction. Fundamentally, Breanna, an instructional designer

in the process of transitioning out of her current position, clearly stated, "I'm more motivated when I'm satisfied with my job because I want to do a better job." Alternatively, Gwen, who expressed levels of dissatisfaction, noted that despite her general low satisfaction related to the task at hand, she still wanted to do a good job in the work that she did. In general, participants expressed motivation associated with specific experiences rather than their feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction overall.

When working with faculty and subject matter experts, participants felt greater motivation when the person they were working with expressed passion for their work and content. Participants in this study shared excitement, passion, and higher motivation when they described interactions with faculty who were equally excited or had a great experience in their classes. Sadie and Breanna described times when they met with faculty and the faculty member's excitement for the content was contagious.

As one of the themes that emerged in relation to job satisfaction specifically was that participants have higher job satisfaction when they are engaging in work that is varied, allows them to demonstrate their own professional competency, and speaks to their intrinsic need to continue learning and growing, it makes sense they are more motivated when they are engaging in work that satisfies and challenges them. Faye explained,

> I feel motivated when I'm given challenges that stimulate me, you know, um, like when I got accepted into that, um, research fellowship opportunity or, um, like that. So that, that's very motivating to me. You know, somebody challenges something and says, you know, "You want to try this out?" "Yeah. You know, I do."

These sentiments were also echoed by Angie, Elliot, and Levi, as they explained that part of their motivation in their work was related to feeling challenged, and generally, participants who were challenged felt more satisfied and more engaged in the work.

Alternatively, when the work was boring or tedious, participants felt less motivated. Most specifically, the transition of courses from one learning management system to the next was one task that continually emerged as laborious. Both Gwen and Breanna talked about how difficult it was to be motivated when the work they were doing was not challenging or engaging, as often this transition included the straight copying and pasting of content from one LMS to the other. Deadlines often complicated the situation as participants such as Gwen did not always feel like they had time to make full improvements as well. Breanna explained her feelings while working with one course and transitioning it from one LMS to another: "It's just such a poorly designed class and I have like no motivation to like really think about how to make it better … so I think like the content, if it's bad, it's really difficult to get motivated."

Relationships also played an important role in terms of their motivation, regardless of an instructional designer's overall satisfaction or dissatisfaction. In terms of demotivation, although instructional designers expected challenging experiences with faculty to be a part of the job, persistently negative experiences had an impact on motivation. Sadie explained, "If you're consistently working with difficult people, it's draining … and demotivating and takes away from their sense of satisfaction." However, alternatively, positive experiences with peers, even when instructional designers expressed some levels of dissatisfaction, did affect how instructional designers expressed their motivation. Breanna explained that she felt more motivated when she was working with someone else who was excited about the content for their course.

Breanna is a prime example of this – although she was preparing to leave her organization and was in the process of finishing certain projects, she still felt a strong desire to produce something that was quality because it still affected her peers – and Gwen, who expressed overall lower feelings of satisfaction, noted, "And again, when one of my supervisors goes the extra mile to help me get some stupid paperwork through that I couldn't get through or whatever, I want to do anything in the world I can for that person."

Summary

The preceding chapter provides detailed descriptions of the findings from the interview, job satisfaction survey, and work product description which revealed the factors and experiences related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation of instructional designers in online higher education. Four themes, with a total of 17 subthemes, emerged from the data related to the work that instructional designers do (Theme 1), the relationships that the engage in (Theme 2), the institutional context (Theme 3), and the internal motivating factors related to the work that they do (Theme 4). Data revealed that instructional designers want to be perceived as competent professionals, who are contributing to their institution, and are valued by their institution. When they are not, they are more likely to experience lower levels of satisfaction. Relationships are also central to the role and responsibilities of the instructional designer, and while the instructional designers in this study expressed different challenges related to those relationships, they also considered relationships to provide some of the most satisfying experiences within their work.

The findings of this study reveal some key ideas related to an instructional designer's job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. Experiences that were related to overall feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation included experiences that allowed instructional

designers to demonstrate and be appreciated for their professional competencies, for them to be able to continue to grow and learn. Relationships with colleagues also contributed to general feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. Most specifically, feelings of high satisfaction emerged when IDs felt they were considered valuable members of their institution, and when their value was demonstrated through institutional investment. Feelings of dissatisfaction were higher when instructional designers feel like they are not valued or their work is not fulfilling. While most instructional designers try not to allow feelings of dissatisfaction to affect the quality of the work they do, their motivation to do that work may be affected by either the work they are doing or a critical incident that affects their general motivation.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSION

Overview

The purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study is to describe the experiences and factors related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation for instructional designers working in online programs in not-for-profit higher education institutions. This study fills a gap in the literature in looking not just at the experiences of instructional designers in online higher education but considering how those experiences affect job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. Eleven instructional designers from ten institutions were interviewed and provided a screen-casted discussion of their work, along with their feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation in their current working situation.

This study poses a central research question and three sub-questions. The findings and implications of the findings are presented, including how this study contributes to the theoretical, empirical, and practical understanding of the experiences of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation of instructional designers in not-for-profit higher education. This chapter presents limitations and delimitations, as well as suggestions for further research.

Summary of Findings

As a context for understanding the findings of this study, it may be helpful to return to a question introduced earlier in this study in light of general attitudes about satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation: "What does a worker want from his job?" (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993, p. 6). Based upon the analysis of a job satisfaction survey, interviews, and a work product description, 4 main themes with 17 subthemes emerged. The four main themes were 1) the work that instructional designers do, 2) the relationships they develop, 3) the institutional context of their work, and 4) their motivation for doing the work. The findings are summarized

in Table 4 and Table 5. These four themes provided the context in which participants were able to articulate the experiences that led to feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation and the framework for understanding the central research question and the three sub-questions:

CQ What experiences do instructional designers in online higher education associate with feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation?

- **SQ 1** What experiences do participants associate with feelings of job satisfaction?

- **SQ 2** What experiences do participants associate with feelings of job dissatisfaction?

- **SQ 3** How do participants describe their motivation in the workplace in light of feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction?

Central Research Question

Findings related to the central research question brought to light the broader key experiences related to an instructional designer's feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation.

All participants in this study expressed feelings of job satisfaction related to the actual work that they did, from course design to training to online technology support. Participants had strong feelings of satisfaction when they were able to produce something that they perceived as high quality and contributing to the overall good of the institution. As they discussed the work that they did and their satisfaction with the work, it was usually work they could take pride in, that allowed them to flex their skills as instructional designers. Feelings of dissatisfaction emerged when the work they did was boring, tedious, or when they perceived barriers that did not allow them to produce instructional resources to the level of quality they desired. Participants

connected higher levels of motivation with work they found engaging and valuable to the institution.

Participants also discussed feelings of satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation related to the relationships they forged in their jobs. Job satisfaction occurred as a result of their feelings of support and collegiality with peers and faculty. Dissatisfaction was generally the result of a lack of feeling supported in their roles, as well as perceived personal attacks on either the participant or the work that the participant was doing. Motivation was associated with positive relationships, regardless of overall feelings of satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Participants also expressed feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation related to how their institution demonstrated they valued them as instructional designers. In this area, participants expressed the most extremes related to how their institution made them feel. Participants who felt more valued by their institution generally had higher job satisfaction and greater motivation in their work. Instructional designers who had experiences in which they did not feel valued by their institution generally had lower job satisfaction and expressed lower motivation to contribute overall to the good of the institution.

Finally, all of the instructional designers in this study expressed feelings related to both a love of learning and a desire to both continue to learn and continue to be challenged in their work. Feelings of satisfaction and motivation were greater in situations and environments when instructional designers felt they were challenged and able to learn and grow. Instructional designers expressed lower feelings of satisfaction or feelings of dissatisfaction when they were in a working environment that did not foster or challenge them to grow. In this area, instructional designers also expressed the strongest relationships between motivation, satisfaction, and

dissatisfaction as their motivation to do their work was tied directly to whether that work was

challenging and fostered growth.

Collectively, these were the experiences that the instructional designers related to feelings

of satisfaction or dissatisfaction and their relationship with motivation. It is also important to

consider the factors satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation separately for a richer

understanding of each.

Sub-question 1

The first sub-question was What experiences do instructional designers associate with

feelings of job satisfaction? The experiences that participants associated with feelings of job

satisfaction were experiences that allowed them to demonstrate their value to their institution,

experiences that allowed them to continue to learn and grow, and experiences related to positive

relationships with peers and colleagues. These findings are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Sub-question 1 – Experiences that Contribute to Job Satisfaction

Theme 1: Work that IDs Do	Theme 2: Relationships	Institutional Context	Values and Motivation
Solid course design, creating a good experience for students, perception of quality work, opportunities to demonstrate competence.	Positive, collegial interactions with faculty; Supportive engagement with colleagues and peers.	Feeling valued and invested in by the institution through work, compensation, knowing they were able to make an impact in the HEI.	Experiences that allow IDs to engage in personal growth, learning new skills.

Participants took a great deal of pride in their work, not just in what they were doing, but

the quality of their work as it related to improving the learning experiences of students and the

teaching experience of teachers. Frequently in the interviews, participants described how they

took pleasure in moments when faculty would learn something new, expressed excitement at

faculty learning something they had not been able to do previously in the class, and ultimately

desired that faculty were able to take ownership of their classes, especially in online learning. Their articulation regarding the desire to improve the learning experience for students was similar to that of faculty, though in that area there was some disconnect as participants had limited contact or interaction with students and rarely received direct feedback from them. Nonetheless, participants took seriously the responsibility to ensure that students had a solid learning experience.

Beyond their own perceived value in terms of creating learning experiences for students, participants were most satisfied when they felt there was meaning to their work and that it contributed to the good of the institution overall. The projects and work that participants did often extended beyond just course design to encompass a wide variety of tasks. When asked what a typical day looked like, most of the participants in this study responded that there was no such thing as a "typical day," as the work they do is so varied. The variety also contributed to the overall feelings of satisfaction. However, for participants, it was not just that they were able to contribute to the good of the institution that mattered but that the institution was able to demonstrate that they also valued the instructional designer through investment in them.

Participants were not just focused on the learning and growth of students and faculty, but also their own professional growth. They expressed greater overall satisfaction when they were able to grow and learn professionally. This included the opportunity to engage with multiple subjects, engage in on-the-job learning, and participate in conferences and other types of professional development. Participants in this study all articulated a love of learning and continued growth and expressed satisfaction when they were able to engage in that learning.

Finally, participants shared that experiences related to positive interactions and relationships led to greater job satisfaction. Each type of relationship looked a little different: in

relationships with faculty, it was when they were treated as professional equals and when faculty

acknowledged the professional competence of the participants; in relationships with their peers

and colleagues, it was generally the shared experience of feeling support and collaboration that

contributed to the greatest feelings of satisfaction.

Sub-question 2

The second sub-question was What experiences do instructional designers associate with

feelings of dissatisfaction? The experiences that related to dissatisfaction generally fell into

categories of feeling a lack of control in their work, specific institutional tensions, and work that

was unchallenging. Further, in situations when participants felt misunderstood, overworked, and

undervalued, feelings of overall satisfaction dramatically fell. These findings are summarized in

Table 4.

Table 4

Sub-question 2 – Experiences that Contribute to Low Satisfaction/Dissatisfaction

Theme 1: Work that IDs Do	Theme 2: Relationships	Theme 3: Institutional Context	Theme 4: Values and Motivation
No challenge to the work that IDs are doing. Work that does not meet the quality that IDs feel it should, feeling like a "work mill."	Professional skill of the ID is called into question. Faculty/SME resistance that prevents ID from doing their job. Poor relationships with supervisor/lack of leadership.	Poor leadership, lack of strategic plan that translates to not feeling valued by the institution Lack of control based on institutional processes and procedures.	Lack of feedback loop regarding students and faculty. Not having opportunities to grow and engage with different content Not being able to fully use their skills.

As mentioned previously, participants expressed satisfaction when they felt faculty and

colleagues perceived them as professional equals. However, more often than not, participants did

not feel they were perceived as equals. Some pushback and tension related to online learning was

always expected; it was when the interactions moved beyond simple pushback to perceived

personal attacks that it had a significant impact on how the participants expressed their satisfaction or dissatisfaction. The participants wanted to be seen and regarded as equals and professionals. When they were not, they felt much lower levels of satisfaction. Experiences that led to dissatisfaction tended to be more personal.

Additionally, participants felt levels of dissatisfaction when they felt out of control, unable to fully utilize their knowledge and skills, or when there was a pervasive lack of understanding of the work that instructional designers did and were capable of doing. In these cases, participants used words and phrases like "work mill," "factory work," "why bother," "disheartened," or "undervalued and unappreciated" to describe how they felt about their work and their experiences. As noted previously, participants felt a strong drive to make the teaching experience better for faculty and the learning experience better for students. When policies were in place that prevented them from being able to do so, participants also expressed low job satisfaction.

Sub-question 3

The third sub-question asked, How do instructional designers describe their motivation in the workplace in light of feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction? The relationship between motivation and job satisfaction or dissatisfaction for participants was complex and encompassed their work, the relationships in their work, and how they felt valued by the institution. These findings are summarized in Table 5.

Participants' desire to produce quality work was central to their motivation and related to their satisfaction. When they were in situations where they could produce quality work, they were much more satisfied than when there were specific institutional limitations placed on their work. Further, participants expressed greater motivation when people they were working with,

most frequently faculty and subject matter experts, were also motivated and passionate about their content.

Table 5

Sub-question 3 – Motivation Related to Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

Job Satisfaction	Greater motivation related to satisfaction
	Motivation related to positive relationships and interactions
	Greater motivation with work that was varied and challenging
	Desire to produce quality work
Job Dissatisfaction	Lower motivation with tedious work, poor content
	Low motivation with difficult working relationships
	Lack of opportunities for growth
	Feeling unable to demonstrate professional competency reduced motivation

Instructional designers expressed greater motivation related to positive experiences and interactions related to the relationships that they had with peers, faculty and subject matter experts, and other departments, taking overall satisfaction into account only minorly. Greater motivation was described in terms of higher job satisfaction overall, but even participants who expressed ambivalence or levels of low satisfaction were concerned about the relationships that they built and maintained as instructional designers and could express higher motivation based on those relationships. Motivation included both being willing to go above and beyond and continue to produce quality work, as well as a desire to effect change in the experience of students and faculty.

Certain experiences lead participants to feel an overall lack of motivation. Generally, when the work was boring or when instructional designers did not feel challenged, they expressed lower feelings of motivation. Additionally, they would feel lower motivation associated with critical incidents, or specific events that in this case caused bad feelings. One

participant was told she could not attend a conference as a result of unfinished or incomplete work, and two other participants experienced epiphanies related to their work and course design that caused them to question the quality of their work and their value to the institution. In these instances, participants identified little to no motivation that extended beyond a specific project to the whole working experience of the instructional designer.

Discussion

The purpose of this transcendental phenomenological study is to describe the experiences and factors related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation for instructional designers working in online programs in not-for-profit higher education institutions. The findings in this study contribute to the currently existing body of knowledge related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation theory in the workplace by extending a qualitative understanding of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. The findings in this study also contribute to the currently existing body of knowledge related to the role of the instructional designer in online higher education. While a body of knowledge related to job satisfaction in higher education exists, this study also adds a deeper understanding to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation in higher education. This study also fills a gap related specifically to the experiences and feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation of instructional designers in online higher education.

Theoretical Literature

There is a robust body of knowledge that offers explanation to better understand motivation in the workplace as it is related to feelings of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. According to motivation theory, motivation attached to job satisfaction in the workplace is based on the ability of the job to meet certain basic needs (Mangi et al., 2015; Maslow, 1943). The

theory of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation put forth by Herzberg et al.

(1959/1993) provided a valuable theoretical framework for this study in terms of helping frame

the conversation of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation for instructional designers in

online higher education. Herzberg posed that job satisfaction functioned on two separate planes.

Motivators were central, intrinsic aspects of the job related to human achievement and attached

to job satisfaction, while hygiene factors were extrinsic aspects of the job and could reduce job

dissatisfaction but could not inherently improve satisfaction (Herzberg, 1987; Herzberg et al.,

1959/1993).

Most of the findings in this study were consistent with the framework provided by

Herzberg et al. (1959/1993) related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. The

factors that instructional designers in this study associated with feelings of higher job satisfaction

were consistent with the theoretical framework, specifically in that the work that instructional

designers do, as well as opportunities for growth and development, is a source of satisfaction

overall (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993). These are also consistent with the findings of Alghamdi

(2017), who found that there was a strong correlation between overall job satisfaction and the

nature of the work itself. Participants in this study frequently expressed greater satisfaction and

higher motivation when the work was engaging and interesting, and fulfilled the intrinsic need to

make a valuable contribution to the institution. When the work was tedious and unengaging,

participants expressed lower levels of job satisfaction and, by extension, lower levels of

motivation.

An additional factor that emerged for participants in this study related to their job

satisfaction was the provision of the opportunity for continued growth, development, and

learning within their role. This is reflected within the motivation-hygiene theory (Herzberg,

1974) and is related to an instructional designer's growth. Participants met this need through the variety of content areas they engaged with, the opportunities to do new and "exciting" things with faculty, as well as the professional development opportunities that were available to them. Participants often expressed that they were more motivated after attending a conference to try new and exciting things within their jobs. Conversely, instructional designers expressed lower satisfaction when they were in environments where the work was single track, limiting, and did not allow them to fully utilize their abilities as instructional designers.

One of the important findings in this study was the role that relationships play in the levels of job satisfaction and motivation for instructional designers. According to Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), working relationships are considered hygiene factors, that is, factors that can affect lower dissatisfaction, but not increase job satisfaction. However, participants continually discussed their positive relationships with other instructional designers and faculty as contributing factors to their job satisfaction. In the work of instructional designers, relationships are central to the work; instructional design is inherently collaborative in nature, and so the relationships, or lack thereof, had a strong impact on their job satisfaction. The role of relationships in job satisfaction is found in other literature using the motivation-hygiene theory to frame job satisfaction in higher education (Rich, 2015). Rich (2015) also found that support from colleagues positively contributed to the job satisfaction of adjuncts in higher education.

According to Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), in addition to the factors that lead to job satisfaction, there are factors that can reduce job dissatisfaction. These are factors that are related to the work environment, and while they reduce job dissatisfaction, they may not ultimately increase overall job satisfaction. For instructional designers in this study, the hygiene factors included salary, working conditions (unless they were perceived as related to how instructional

designers were valued by the institution), and policies and procedures. Participants mentioned these factors in terms of their work but were clear that these things ultimately would not make them more satisfied overall.

Participants generally felt their salary was low, or recognized that in the field itself there was a trend toward feeling like the salary was lower than what they believed they could make in another organization, or perhaps even at another institution. However, none of the participants in this study transitioned to a new position based simply on pay. Transition to a new institution was related to an increased salary and a desire for a different quality of life, or increased salary and the desire to move into a position that afforded them more growth and engagement in their work. Machado-Taylor et al. (2016) supported Herzberg's theory in pointing out that salary is important as long as it allows employees to meet basic needs; once those basic needs are met, employees will identify other factors as greater contributors to their satisfaction.

Similarly, participants discussed challenges associated with working conditions and policies and procedures, but in most cases, these were secondary factors which did not contribute to increased satisfaction overall (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993). The exception to these factors as hygiene factors, rather than motivators, occurred when instructional designers perceived these factors as preventing them from doing their job well. In several cases, such as technology and LMS access, as well as requirements for faculty, the hygiene factors actually became motivators in how they allowed or prevented the instructional designer to fulfill their needs to demonstrate competence and actually do their job.

Empirical Literature

This study adds to a growing body of literature and research related to the experience of the instructional designer in online higher education. While there have been studies looking at

the experience of the instructional designer in higher education (Ashbaugh, 2013; Bawa & Watson, 2017; Bongers, 2017; Campbell et al., 2009; Houareau, 2017; Kumar & Ritzhaupt, 2017; Liu, Gibby, Quiros, & Demps, 2002; Rubley, 2016; Sugar & Luterbach, 2016; Tracey, Hutchinson, & Grzebyk, 2014; Yusop & Correia, 2014), as well as the general perception of job satisfaction of both academic and non-academic staff (Alghamdi, 2017; Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Eagan et al., 2015; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016; Nandan & Krishna, 2013; Quinn & Thorne, 2014; Smerek & Peterson, 2007), there has been no research done looking specifically at the job satisfaction of instructional designers in online higher education. This study helps to begin to fill that gap.

This study confirms previous empirical research looking at factors of job satisfaction in higher education in general. Although the research conducted by Rawn and Fox (2018) looked at teaching faculty, elements of job satisfaction were the same, namely a strong desire to contribute overall to the success of the institution and feel like a valuable, contributing member of the institution. This study also confirmed several of the factors addressed in Chapter 2 that had a direct impact on job satisfaction, including the work itself (Alghamdi, 2017; Mudrak et al., 2018), recognition or lack thereof (Eagan et al., 2015; Felder, 2018; Nandan & Krishna, 2013), and relationships with colleagues (Machado-Taylor et al., 2016). The findings in this study also extend an understanding of motivation, job satisfaction, and dissatisfaction associated with the intrinsic value of work that employees do, and how it meets specific needs for those employees.

However, as indicated by the experiences that participants shared, instructional designers in higher education do far more than simply work on curriculum in the institution. Research regarding the role of the instructional designer in higher education outlines numerous roles and competencies (Brigance, 2011; Cox & Osguthorpe, 2003; Intentional Futures, 2016). In several

cases, participants were responsible for training and providing resources that impacted the entire student experience, including orientation information and faculty support information. This is consistent with the research looking at the role of the instructional designer in higher education as discussed by Kumar and Ritzhaupt (2017) and Rubley (2016).

One area where this study added depth and complexity to the currently existing body of literature is related to the collaboration of instructional designers with faculty (Bawa & Watson, 2017; Bongers, 2017; Halupa, 2019; Houareau, 2017; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017). While instructional designers did express some frustration at their engagement with faculty and SMEs, there was more nuance to the relationship, as participants also recognized that a key part of their job included anticipating and responding to the needs of faculty in course design and improving the faculty experience overall, and clarifying that they expected some pushback and conflict. Some contention was a necessary part of the process and did not necessarily contribute to a more satisfactory or dissatisfactory experience unless certain other factors were at play. However, participants in this study also articulated higher job satisfaction with positive interactions and engagements with faculty.

All of the participants discussed a desire to impact and make a better experience for the students and to support and help faculty grow. This is consistent with the research done by Rowland and DiVasto (2013) looking at the impact of instructional designers on student learning overall. However, while participants care about the student experience, due to the lack of interaction with students, there were other areas where they sought to receive validation for their work.

One of the emerging themes in the literature that my research did not fully confirm was the vision of the instructional designer as innovator and technology expert (Scoppio & Luyt,

2017). Participants were asked about the freedom they had to innovate, and while most participants did have freedom, and took some chances to do so, there were usually parameters around the innovation including faculty and institutional limitations. Further, several participants expressed that they wished they could do more but didn't have the time or that they had freedom to do so but only within certain bounds, including what faculty would be able to do as well.

Participants also felt more validated and appreciated, and thus satisfied, when they knew their institution valued them and invested in them through opportunities for professional development as well as equipping them to do their jobs. This is also consistent with the theory put forth by Herzberg et al. (1959/1993). When they did not have the resources they needed to do the job, participants interpreted the lack of resources as a lack of perceived value by the institution, and a lack of understanding of the work that the instructional designer does.

Although it might be assumed that salary plays a large role in how the participants considered their job satisfaction, realistically, the findings in this study were consistent with the theoretical framework and additional research, that salary was not a strong motivator as long as basic needs were met (Herzberg et al., 1959/1993; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016). Most of the participants recognized their pay was lower than they thought their work was worth, but they recognized the role of their choice in work context, both at the institutional level, as well as within higher education in general. Participants also recognized that they would need to move to a new institution to see a significant increase in pay but mentioned other elements, such as flexibility, as being equally important.

One theme that emerged in the literature was organizational culture and working environment (Bozeman & Gaughan, 2011; Machado-Taylor et al., 2016; Moradi et al., 2013). Although participants touched on certain elements of this – specifically, the organizational

structure and online learning strategic plan – organizational culture was not a significant factor of job satisfaction so much as the context in which instructional designers work. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction in these areas were more related to how participants interpreted these areas in light of the support they received and provided, as well as the availability of resources to be able to complete the work and the tasks set before them.

Implications

The purpose of this section is to address the theoretical, empirical, and practical implications of this transcendental phenomenological study looking at the intersection of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation of instructional designers in online higher education. In light of this study and previous research, there are several areas where adjustments can be made in an institution to increase job satisfaction and decrease job dissatisfaction to affect overall motivation. Considering participants' feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation, participants were far more expressive in terms of factors that affected low to high satisfaction than factors that affected low to high dissatisfaction. This communicates that the factors related to the work that instructional designers do were ultimately more important to instructional designers than the context in which they did the work.

The following subsections provide insight into the theoretical constructs of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation in higher education, specifically as they are related to Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Empirical implications are explored to demonstrate how this study confirmed or extended previous research in related areas specifically related to job satisfaction and the role of instructional designers in higher education. Finally, practical implications are identified and discussed in terms of how institutions should be structured to best support instructional designers to increase their contribution and engagement in the institution.

Theoretical

This phenomenological study was designed to capture the lived experiences of instructional designers in online higher education related to their feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. Herzberg's (1966) motivation-hygiene theory provided a theoretical framework for understanding how positive and negative feelings about job factors affect overall motivation. There are certain theoretical implications to this research. Although the motivation-hygiene theory has been used to frame job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in previous studies, it has not been used specifically in relation to instructional designers. Thus, there are some unique aspects of the work of instructional designers that can inform a better overall understanding of motivation and hygiene factors in higher education.

According to Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), job satisfaction is driven by factors related to the work itself, and specifically, the intrinsic value that employees place on those factors. In this study, participants placed a high intrinsic value on the work they did and how that contributed to the overall good of the institution, a positive faculty experience, and a positive and engaging student experience. Participants described lower satisfaction when they engaged in tasks that they perceived did not contribute overall value to the institution, or that participants recognized did not live up to the full potential of improving the student experience.

An additional factor that participants considered in terms of their satisfaction was the presence of opportunities for learning and growth. Although, according to Herzberg et al. (1959/1993), growth is generally lower on the scale of contributions to job satisfaction, all of the participants described themselves as "learners" in one way or another and thus found greater satisfaction in roles that fostered that growth.

In Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory, relationships were technically considered a hygiene factor; specifically, one that could reduce job dissatisfaction but could not increase satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966). Hygiene factors could become motivating factors if the identified factor actually contributed to the nature of the work itself. For participants, relationships were not just a factor of the environment, but closely linked to the actual work of the instructional designers, and must be considered motivators, a factor that leads to job satisfaction.

One of the challenges observed in other studies that utilized Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory was the persistent consideration of job satisfaction on a single continuum rather than two continuums with low to high satisfaction and low to high dissatisfaction. Some of the same challenges emerged in this study as well; however, the findings in this study were consistent with the perception of low to high satisfaction related to the actual work that instructional designers do. Further, as participants described their experiences, hygiene situations that spoke to flexibility, work conditions, salary, and benefits became secondary if the primary factors related to satisfaction, such as recognition, relationships, and the opportunity to do meaningful and engaging work, were present.

Empirical

The findings in this study were consistent with the current body of research related to job satisfaction, motivation, and organizational engagement. The importance of understanding feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation is directly related to understanding how those feelings ultimately affect how an employee engages with their organization. In the literature specific to job satisfaction in higher education, previous studies affirmed that there was a relationship between high job satisfaction, organization engagement, and institutional effectiveness that resulted in better outcomes for students (Khanna, 2017; Stankovska et al.,

2017). In this study, all of the participants generally desired and pushed toward positive outcomes for students and faculty regardless of their overall levels of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction, though instructional designers with higher levels of job satisfaction felt more engaged and motivated in their work. Extreme critical incidents, such as the participant who was told she could not attend a conference she was scheduled to present at, or the participant who had an extremely positive interaction with faculty members, could generally move the needle more toward higher or lower levels of satisfaction and affect overall motivation.

Previous research in organizational theory and behavior makes a strong connection between job satisfaction, organizational behavior, and employee engagement (Ayim & Mohammad, 2015; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015). Further, Biswas and Mazumder (2017) pointed out that employee satisfaction plays a significant role in their engagement and positive organizational behavior. When participants described their feelings of satisfaction related to motivation and engagement, they connected their feelings of motivation to more positive engagement. Instructional designers would do the tasks that were set before them to the highest quality they could due to their intrinsic desire for quality work, but feelings of low satisfaction and high dissatisfaction did affect overall engagement in their work and in the institution. In extreme circumstances, participants recognized that if they did not feel their institution valued them, they would be less likely to engage in the organization overall.

This study also confirms previous research regarding the relational and collaborative nature of the work that instructional designers do (Bawa & Watson, 2017; Bongers, 2017; Brown, Eaton, Jacobsen, Roy, & Friesen, 2013), as well as their desire for personal and professional growth (Yanchar & Hawkley, 2014, 2015), and connects both the relational nature of the work and the desire for personal and professional growth to the job satisfaction of

instructional designers in online higher education. Institutionally, the instructional designer can make a significant impact on the teaching experience for faculty and the learning experience for students through not only the solid design of courses but also through training faculty who then would take more ownership in their online classes.

While all the participants acknowledged the importance of contributing overall to the institution, those who were satisfied described higher levels of contribution and engagement. In addition to their responsibilities related to their instructional design role, participants who were more satisfied contributed in other areas of the institution, participating in the general life of the institution or engaging in special projects and recognizing the value of their skills as instructional designers in doing so. Instructional designers who were less satisfied discussed looking for and applying for new jobs, seeking positions that fit them better, and not feeling the need to "fly the flag" for their institution.

Practical

This study set out to examine how job satisfaction and dissatisfaction influenced the motivation of instructional designers in online higher education. Analysis of the data revealed factors that lead to a deeper understanding of the practical implications of this research in terms of motivation and organizational behavior, employee motivation and engagement, turnover in the organization, and the role of motivation in the design of innovative and effective online courses.

In the literature, motivation and organizational engagement were closely related. Conversely, the absence of certain factors that contribute to satisfaction and motivation may lead employees to seek work in another setting. Several participants in this study were planning to transition to new institutions following interviews, and several others were interviewing for new positions or expressed a desire to leave. While lower job satisfaction was a cause, factors most

frequently cited by participants included a desire for more opportunities and personal growth. Yalabik et al. (2017) had similar findings and noted that organizations must account for the potential negative impact of turnover, including both cost and morale. Participants who had experienced high team turnover expressed feelings of dissatisfaction and low morale, as the impact of turnover on the team was felt as having the added pressure of ensuring new hires would be prepared and not quit.

The literature shows a strong connection between satisfaction, motivation, and organizational behavior (Abdullah & Akhtar, 2016; Biswas & Mazumder, 2017; Pouramini & Fayyazi, 2015). Overall, the findings in this study were consistent with the research. Participants articulated varying levels of organizational engagement and organizational citizenship behavior based on their feelings of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. One of the participants was very clear that they were guarded in terms of what they were willing to do and contribute in their place of work because they did not feel valued by their institution. Institutions that want to fully maximize the value of their instructional design teams need to recognize the ways that instructional designers feel valued and incorporate practices that communicate those feelings of value to the instructional designer. Developing policies and procedures that support the work of instructional designers, as well as establishing practices that can recognize the contribution and work of instructional designers and allow them to feel they are valued, would contribute to greater feelings of satisfaction and thus greater feelings of organizational engagement.

Alternatively, instructional designers who had high levels of satisfaction with their job and with their organization demonstrated high levels of engagement not just in their work but in their institution, engaging in different projects in the institution in general. One participant described putting into practice their instructional design skills while working on a research

project with another department. When participants felt valued, they were much more generous with their time and their skills to the benefit of the entire institution. Institutions need to recognize both the variety of skills that instructional designers bring to their roles and the ways that instructional designers can utilize those skills, providing opportunities for them to demonstrate their skills and engage in varied and potentially exciting work.

Motivation was more complex for instructional designers who had greater feelings of ambivalence toward their jobs. On the whole, they were still intent on doing their job to the best of their ability, though some expressed flagging feelings of motivation in the face of frustration, especially in terms of critical incidents that impacted feelings of satisfaction.

Participants with higher levels of satisfaction and organizational engagement were more engaged in the institution overall, but also focused on their responsibilities related to faculty and students. When making instructional design decisions, instructional designers will consider students and faculty as the most important stakeholders and will work to design instruction that meets the needs of these stakeholders (Lenert & Janes, 2017; Scoppio & Luyt, 2017). In this study, while instructional designers consistently identified a good student experience as a motivating factor, their relationships and interactions with faculty was more frequently discussed as a component of that motivation. Higher job satisfaction in instructional designers in this study was related to and impacted their motivation in their interactions with faculty.

Institutions need to recognize the factors in place in their institution that could have an overall impact on the job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of their instructional designers. Participants discussed how feeling valued and receiving positive and constructive feedback regarding their work did not just increase their satisfaction but also their motivation. Instructional designers are academic professionals and expect to be treated as such. Given how much

emphasis participants placed on their own competence in their jobs in terms of job satisfaction, it makes sense that external feedback relating to that competence would be central to their perceptions of satisfaction and motivation.

Delimitations and Limitations

When determining the parameters for this study, certain expectations were set around participants in terms of the type of institution where they worked, the amount of time they had been an instructional designer, and the amount of time they had been at their current institution. It was my intention that only participants working for non-profit HEIs be considered, as for-profit institutions generally fall under different requirements for work and different institutional models (McCaffery, 2010).

There were some challenges in terms of recruiting participants. One participant offered that it was not a surprise, as this study could be considered "looking under the hood," something that some may not be comfortable with doing, especially in light of the sensitivity of the subject matter. Other potential participants declined due to busyness and an extensive workload. Most instructional designers will work year-round for the institution, and as data collection took place during summer and fall months, many instructional designers expressed being extremely busy preparing for the upcoming summer.

To broaden the potential pool of participants, these challenges forced a reevaluation of the parameters around the expectations for several aspects of the study as well as the minimum requirements for participants. Adjustments were made in the length of time participants had been at their institution as well as length of time in the field of instructional design in general. In both cases, I reduced the minimum requirement; the length of time that a participant needed to be an instructional designer was reduced from 3 years to 1 year, and the length of time at their current

institution was reduced from 18 months to 12 months. Though this adjustment initially broadened my potential pool of participants, ultimately all but one participant fit within the initial parameters set.

Adjustments were also made to the data collection methods. Initially, participants were also requested to keep and submit a critical incident journal for an extended period of time. It is believed that this requirement was a barrier to participation, and so this requirement was removed, instead including questions regarding critical incidents in the interview. While the data collected was slightly different than initially intended, the data was actually richer as participants spoke to key events that influenced their feelings of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction.

Further, given the workload of instructional designers throughout the year, I chose to increase the amount of the gift card from $25 to $50. It was also hoped that this would make participation more attractive to participants and encourage participation. The decision to increase the gift for participation as well as reevaluate the data collection methods reduced the pressure on what instructional designers would need to produce and deliver for participation, but still allowed for thick, rich descriptions to emerge regarding feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation.

The participant pool for this study was limited to instructional designers that I was connected to via the online social networking site LinkedIn and additional participants gathered through the snowball method of sampling; specifically, several were recruited through a Quality Matters Listserv where information for my study was shared by a non-participant. While over 35 potential participants were contacted and the research was posted on several Listservs, less than 25% of those contacted agreed to participate, and no participants were recruited from Instructional Design Central, one of the sites that approved my request to recruit. The limitations

of participants through LinkedIn and snowball sampling means that my participant pool was

constrained to who would be active on these kinds of networking sites.

Additional limitations include the fact that most of my participants were females.

However, according to Intentional Futures (2016), approximately 67% of instructional designers

are female. While the percentage of females to males in this study is slightly higher than this

percentage, it is still representative on the whole of a female majority in the field of instructional

design.

The goal of this study was to look at factors that contributed to feelings of satisfaction,

dissatisfaction, and motivation in online higher education, and this study achieved that goal.

However, the range of instructional designers who expressed both satisfaction and dissatisfaction

may have been too broad, and richer descriptions may have been achieved if the participant pool

had been limited to instructional designers who demonstrated high levels of either satisfaction or

dissatisfaction.

<div align="center">**Recommendations for Future Research**</div>

Although this study provides valuable data regarding the experiences related to job

satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation for instructional designers in online higher education,

it also revealed further areas that would benefit from additional research.

Some research has already been conducted regarding the organizational structure of the

instructional design team and the effectiveness related to that structure (Drysdale, 2018); one

factor that emerged was closely related to how the instructional designer perceived his or her job

within that organizational structure of the HEI, especially as it related to whether the role was

centralized or within an individual department. Further consideration should be given not only to

the effectiveness of certain organizational structures, but also how instructional designers

perceive their job satisfaction within such structures.

In this study, motivation was complex and articulated along various lines of job

satisfaction and dissatisfaction. Another area that would benefit from additional research is the

motivation for instructional designers. While in this study participants were able to discuss

motivation in terms of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, low satisfaction did not always equate to

low motivation. Further research exploring motivation as a stand-alone construct may reveal

additional insight related to instructional designers in higher education.

Most significantly, as I finished this dissertation, online learning in higher education

became mainstream as many institutions were forced to go fully online due to the COVID-19

epidemic (Bao, 2020; Friedman, 2020). As instructional designers are on the frontlines of online

teaching and learning at many institutions, the epidemic has had the potential to deeply impact

the work and the role of the instructional designer in higher education. Thus, it opened the door

for multiple avenues of further study, both qualitative and quantitative, related to the transition to

online learning, the role of the instructional designer in the institution, and the effectiveness of

the instructional designer in this role.

The COVID-19 pandemic is so new that very little empirical research has been done;

however, articles are beginning to surface regarding the nature of the online course during

COVID-19, recognizing that much of the online instruction being delivered in the spring of 2020

is not true online learning in the sense that there was not the time to engage the general

structures, infrastructures, requirements, and months of planning that take place with

instructional designers in traditional online course design (Hodges et al., 2020). As factors that

emerged in this study related to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction included feelings about the

quality of the online courses, the restrictions of time often placed on instructional designers, and how instructional designers were perceived by their institution, findings could be rich in terms of how the role of the instructional designer changed, how an institutional shift related to online learning, and whether those institutions with strong online strategic plans were better suited to shift to remote and online learning.

Summary

The preceding chapter provides a discussion of the findings and implications of this transcendental phenomenological study looking at the intersection of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation in instructional designers in online higher education.

Job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation for instructional designers proved to be a complex topic, influenced by multiple factors in the work of the instructional designer. It is important to understand that instructional designers felt a need to contribute to their institution and expressed a strong desire to improve the student and the faculty experience. They also wanted to feel like a valued member of the institution. As a result of this study, institutions need to consider how they communicate to instructional designers their value and contribution to the overall success of the institution, both academically and in other areas, and take appropriate steps to recognize that contribution. Instructional designers also thrive and feel the greatest motivation in strong team environments where they feel supported by their colleagues and are able to engage with a variety of subjects to encourage learning and personal growth.

Understanding these factors can ultimately increase the overall engagement of the instructional designer in the institution and the contributions they are able to make to improving the experiences of faculty, students, and the overall quality of the educational experience provided by the institution.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, N., & Akhtar, M. M. S. (2016). Job satisfaction through organizational citizenship behaviour: A case of university teachers of Pakistan. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 62*(2), 134–149. Retrieved from

https://journalhosting.ucalgary.ca/index.php/ajer/article/view/56074

Adair, J. E. (2006). *Leadership and motivation: The fifty-fifty rule and the eight key principles of motivating others* (1st ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Kogan Page.

Alderfer, C. P. (1969). An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organization Behavior and Human Performance 4*(2), 142–175. Retrieved from

https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/organizational-behavior-and-human-performance

Alghamdi, H. H. (2017). *Examining motivation-hygiene theory: Job satisfaction among faculty members in Saudi higher educational institution* (Doctoral disseration). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (10287522)

Allen, I., & Seaman, J. (2015). *Grade level: Tracking online education in the United States*. [PDF Document]. Retrieved from http://info2.onlinelearningconsortium.org/rs/897-CSM-305/images/gradelevel.pdf

Allen, I., & Seaman, J. (2017). *Digital learning compass: Distance education enrollment report*. [PDF Document]. Retrieved from http://info2.onlinelearningconsortium.org/rs/897-CSM-305/images/gradelevel.pdf

Allen, I., Seaman, J., Poulin, R., & Straut, T. (2016). *Online report card: Tracking online education in the United States* [PDF Document]. Retrieved from http://onlinelearningconsortium.org/read/online-report-card-tracking-online-education-united-states-2015

Alonderiene, R., & Majauskaite, M. (2016). Leadership style and job satisfaction in higher education institutions. *International Journal of Educational Management, 30*(1), 140–164. doi:10.1108/IJEM-08-2014-0106

Amirault, R. J. (2012). Distance learning in the 21st century university: Key issues for leaders and faculty. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 13*(4), 253–265. Retrieved from http://www.infoagepub.com/quarterly-review-of-distance-education.html

Ashbaugh, M. L. (2013). Expert instructional designer voices: Leadership competencies critical to global practice and quality online learning designs. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 14*(2), 97–118. Retrieved from http://www.infoagepub.com/quarterly-review-of-distance-education.html

Ayim, G. S., & Mohammad, H. (2015). Organizational citizenship behaviour: An empirical investigation of the impact of age and job satisfaction on Ghanaian industrial workers. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis, 23*(2), 285–301. doi:10.1108/IJOA-08-2012-0586

Baldwin, S. J., Yu-Hui, C., & Friesen, N. (2018). Online course design and development among college and university instructors: An analysis using grounded theory. *Online Learning, 22*(2), 157–171. doi:10.24059/olj.v22i2.1212

Bao, W. (2020). COVID-19 and online teaching in higher education: A case study of Peking University. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies, 2*(2), 113–115. doi:10.1002/hbe2.191

Basit, A. A., & Arshad, R. (2016). The role of needs-supplies fit and job satisfaction in predicting employee engagement. *Jurnal Pengurusan, 47*, 1–17. Retrieved from http://ejournal.ukm.my/pengurusan

Bassett-Jones, N., & Lloyd, G. C. (2005). Does Herzberg's motivation theory have staying power? *Journal of Management Development, 24*(10), 929–943. doi:10.1108/02621710510627064

Bawa, P., & Watson, S. (2017). The chameleon characteristics: A phenomenological study of instructional designer, faculty, and administrator perceptions of collaborative instructional design environments. *The Qualitative Report, 22*(9), 2334–2355. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/

Beaudoin, M. F. (2015). Distance education leadership in the context of digital change. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 16*(2), 33–44. Retrieved from http://www.infoagepub.com/quarterly-review-of-distance-education.html

Beaudoin, M. F. (2016). Issues in distance education: A primer for higher education decision makers. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2016*(173), 9–19. doi:10.1002/he.20175

Behling, O., Labovitz, G., & Kosmo, R. (1968). The Herzberg controversy: A critical reappraisal. *Academy of Management Journal, 11*(1), 99. Retrieved from http://aom.org/Publications/AMJ/Welcome-to-AMJ.aspx

Bergmann, H. F. (2001). "The silent university": The Society to Encourage Studies at Home, 1873–1897. *The New England Quarterly, 74*(3), 447–477. doi:10.2307/3185427

Bessette, L. S. (2020). Digital learning during the COVID-19 pandemic. *The National Teaching & Learning Forum, 29*(4), 7–9. doi:10.1002/ntlf.30241

Bezemer, J., & Mavers, D. (2011). Multimodal transcription as academic practice: A social semiotic perspective. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 14*(3), 191–206. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2011.563616

Biswas, N., & Mazumder, Z. (2017). Exploring organizational citizenship behavior as an

    outcome of job satisfaction: A critical review. *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior,*

    16(2), 7–16. Retrieved from http://www.iupindia.in/Organizational_Behavior.asp

Bongers, N. P. (2017). *Satisfaction of collaborative online course development in higher*

    education. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses

    Global database. (Proquest No. 10615713)

Bonnici, L. J., Maatta, S. L., Klose, M. K., Julien, H., & Bajjaly, S. (2016). Instructional style

    and learner-centered approach: A cross-institutional examination of modality preference

    for online course delivery in a graduate professional program. *Studies in Higher*

    Education, 41(8), 1389–1407. doi:10.1080/03075079.2014.977860

Bozeman, B., & Gaughan, M. (2011). Job satisfaction among university faculty: Individual,

    work, and institutional determinants. *The Journal of Higher Education, 82*(2), 154–186.

    doi:10.1353/jhe.2011.0011

Brigance, S. K. (2011). Leadership in online learning in higher education: Why instructional

    designers for online learning should lead the way. *Performance Improvement, 50*(10),

    43–48. doi:10.1002/pfi.20262

Brown, B., Eaton, S. E., Jacobsen, D. M., Roy, S., & Friesen, S. (2013). Instructional design

    collaboration: A professional learning and growth experience. *Journal of Online*

    Learning and Teaching, 9(3), 439. Retrieved from http://jolt.merlot.org/

Burke, D. D., Clapper, D., & McRae, D. (2016). Accessible online instruction for students with

    disabilities: Federal imperatives and the challenge of compliance. *Journal of Law and*

    Education, 45(2), 135–180. Retrieved from http://www.law.sc.edu/jled/

Burnette, D. M. (2015). Negotiating the mine field: Strategies for effective online education adminstrative leadership in higher education institutions. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 16*(3), 13–25. Retrieved from http://www.infoagepub.com/quarterly-review-of-distance-education.html

Campbell, K., Schwier, R. A., & Kenny, R. F. (2009). The critical, relational practice of instructional design in higher education: An emerging model of change agency. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 57*(5), 645–663. doi:10.1007/s11423-007-9061-6

Caruth, G. D., & Caruth, D. L. (2013). Distance education in the United States: From correspondence courses to the internet. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education, 14*(2), 141–149. Retrieved from http://tojde.anadolu.edu.tr/

Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 140*(4), 980–1008. doi:10.1037/a0035661

Chawinga, W. D., & Zozie, P. (2016). Information needs and barriers to information sources by open and distance learners: A case of Mzuzu University, Malawi. *SA Journal of Information Management, 18*(1), 1-e12. doi:10.4102/sajim.v18i1.692

Christensen, T. K., & Osguthorpe, R. T. (2004). How do instructional-design practitioners make instructional-strategy decisions? *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 17*(3), 45–65. doi:10.1111/j.1937-8327.2004.tb00313.x

Chyung, S. Y., & Vachon, M. (2013). An investigation of the profiles of satisfying and dissatisfying factors in e-learning. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 26*(2), 117–140. doi:10.1002/piq.21147

Costley, J., Hughes, C., & Lange, C. (2017). The effects of instructional design on student engagement with video lectures at cyber universities. *Journal of Information Technology Education: Research, 16*, 189–207. Retrieved from https://www.informingscience.org/Journals/JITEResearch/Overview

Cox, S., & Osguthorpe, R. T. (2003). How do instructional design professionals spend their time? *TechTrends, 47*(3), 45. https://doi-org.ezproxy.liberty.edu/10.1007/BF02763476

Craft, R. K., Baker, J. G., & Finn, M. G. (2016). The value of tenure in higher education. *Journal of Business Inquiry, 15*(2), 100–115. Retrieved from http://journals.uvu.edu/index.php/jbi

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publishing.

Curriculum developer [Job listing]. (2018). *Grand Canyon Education.* Retrieved from https://jobs.gce.com/curriculum-developer/job/9740122

Czerniewicz, L., & Walji, S. (2019). Issues for universities using private companies for online education. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11427/29813

Demiral-Uzan, M. (2015). Instructional design students' design judgment in action. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 28*(3), 7–23. doi:10.1002/piq.21195

Drysdale, J. (2018). *The organizational structures of instructional design teams in higher education: A multiple case study* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from Digital Commons@ACU. (Document Number 115)

Eagan, M. K., Jaeger, A. J., & Grantham, A. (2015). Supporting the academic majority: Policies and practices related to part-time faculty's job satisfaction. *Journal of Higher Education, 86*(3), 448–483. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/uhej20

Eaton, S. E., Brown, B., Schroeder, M., Lock, J., & Jacobsen, M. (2017). *Signature pedagogies for e-learning in higher education and beyond*. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/1880/51848

Elder, S. J., Svoboda, G., Ryan, L. A., & Fitzgerald, K. (2016). Work factors of importance to adjunct nursing faculty. *The Journal of Nursing Education, 55*(5), 245. doi:10.3928/01484834-20160414-02

Eunmo Sung, R. E. M. (2012). Five facets of social presence in online distance education. *Computers in Human Behavior, 28*(5), 10. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2012.04.014

Felder, E. L., Jr. (2018). *Higher education nonacademic staff job performance and job satisfaction: Pillars of feedback interdependency* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (Proquest ID 10823103)

Frantzen, D. (2014). Is technology a one-size-fits-all solution to improving student performance? A comparison of online, hybrid and face-to-face courses. *Journal of Public Affairs Education, 20*(4), 565–578. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/24369838

Friedman, M. (2020). COVID-19 provides lessons for Arkansas' universities: Traditional campuses adjust quickly to online learning environment. *Arkansas Business, 37,* 10.

Gray, C. M., Dagli, C., Demiral-Uzan, M., Ergulec, F., Tan, V., Altuwaijri, A. A., . . . Boling, E. (2015). Judgment and instructional design: How ID practitioners work in practice. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 28*(3), 25–49. doi:10.1002/piq.21198

Hagedorn, L. S. (2000). Conceptualizing faculty job satisfaction: Components, theories, and outcomes. *New Directions for Institutional Research, 2000*(105), 5–20.

Halupa, C. (2019). Differentiation of roles: Instructional designers and faculty in the creation of online courses. *International Journal of Higher Education, 8*(1), 55. doi:10.5430/ijhe.v8n1p55

Harasim, L. (2000). Shift happens: online education as a new paradigm in learning. *The Internet and Higher Education, 3*(1), 41–61. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1096-7516(00)00032-4

Hassanein, O., & Hassanein, S. (2015). E-learning instructional design and the mismatch between e-learners and e-educators' learning styles. *International Journal on E-Learning, 14*(1), 5–28. Retrieved from http://www.learntechlib.org/c/IJEL/

Heidegger, M. (2010). *Being and time* (J. Stambaugh, Trans.). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York, NY: The World Publishing Company.

Herzberg, F. (1974). Motivation-hygiene profiles: Pinpointing what ails the organization. *Organizational Dynamics, 3*(2), 18–29. Retrieved from https://www.journals.elsevier.com/organizational-dynamics

Herzberg, F. (1982). *The managerial choice: To be efficient and to be human* (2nd ed.). Salt Lake City, UT: Olympus.

Herzberg, F. (1987). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review, September-October*.

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1993). *The motivation to work*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers. (Original work published in 1959)

Hiles, D. R. (n.d.). Axiology. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage encyclopedia of qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.

Hill, P. (2017). State of higher ed LMS market for US and Canada: Spring 2017 edition [Report]. Retrieved from https://mfeldstein.com/state-higher-ed-lms-market-us-canada-spring-2017-edition/

Hill, R. J. (2014). *Examining adjunct instructor characteristics, perceived fit, and teaching modality to determine if they predict organizational commitment and job satisfaction at a Midwestern career college* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Dissertations & Theses @ Liberty University database. (UMI No. 3624481)

Hodges, C., Moore, S., Lockee, B., Trust, T., & Bond, A. (2020). The Difference Between Emergency Remote Teaching and Online Learning. Retrieved from https://er.educause.edu/articles/2020/3/the-difference-between-emergency-remote-teaching-and-online-learning

Honebein, P. C. (2017). The influence of values and rich conditions on designers' judgments about useful instructional methods. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 65*(2), 341–357. doi:10.1007/s11423-016-9485-y

Honebein, P. C., & Honebein, C. H. (2015). Effectiveness, efficiency, and appeal: Pick any two? The influence of learning domains and learning outcomes on designer judgments of useful instructional methods. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 63*(6), 937–955. doi:10.1007/s11423-015-9396-3

Houareau, S. T. (2017). *New leadership competencies for instructional designers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (Proquest ID. 10599567)

House, R. J., & Wigdor, L. A. (1967). Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and

    motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology, 20*(4), 369–

    389. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/17446570

Intentional Futures. (2016). *Instructional design in higher education* [PDF Document]. Retrieved

    from https://intentionalfutures.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/Instructional-Design-in-

    Higher-Education-Report.pdf

International Board of Standards for Training Perfomance and Instructions. (2012). *Instructional*

    design competencies. Retrieved from http://ibstpi.org/

Jerome, N. (2013). Application of the Maslow's hierarchy of need theory; impacts and

    implications on organizational culture, human resource and employee's performance.

    International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 2(3), 39–45.

Jewitt, C. (2012). *An introduction to using video for research* [PDF Document]. Retrieved from

    http://eprints.ncrm.ac.uk/2259/4/NCRM_workingpaper_0312.pdf

Kafle, N. P. (2011). Hermeneutic phenomenological research method simplified. *Bodhi: An*

    Interdisciplinary Journal, 5, 181–200.

Kanfer, R., & Chen, G. (2016). Motivation in organizational behavior: History, advances and

    prospects. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 136*, 6–19.

    doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2016.06.002

Ke, F., & Kwak, D. (2013). Constructs of student-centered online learning on learning

    satisfaction of a diverse online student body: A structural equation modeling approach.

    Journal of Educational Computing Research, 48(1), 97–122. doi:10.2190/EC.48.1.e

Kebaetse, M. B., & Sims, R. (2016). Using instructional consultation to support faculty in

    learner-centered teaching. *The Journal of Faculty Development, 30*(3), 31–40. Retrieved

from https://newforums.com/title-list/author-guidelines/the-journal-of-faculty-development/

Khanna, V. (2017). Measuring job satisfaction of academicians using Herzberg theory. *Delhi Business Review, 18*(2), 75–86. Retrieved from http://www.delhibusinessreview.org/latest.htm

Klein, J. D., & Jun, S. (2014). Skills for instructional design professionals. *Performance Improvement, 53*(2), 41–46. doi:10.1002/pfi.21397

Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Krämer, B. J., Neugebauer, J., Magenheim, J., & Huppertz, H. (2015). New ways of learning: Comparing the effectiveness of interactive online media in distance education with the European textbook tradition. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 46*(5), 965–971. doi:10.1111/bjet.12301

Kumar, S., & Ritzhaupt, A. (2017). What do instructional designers in higher education really do? *International Journal on E-Learning, 16*(4), 371–393. Retrieved from http://www.learntechlib.org/c/IJEL/

Lambert, J. L., & Fisher, J. L. (2013). Community of inquiry framework: Establishing community in an online course. *Journal of Interactive Online Learning, 12*(1), 16. Retrieved from http://www.ncolr.org/

Larkin, I. M., Brantley-Dias, L., & Lokey-Vega, A. (2016). Job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and turnover intention of online teachers in the k–12 setting. *Online Learning, 20*(3), 26–51. Retrieved from http://onlinelearningconsortium.org/read/online-learning-journal/

Latham, G. P. (2012). *Work motivation: History, theory, research, and practice* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 485–516.

Learning technologies specialist [Job listing]. (2018). Retrieved from https://sjobs.brassring.com/TGnewUI/Search/Home/Home?partnerid=25620&siteid=5494#jobDetails=3618043_5494

Lenert, K. A., & Janes, D. P. (2017). The incorporation of quality attributes into online course design in higher education. *International Journal of E-Learning & Distance Education, 32*(1), 1–14. Retrieved from http://www.ijede.ca/index.php/jde

Lichtenstein, S., Lichtenstein, G., & Higgs, M. (2017). Personal values at work: A mixed-methods study of executive's strategic decision-making. *Journal of General Management, 43*(1), 15–23. doi:10.1177/0306307017719702

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2013). *The constructivist credo*. New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Liu, M., Gibby, S., Quiros, O., & Demps, E. (2002). Challenges of being an instructional designer for new media development: A view from the practitioners. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia, 11*, 195–219.

Lloyd, R., & Mertens, D. (2018). Expecting more out of expectancy theory: History urges inclusion of the social context. *International Management Review, 14*(1), 24–37. Retrieved from http://www.imrjournal.org/

Lorenzo, G. (2008). The Sloan semester. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 12*(2), 5–40. Retrieved from http://sloanconsortium.org/jaln/v12n2/sloan-semester

Lunenburg, F. C. (2011). Expectancy theory of motivation: Motivating by altering expectations. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration, 15*(1), 1–6. Retrieved from http://www.nationalforum.com/Electronic%20Journal%20Volumes/Luneneburg,%20Fred%20C%20Expectancy%20Theory%20%20Altering%20Expectations%20IJMBA%20V15%20N1%202011.pdf

Machado-Taylor, M. L., Meira Soares, V., Brites, R., Brites Ferreira, J., Farhangmehr, M., Gouveia, O. M. R., & Peterson, M. (2016). Academic job satisfaction and motivation: Findings from a nationwide study in Portuguese higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(3), 541–559. doi:10.1080/03075079.2014.942265

Manganelli, L., Thibault-Landry, A., Forest, J., & Carpentier, J. (2018). Self-determination theory can help you generate performance and well-being in the workplace: A review of the literature. *Advances in Developing Human Resources, 20*(2), 227–240. doi:10.1177/1523422318757210

Mangi, A. A., Kanasro, H. A., & Burdi, M. B. (2015). Motivation tools and organizational success: A critical analysis of motivational theories. *Government: The Research Journal of Political Science, 4*(4), 51–62. Retrieved from http://sujo.usindh.edu.pk/index.php/THE-GOVERNMENT

Mansureh, K., Angie, L., & Lilia, S. (2017). Issues and challenges for teaching successful online courses in higher education: A literature review. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 46*(1), 4–29. doi:10.1177/0047239516661713

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370–396. doi:10.1037/h0054346

Mbuva, J. M. (2014). Online education: Progress and prospects. *Journal of Business and Educational Leadership, 5*(1), 91–101. Retrieved from http://asbbs.org/journals/

McCaffery, P. (2010). *The higher education manager's handbook* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

McCombs, B. (2015). Learner-centered online instruction. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 2015*(144), 57–71. doi:10.1002/tl.20163

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Merrill, M. D. (2007). The proper study of instructional design. In R. A. Reiser & J. V. Dempsey (Eds.), *Trends and issues in instructional design and technology* (pp. 336–341). Upper Saddler River, NJ: Pearson.

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Miner, J. B. (2003). The rated importance, scientific validity, and practical usefulness of organizational behavior theories: A quantitative review. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 2*(3), 250–268. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40214194

Moate, R., & Cox, J. (2015). Learner-centered pedagogy: Considerations for application in a didactic course. *The Professional Counselor, 5*(3), 379–389. doi:10.15241/rmm.5.3.379

Moradi, E., Almutairi, D. O., Idrus, D., & Emami, R. (2013). The influence of organizational learning culture on job satisfaction among academic staff. *Journal of Global Management, 5*(1), 56–66. Retrieved from https://ideas.repec.org/s/grg/03mngt.html

Morris, T. L., & Laipple, J. S. (2015). How prepared are academic administrators? Leadership and job satisfaction within U.S. research universities. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 37*(2), 241–251. doi:10.1080/1360080X.2015.1019125

Moskal, T. M. (2012). *Instructional designers in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global database. (UMI No. 3546879)

Moustakas, C. E. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Mudrak, J., Zabrodska, K., Kveton, P., Jelinek, M., Blatny, M., Solcova, I., & Machovcova, K. (2018). Occupational well-being among university faculty: A job demands-resources model. *Research in Higher Education, 59*(3), 325–348. doi:10.1007/s11162-017-9467-x

Nandan, D. R., & Krishna, K. S. R. (2013). Determinants of job satisfaction of faculty in higher education. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations, 49*(1), 132–147. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/journal/indijindurela

National Center for Education Statistics. (2017). *IPEDS: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System*. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Paiva, J., Morais, C., Costa, L., & Pinheiro, A. (2016). The shift from "e-learning" to "learning": Invisible technology and the dropping of the "e." *British Journal of Educational Technology, 47*(2), 226–238. doi:10.1111/bjet.12242

Pan, B., Shen, X., Liu, L., Yang, Y., & Wang, L. (2015). Factors associated with job satisfaction among university teachers in northeastern region of China: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 12*(10), 12761– 12775. doi:10.3390/ijerph121012761

Pan, C. C., Deets, J., Phillips, W., & Cornell, R. (2003). Pulling tigers' teeth without getting bitten: Instructional designers and faculty. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 4*(3), 289–302. Retrieved from http://www.infoagepub.com/quarterly-review-of-distance-education.html

Pan, C. C., & Thompson, K. (2009). Exploring dynamics between instructional designers and higher education faculty: An ethnographic case study. *Journal of Educational Technology Development & Exchange, 2*(1), 33 –51. Retrieved from https://aquila.usm.edu/jetde/

Parker, M. A., Baffour, T., & Cruz, L. (2018, July). The i3 model: Rethinking how faculty teach quality online and blended courses. *International Conference on e-Learning*. Paper presented at the International Conference on e-Learning, Cape Town, South Africa. Retrieved from https://www.academic-conferences.org/

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishing.

Petrovic-Dzerdz, M., & Trépanier, A. (2018). Online hunting, gathering and sharing - A return to experiential learning in a digital age. *International Review of Research in Open & Distance Learning, 19*(2), 271–281. Retrieved from http://www.irrodl.org/index.php/irrodl

Phillippi, J., & Lauderdale, J. (2018). A guide to field notes for qualitative research: Context and conversation. *Qualitative Health Research, 28*(3), 381–388. doi:10.1177/1049732317697102

Pittman, V. V. (2012). University correspondence study: A revised historigraphic perspective. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of Distance Education* (3rd ed., pp. 21–38). London, UK: Routledge.

Pouramini, Z., & Fayyazi, M. (2015). The relationship between positive organizational behavior with job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee engagement. *International Business Research, 8*(9), 57–66. Retrieved from http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/ibr

Quinn, F. F., & Thorne, D. M. (2014). The influence of organizational effectiveness and other correlates on the job satisfaction of staff employees at four year institutions of higher education. *Business Studies Journal, 6*, 67–84. Retrieved from https://www.abacademies.org/journals/business-studies-journal-home.html

Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2016). *Qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rawn, C. D., & Fox, J. A. (2018). Understanding the work and perceptions of teaching focused faculty in a changing academic landscape. *Research in Higher Education, 59*(5), 591–622. doi:10.1007/s11162-017-9479-6

Reigeluth, C. M. (Ed.) (1983). *Instructional design theories and models: An overview of their current status*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Reigeluth, C. M., Beatty, B. J., & Myers, R. D. (Eds.). (2016). *Instructional design theories and models, volume IV: The learner-centered paradigm of education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates.

Reio, T. G., & Crim, S. J. (2013). Social presence and student satisfaction as predictors of online enrollment intent. *American Journal of Distance Education, 27*(2), 122–133. doi:10.1080/08923647.2013.775801

Reiser, R. A. (2001). A history of instructional design and technology: Part II: A history of instructional design. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 49*(2), 57–67. doi:10.1007/BF02504928

Rich, T. (2015). A worthy asset: The adjunct faculty and the influences on their job satisfaction. *To Improve the Academy, 34*(1–2), 156–170. doi:10.1002/tia2.20010

Richardson, J. C., & Swan, K. (2003). Examining social presence in online courses in relation to students' perceived learning and satisfaction. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 7*, 68–88. Retrieved from http://sloanconsortium.org/publications/jaln_main

Riessman, C. K. (1993). *Narrative analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ritzhaupt, A. D., & Kumar, S. (2015). Knowledge and skills needed by instructional designers in higher education. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 28*(3), 51–69. doi:10.1002/piq.21196

Rizkallah, E. G., & Victoria, S. (2017). Understanding student motivation: A key to retention in higher education. *Scientific Annals of Economics and Business, 64*(1), 45–57. doi:10.1515/saeb-2017-0004

Rovai, A. P., & Downey, J. R. (2010). Why some distance education programs fail while others succeed in a global environment. *The Internet and Higher Education, 13*(3), 141–147. doi:10.1016/j.iheduc.2009.07.001

Rowland, G., & DiVasto, T. (2013). Instructional design and powerful learning. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 26*(2), 9–42. doi:10.1002/piq.21141

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Rubley, J. N. (2016). *Instructional designers in higher ed: Changing the course of next-generation learning* [PDF Document]. Retrieved from

http://results.chronicle.com/LP=1341

Sachau, D. A. (2007). Resurrecting the motivation-hygiene theory: Herzberg and the positive

psychology movement. *Human Resource Development Review, 6*(4), 377–393.

doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1534484307307546

Sahito, Z., & Vaisanen, P. (2017). The diagonal model of job satisfaction and motivation:

Extracted from the logical comparison of content and process theories. *International*

Journal of Higher Education, 6(3), 209–230. Retrieved from

http://www.sciedupress.com/journal/index.php/ijhe

Salmons, J. (2015). *Qualitative online interviews: Strategies, design, and skills* (2nd ed.). Los

Angeles, CA: Sage.

Sawitri, D., Suswati, E., & Huda, K. (2016). The impact of job satisfaction, organization

commitment, organization citizenship behavior (OCB) on employees' performance.

International Journal of Organizational Innovation (Online), 9(2), 24–45. Retrieved from

http://www.ijoi-online.org/

Schwandt, T. A. (2015). *Sage dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA:

Sage Publications.

Scoppio, G., & Luyt, I. (2017). Mind the gap: Enabling online faculty and instructional designers

in mapping new models for quality online courses. *Education and Information*

Technologies, 22(3), 725–746. doi:10.1007/s10639-015-9452-y

Seaman, J. E., Allen, I., & Seaman, J. (2018). *Grade increase: Tracking distance education in the United States* [PDF Document]. Retrieved from http://onlinelearningsurvey.com/reports/gradeincrease.pdf

Sebalj, D., Holbrook, A., & Bourke, S. (2012). The rise of "professional staff" and demise of the "non-academic": A study of university staffing nomenclature preferences. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 34*(5), 463–472. doi:http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cjhe20

Seng, E. L. K., & Wai, C. C. (2016). An empirical study of academic and non-academic staff's job satisfaction and organizational commitment in an institute of higher learning. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Business and Economics, 4*(1), 45–72. Retrieved from http://scientificia.com/index.php/JEBE

Sharif, A., & Cho, S. (2015). 21st-century instructional designers: Bridging the perceptual gaps between identity, practice, impact and professional development. *RUSC, 12*(3), 72–85. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.7238/rusc.v12i3.2176

Shearer, R. L. (2012). Theory to practice in instructional design. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (pp. 251–267). London, UK: Routledge.

Simonson, M., Smaldino, S., & Zvacek, S. M. (2014). *Teaching and learning at a distance: Foundations of distance education* (6th ed.). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.

Smerek, R. E., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herzberg's theory: Improving job satisfaction among non-academic employees at a university. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(2), 229–250. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/25704501

Smith, D. B., & Shields, J. (2013). Factors related to social service workers' job satisfaction: Revisiting Herzberg's motivation to work. *Administration in Social Work, 37*(2), 189–198. doi:10.1080/03643107.2012.673217

Smith, D. W. (2007). *Husserl*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Spector, P. E. (1994; 2011). Job satisfaction survey. Retrieved from http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/jsspag.html

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Springer, S. (2018). One university's experience partnering with an online program management (OPM) provider: A case study. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration, 21*(1). Retrieved from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/spring211/springer211.html

Stankovska, G., Angelkoska, S., Osmani, F., & Grncarovska, S. P. (2017). Job motivation and job satisfaction among academic staff in higher education. *BCES Conference Books, 15*, 159–166. Retrieved from http://bces-conference.org/BCES%20Conference%20Books.html

Sugar, W. A., & Luterbach, K. J. (2016). Using critical incidents of instructional design and multimedia production activities to investigate instructional designers' current practices and roles. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 64*(2), 285–312. doi:10.1007/s11423-015-9414-5

Sugar, W. A., & Moore, R. L. (2015). Documenting current instructional design practices: Towards a typology of instructional designer activities, roles, and collaboration. *The*

Journal of Applied Instructional Design, 5(1), 51–59. Retrieved from

https://www.jaid.pub/

Tannehill, D. B., Serapiglia, C. P., & Guiler, J. K. (2018). Administrative or faculty control of

online course development and teaching: A comparison of three institutions. *Information*

Systems Education Journal, 16(3), 26–34. Retrieved from http://isedj.org/

Thomasson, A. L. (2017). Husserl on essences: A reconstruction and rehabilitation. *Grazer*

Philosophische Studien, 94(3), 436–459. doi:10.1163/18756735-09403008

Tracey, M. W., Hutchinson, A., & Grzebyk, T. Q. (2014). Instructional designers as reflective

practitioners: Developing professional identity through reflection. *Educational*

Technology Research and Development, 62(3), 315–334. doi:10.1007/s11423-014-9334-

9

Tripathi, N., & Moakumla. (2018). A valuation of Abraham Maslow's theory of self-

actualization for the enhancement of quality of life. *Indian Journal of Health and*

Wellbeing, 9(3), 499–504. Retrieved from http://www.i-scholar.in/index.php/ijhw

Trivellas, P., & Santouridis, I. (2016). Job satisfaction as a mediator of the relationship between

service quality and organisational commitment in higher education. An empirical study of

faculty and administration staff. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence,*

27(1/2), 169–183. doi:10.1080/14783363.2014.969595

Upadhyaya, C. (2014). Application of the Maslow's hierarchy of need theory; impacts and

implications on organizational culture, human resource and employee's performance.

International Journal of Education and Management Studies, 4(4), 353–356. Retrieved

from http://www.i-scholar.in/index.php/injems

Van Manen, M. (2014). *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-giving methods in phenomenological research and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Vijayakumar, V. S. R., & Saxena, U. (2015). Herzberg revisited: Dimensionality and structural invariance of Herzberg's two-Mafactor model. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 41*(2), 291–298. Retrieved from http://jiaap.org/

von Konsky, B. R., Miller, C., & Jones, A. (2016). The skills framework for the information age: Engaging stakeholders in curriculum design. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 27*(1), 37–50. Retrieved from http://jise.org/

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Wang, Y. D. (2014). Building student trust in online learning environments. *Distance Education, 35*(3), 345–359. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2015.955267

Webber, K. L., & Rogers, S. M. (2018). Gender differences in faculty member job satisfaction: Equity forestalled? *Research in Higher Education*. doi:10.1007/s11162-018-9494-2

Weisberg, M., & Dent, E. (2016). Meaning or money? Non-profit employee satisfaction. *Voluntary Sector Review, 7*(3), 293–313. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1332/096278916X14767760873899

Williams, D. D., South, J. B., Yanchar, S. C., Wilson, B. G., & Allen, S. (2011). How do instructional designers evaluate? A qualitative study of evaluation in practice. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 59*(6), 885–907. doi:10.1007/s11423-011-9211-8

Wu, Y. (2016). Factors impacting students' online learning experience in a learner-centred course. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning, 32*(5), 416–429. doi:10.1111/jcal.12142

Yalabik, Z. Y., Rayton, B. A., & Rapti, A. (2017). Facets of job satisfaction and work engagement. *Evidence-based HRM: a Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship, 5*(3), 248–265. doi:10.1108/EBHRM-08-2015-0036

Yanchar, S. C. (2016). Instructional design practice as innovative learning: Journeys into the unfamiliar. *Educational Technology, 56*(1), 14–21. Retrieved from http://aect.site-ym.com/page/ETM

Yanchar, S. C., & Hawkley, M. N. (2014). "There's got to be a better way to do this": A qualitative investigation of informal learning among instructional designers. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 62*(3), 271. doi:10.1007/s11423-014-9336-7

Yanchar, S. C., & Hawkley, M. N. (2015). Instructional design and professional informal learning: Practices, tensions, and ironies. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 18*(4), 424. Retrieved from https://www.j-ets.net/ETS/index.html

York, C. S., & Ertmer, P. A. (2016). Examining instructional design principles applied by experienced designers in practice. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 29*(2), 169–192. doi:10.1002/piq.21220

Yusop, F. D., & Correia, A. (2014). On becoming a civic-minded instructional designer: An ethnographic study of an instructional design experience. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 45*(5), 782–792. doi:10.1111/bjet.12112

Zeb, A., ur Rehman, S., Saeed, G., & HamidUllah. (2014). A study of the relationship between reward and recognition and employees job satisfaction: A literature review. *Abasyn University Journal of Social Sciences, 7*(2), 295–308. Retrieved from http://www.aupc.info/

Zemsky, R., Shaman, S., & Baldridge, S. C. (2020). Will your college close? Forty percent of

    institutions are destined to struggle. What to do? Here's what works – and what doesn't.

    The Chronicle of Higher Education, 66, 26–31.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Demographic Information and Job Satisfaction Survey

Participant Demographics

Name:
Age:
Gender:
Degrees attained:
Current job title:
Institution:

Job Satisfaction Inventory

© Paul E. Spector (see copyright and permissions at the bottom of the survey)

PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.	Disagree Very Much	Disagree Moderately	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Moderately	Agree Very Much
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Communications seem good within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Raises are too few and far between.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1	2	3	4	5	6
My supervisor is unfair to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6
My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1	2	3	4	5	6

I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I like doing the things I do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6
My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	6
The benefit package we have is equitable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I like my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Work assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6

JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Paul E. Spector, Department of Psychology, University of South Florida

Permission to use the survey is contingent upon willingness to share aggregate results of the survey with the author. Numerical results as well as descriptive statistics will be shared with the author upon completion of the study.

APPENDIX B: Letter of Consent

CONSENT FORM
The Intersection of Job Satisfaction, Job Dissatisfaction, and Motivation of Instructional
Designers in Online Higher
Education: A Transcendental Phenomenological Study

Laura Dykstra
Liberty University
School of Education

You are invited to be in a research study regarding experiences related to job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. You were selected as a possible participant because you are currently an instructional designer in an institution of higher education, specifically focusing on online education, have been an instructional designer in higher education for more than three years, and been in your current place of employment for more than 18 months. Please read this form and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to be in the study.

Laura Dykstra, a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at Liberty University, is conducting this study.

Background Information: The purpose of this study is to determine the factors and experiences that impact job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation in instructional designers who work in online higher education.

Procedures: If you agree to be in this study, I would ask you to do the following things:
1. Complete a demographic and job satisfaction survey. This should take approximately 15 minutes
2. Participate in an interview that will be recorded using an audio recording device and the online web-conferencing site Zoom. This interview should take approximately 60 minutes, but no more than 75 minutes. The video will be used for archival purposes only and will not be shared. A second, audio recording will be made, which will be sent to a third party transcriptionist.
3. Complete a video explaining an instructional experience or resource that you have created, explaining your feelings about job satisfaction or dissatisfaction while completing the task. This video should be a minimum of 15 minutes, but a maximum of 45.

Risks: The risks involved in this study are minimal, though you will be asked specific questions about factors at your work, including colleagues and supervisors, that cause feelings of job satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and motivation. There is some minimal risk if specific names are revealed, but all steps are being taken to ensure participants and the institution where you work remain anonymous.

Benefits: Participants should not expect to receive a direct benefit from taking part in this study, though I will share the results of the study with participants.

Compensation: Participants will be compensated for participating in this study. A $50 gift card to Amazon will be emailed to participants once they have completed and submitted the work product sample.

Confidentiality: The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report I might publish, I will not include any information that will make it possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely, and only the researcher will have access to the records. Audio recordings may be emailed for transcription, but all videos will be transcribed by the researcher. Participants and places of employment will be assigned a pseudonym. I will conduct the interviews using a web conferencing system and separate audio recording tool. Interviews will be recorded using video and audio and transcribed. Video recordings will be stored on a password locked computer for three years and then erased. Only the researcher will have access to these recordings. Audio recordings may be sent to a third-party transcriptionist. Data will be stored on a password locked computer in a secure file and backed up on an external hard drive which will also be password protected. It may be used in future presentations. After three years, all electronic records will be deleted.

Voluntary Nature of the Study: Participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with Liberty University. If you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any question or withdraw at any time without affecting those relationships.

How to Withdraw from the Study:
If you choose to withdraw from the study, please contact the researcher at the email address/phone number included in the next paragraph. Should you choose to withdraw, data collected from you will be destroyed immediately and will not be included in this study.

Contacts and Questions: The researcher conducting this study is Laura Dykstra. You may ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, **you are encouraged** to contact her at ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ or ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ You may also contact the researcher's faculty chair, Dr. Chris Bellamy at ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study and would like to talk to someone other than the researcher, **you are encouraged** to contact the Institutional Review Board, 1971 University Blvd., Green Hall Ste. 2845, Lynchburg, VA 24515 or email at irb@liberty.edu.

Please notify the researcher if you would like a copy of this information for your records.

Statement of Consent: I have read and understood the above information. I have asked questions and have received answers. I consent to participate in the study.

☐ The researcher has my permission to audio and video record me as part of my participation in this study.

_____

Signature of Participant   Date

_____

Signature of Investigator   Date

APPENDIX C: Instructions for Work Product Screen Cast

The Intersection of Job Satisfaction, Dissatisfaction, and Motivation of Instructional Designers in Online Higher Education: A Transcendental Phenomenology
Work Product Description Protocol

Instructions:

Identify an instructional resource that you designed or created, and create a video screencast that runs a minimum of 15 minutes in which you describe the product and your feelings when creating it. Please use the following questions as a guide. Once you have completed the video, please submit it to the link provided in the email.

1. Describe the product or resource. What instructional needs does it meet, and why was it created?

2. Describe your feelings of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction during the creation of this resource. What did you enjoy the most about creating it? What did you find most challenging? Are you proud of your work?

3. Did you have the resources and knowledge that you feel like you needed to complete it? What skills did it require?

4. Describe the process of creating the resource. With whom did you collaborate? How did those interactions affect your feelings about the project? How did those interactions affect your feelings about your job?

APPENDIX D: Institutional Review Board (IRB) Approval Letter

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY.
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

February 13, 2019

Laura E. Dykstra
IRB Approval 3636.021319: The Intersection of Job Satisfaction, Job Dissatisfaction, and Motivation of Instructional Designers in Online Higher Education: A Transcendental Phenomenological Study

Dear Laura E. Dykstra,

We are pleased to inform you that your study has been approved by the Liberty University IRB. This approval is extended to you for one year from the date provided above with your protocol number. If data collection proceeds past one year or if you make changes in the methodology as it pertains to human subjects, you must submit an appropriate update form to the IRB. The forms for these cases were attached to your approval email.

Your study falls under the expedited review category (45 CFR 46.110), which is applicable to specific, minimal risk studies and minor changes to approved studies for the following reason(s):

6. Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes.

Thank you for your cooperation with the IRB, and we wish you well with your research project.

Sincerely,

LIBERTY
UNIVERSITY.
Liberty University | Training Champions for Christ since 1971

APPENDIX E: Participant Demographic Information

Participant Demographic Information

Participant	Gender (Identified)	Age	Job Title	Highest Degree	Time at HEI (years)	Job Satisfaction Survey
Sadie	F	41	Instructional Designer,	MA, Curriculum and Instruction	9.5	3	Ambivalent (High)
Tara	F	34	Instructional Designer	Masters, Leadership	5	2	Ambivalent
Breanna	F	29	Instructional Designer	MBA	5.5	2	Satisfied
Leah	F	38	Instructional Designer	MFA	5	10	Ambivalent (High)
Levi	M	39	Instructional Designer and Technologist Manager	PhD, Church History	4.5	13	Satisfied
Elliot	M	39	Instructional Designer and Faculty Development Specialist	PhD, Higher Education (In Progress)	2	8	Satisfied
Angie	F	55	Instructional Designer	MS, Education, Graduate Certificate in Instructional Design	1.5	4	Satisfied
Gwen	F	54	Instructional Designer	PhD, Community College Leadership	4	4	Ambivalent (High)
Maggie	F	51	Instructional Designer	MA, EdD (ABD)	3.25	6	Ambivalent (Low)
Faye	F	66	Instructional Designer	MA, Organizational Management; EdM, Educational Psychology	3	11 *	Satisfied
Wendy	F	38	Instructional Technologist/Designer	Masters of Education	8	16	Dissatisfied

* Participant also spent 20 years working as an Instructional Designer/Trainer in corporate environments