2019

The Effects of Self-leadership on the Job Satisfaction and Job Performance of Online Instructors

John Hall

THE EFFECTS OF SELF-LEADERSHIP ON THE JOB SATISFACTION AND JOB PERFORMANCE OF ONLINE INSTRUCTORS

By

John R. Hall

A Dissertation

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Major: Higher and Adult Education

The University of Memphis

August 2019

Dedication

To my wife, Kim. Thank you for your love and support. This has certainly been a project unlike any other. I appreciate your patience as I have chased this rabbit for many years.

To my daughters, Sarah and Savannah, thank you for your love and for inspiring me to push ahead. It is my hope that this will serve as an example of what may be accomplished through hard work, dedication, sacrifice, patience and perseverance.

To my parents, Ivan and Linda Hall. Thank you for your love, support and endless words of encouragement. You always seemed to know just what to say.

I would also like to dedicate this in memory of Paul and Helena Williams. I love them both dearly and miss them very much.

Acknowledgements

Along the way, there have been many people who have shared ideas, offered suggestions, or played a supportive role in my success. To everyone who has invested their time and energy to help me accomplish this goal, I extend my warmest wishes and heartfelt "Thanks!"

First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Wendy Griswold. Not only have you been an excellent instructor and advisor, you have been a compassionate friend. I especially appreciate your commitment, patience and words of encouragement. I would also like to thank Dr. Donna Menke, Dr. Eric Platt, and Dr. Charisse Gulosino for serving on my dissertation committee and for bringing expertise and compassion to the process. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. Jeffrey Wilson who served as my advisor when I first entered the doctoral program.

I would like to thank Grant Batchelor and Jessi Pope for providing valuable expertise and statistics guidance. Grant, words cannot express how much I appreciate the time that you spent helping me relearn statistics after many years away from the subject. Thank you for your friendship and for caring so much about my success. Jessi, your gift for explaining difficult concepts was just what I needed. I don't know how to say "Thank you" for giving up so much of your own time to help me.

I would like to thank Dr. Ron Larson for inspiring me to pursue a career in higher education.

I would like to thank Dr. Earl Thomas for his lessons on leadership and for introducing me to many of the researchers that are included in this study.

I would like to thank Dr. Christopher Neck for his guidance on self-leadership, but more importantly for being an exceptional friend.

Abstract

Hall, John R. Ed. D. The University of Memphis. July 2019. The Effects of Self-leadership on the Job Satisfaction and Job Performance of Online Instructors. Major Professor: Dr. Wendy Griswold.

Innovations in technology and media have led to changes in the way that higher education is experienced. Today, the convenience, accessibility and flexibility of online learning are embraced by students across the globe. In response to these progressive advancements along with increasing competition for enrollment growth and budgetary concerns, many college and university leaders are framing online education as key element of their strategies for the future. Rising demands for online programming and the rapid evolution of media for education has prompted decision makers to evaluate the similarities and differences between the traditional face-to-face classroom and online learning environments and establish adequate training and development initiatives for faculty members who facilitate online courses. Some instructors embrace online instruction while others resist change or struggle to adapt from familiar methods to online delivery. Like many online students, online instructors fulfill their role in the educational process by often working autonomously and independently. The self-directed behaviors of online instructors play an important role in determining the job performance and the job satisfaction of this employee group. Hierarchical linear regression was used in this study to determine the extent to which self-leadership behaviors and practices predict the job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors in higher education. It was hypothesized that online instructors that practice self-leadership behaviors are more satisfied with their job and perform better on the job than those who do not engage in such behaviors. While controlling for specific demographic factors, self-leadership and its three dimensions were the independent variables while job performance and job satisfaction were the dependent variables. The study focused on

online instructors at eleven U.S. colleges and universities. The research identified how each of three dimensions of self-leadership - behavior-focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought pattern strategies - affects the job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors. The results of this study will aid in the design and modification of training and development programs for these higher education employees.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

Introduction

The number of online courses that are being offered at colleges and universities is increasing. Allen and Seaman (2016) report more than 70 percent of chief academic leaders say that online learning is critical to the long-term strategy of their institutions. According to a February 2016 report from the Babson Survey Research Group published by the Online Learning Consortium, the number of U.S. students taking online courses has exceeded 5.5 million with 28 percent of higher education students enrolled in at least one online course. Many institutions wish to gain a competitive advantage by exploring new ways to increase enrollment. Innovations in technologies have prompted an evolution in the landscape of higher education delivery. In an October, 2017 article published by Inside Higher Education, Jean Dimeo reported that 50 percent of Colorado State University Global Campus's 20,000 online learners live some place outside the state of Colorado - and many reside outside the United States. Strategic decisions may intend to reduce operating costs while expanding educational services to a greater number of non-localized students.

The expansion of online learning programs raises questions about the quality and flexibility of the offerings and how well institutions are meeting the demands of today's students. The instructor is the single most important factor in determining student success in the online environment (Krebitchi, Lipschuetz & Santiague, 2017; Tunks, 2012). Compared to traditional face-to-face courses, online delivery requires instructors to possess unique skills while adapting to new styles of course facilitation. Behaviors such as communicating with students regularly, sharing information and feedback related to course content, relating to individual students' interests, and maintaining a sense of community within the course are indicators of instructor

presence (Palloff & Pratt, 2003; Tunks, 2012). Individual decisions and self-directed or self-leadership strategies play a key role in the way that online instructors approach the various tasks of their job. In practice, self-leadership provides certain behavioral and cognitive strategies that an individual can learn and implement at work, which will positively influence his or her subsequent outcomes (Gomes, Curral, & Caetano, 2014; Neck & Houghton, 2006). This study will explore how the self-directed behaviors of online instructors inform the self-reported job performance and job satisfaction of this employee group.

Problem Statement

Leadership is a topic that has received considerable attention over the years. Scholarly articles, books, and similar writings flood the libraries with various leadership accounts. Seminal manuscripts (Bass, 1985; Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Yukl, 1981; Vroom, 1964) provide extensive overviews of the leadership field as well. A specific subset of the leadership body of knowledge, self-leadership (the process of leading oneself), has garnered a great deal of attention of the past few decades (Anderson & Prussia, 1997; Boss & Simms, 2008; DiLiello & Houghton, 2006; Manz, 1983; Houghton & Neck, 2006). The self-leadership research consists of conceptual pieces as well as empirical articles that test various aspects of the process of leading one's self. The literature is supported by those investigating leadership in higher education (Frenkel, Schechtman & Koenigs, 2006; Muijs, Lumby, Morrison, & Sood, 2012; Rickets, Carter, Place & McCoy, 2012; Spendlove, 2007), however the distinction of self-leadership in the behavioral context of online instruction has yet to receive the same level of attention from academicians. Because it is largely based on motivation and cognitive behaviors, self-leadership is often connected to organizational behavior within the context of the management discipline and the business environment. According to McIllhatton, Johnson, & Holden (1993), the direct transfer

of business practices to an educational context could be inappropriate. Frenkel et al. (2006) note that variations within the educational sector itself have been identified however, the gap in the educational literature is a scholarly application of self-leadership to the higher education arena. This dissertation will attempt to fill this void.

Management research explains that a correlation exists between job satisfaction and job performance (Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Vroom, 1964). Employees who are satisfied with their jobs tend to perform at a higher level than those that are not satisfied. Online instructors often work autonomously without direct supervision therefore they must rely on self-directed behaviors to complete job tasks. The concept of self-leadership is generally described as the process of leading oneself to complete tasks and to meet individual or organizational objectives (Houghton & Neck, 2002). Because of the unique conditions that influence online instruction, an exploration of the relationship between self-leadership behaviors and the job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors may yield results that could aid higher education decision makers.

Specifically, I will apply self-leadership to the study of online teaching. I will posit that online instructors who strongly apply behavioral and mental self-leadership strategies will be more effective and perceive greater job satisfaction than those who rarely practice such strategies. According to the research of Norris (2008), individuals who possess attributes such as autonomy and self-efficacy are more likely to practice self-leadership strategies. Crawford-Ferre and Wiest (2012) note that time constraints and the modality of instruction can cause online instructors to become isolated. Given that online teachers typically work independently, and often in physical locations away from direct supervision, it seems plausible that online instructors who are able to lead themselves over challenging situations are more effective

teachers and more satisfied with their jobs than those who are not effective self-leaders. Organizations, including institutions and systems of higher education, may find value in having individual members regulate their own actions. According to Houghton & Neck (2002), self-leading employees have more fulfilling careers along with a more productive and positive impact at work. A study of higher education employees, particularly online instructors, will help us learn more about the effects of self-leadership.

This study first explores the extent to which self-leadership behaviors inform levels of self-reported job satisfaction and job performance in the online instructor employee group. By comparing performance and satisfaction measures under conditions in which self-leadership behaviors are present, the degree of impact that individual self-leadership behaviors have on self-reported job performance and job satisfaction in the context of higher education online instructors may be determined. According to Norris (2008), employees that prefer autonomy and independence to make decisions may also be more likely to make efforts to improve their individual performance, such as making use of self-leadership strategies. Discovering what self-leadership behaviors predict job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors may serve online education proponents who are committed to improving the quality of online courses through the training and development of learning facilitators. The results of this study identifies areas on which higher education faculty and administrators should focus when assigning instructors to facilitate online courses. The study may also identifies a need for training and development initiatives aimed at facilitating changes that can impact performance and satisfaction.

The study was be developed using self-leadership theory as a basis to study online teaching. According to Houghton and Neck (2002), self-leadership is generally portrayed as a

broader concept of self-influence that derives from intrinsic motivation theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). In addition, Campbell's Theory of Performance (1990) informs job performance while Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1968) provides the basis for job satisfaction. Transactional Theory of Distance (Moore, 1973) frames the understanding of online learning as it has a unique identity and distinguishing pedagogical characteristics in the scope of higher education.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to quantify the interrelationship between self-leadership behaviors and practices and the self-reported levels of job satisfaction and job performance of online instructors.

Research Questions

To what extent do self-leadership practices and behaviors predict levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors?

- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the global score on self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?
- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the presence of behavior-focused strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?
- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the presence of natural reward strategies of

self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?

- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the presence of constructive thought pattern strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?

Significance of the Study

The study is significant to the development of existing literature on self-leadership and higher education. The results may be useful to decision makers in higher education who are responsible for the design, modification and implementation of training and development initiatives for online instructors. A better understanding of how self-directed behaviors affect job performance and job satisfaction may lead to improvements in existing instructor training programs and the emergence of new programs that consider these behaviors in their designs.

Study Overview

Self-Leadership Theory is the basis for the study and will be clearly defined in both broad, historical terms and also in the context of this study. According to Houghton and Neck (2006), self-leadership is generally portrayed as a broader concept of self-influence that derives from intrinsic motivation theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) and self-management theory (Manz & Sims, 1980). The study includes the history of the development of the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (Houghton & Neck, 2002). Self-leadership, job satisfaction and job performance will each be defined in the context of the research questions. The role of online instructors will be introduced and explained. Online education and distance learning experiences will be described in order to reveal more about the

role of online instructors in modern higher education environments and how the preparation, execution and methods of evaluation for online instruction differs from traditional face-to-face delivery. The study explores the strengths and weaknesses as well as the criticisms of online teaching and learning. The sub-categories and complementary facets of the RSLQ will also require explanation. The RSLQ provides an empirically supported measurement tool that considers different aspects of self-leadership ranging from behavioral elements of self-management to cognitive strategies of internal control.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), crafted in 1985 by Paul Spector, is used to learn how online instructors feel about the roles they play at their institutions and in the scope of higher education. The instrument features 36 items across nine facets that determine an overall satisfaction score.

Decades of research has failed to produce a single instrument for measuring job performance that is vastly superior to other measures. Because of this, job performance data has been self-reported by online instructors using a Likert-type scale survey derived from the works of Bailie (2015) and of Maxson (2017). These measures consider Bailie's protocols of Presence and Engagement; Communication; and Timeliness and Responsiveness. It also focuses on key elements of Maxon's Priorities for Instructional Behavior.

Limitations of the Study

It is generally accepted in the research community that larger samples are more likely to yield more robust data sets. Because it is impractical to collect survey responses from every online instructor or from every institution that offers online learning to students, a sample has been drawn. The study is limited by the use of self-reported information. A number of variables may work independently or in cooperation with other factors to influence survey responses.

From a demographic perspective, the lack of a diversified sample of online instructors may serve as a study limitation. Age, ethnicity, training, employment type and employment rank are factors that may shape the responses to survey questions. For example, participants will include online instructors at all employment ranks from instructor to tenured or 'tenure-track' professor. It is reasonable to surmise that survey responses from more experienced online instructors may differ from those of instructors who are in the early part of their careers.

The three instruments (Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ), Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), and Job Performance Survey (JPS), a demographic survey and eight quality assurance questions resulted in a total of 105 survey items. Longer surveys require a greater time investment by the survey taker. While email recipients may agree to participate, some may be compelled to leave the survey incomplete due to its length. A population bar was included on the screen so that survey takers could monitor their progress while engaged in the survey.

The Job Performance Scale used in this study derived from Maxson's (2017) research on essential online instructional behaviors as well as Bailie's (2015) work on identifying online instructional behaviors that online students and online instructors feel are important. Because the JPS has not yet been empirically validated, more research should be conducted using this instrument in order to better understand its practicality. Reliability is a concern in self-reported job performance measures. For future studies, it may be considerable to establish a composite score for job performance that includes data from supervisor evaluations and student evaluations. Observer-rated performance data and the different types of online delivery modes are also considerable when evaluating job performance instruments.

Definitions

For the purposes of this research study, the following definitions are presented for clarity:

Online learning. An education experience that occurs in which 80% or more of the course content is delivered online (Allen & Seaman, 2016).

Online instructor. One who facilitates the delivery of online learning content

Job satisfaction. An attitudinal value that indicates how people feel about their job (Spector, 1997)

Job performance. All of the behaviors employees engage in while at work (Jex & Britt, 2008)

Organization of the study

Chapter one includes the introduction, overview and purpose of the research, significance of the research, research questions, limitations of the study and the definitions of key terms. Chapter two includes a review of related theories on self-leadership, online learning and instruction, job performance and job satisfaction. Chapter three contains the methodology, research questions and design, the population and sampling process, the instrumentation, and the data collection procedures. Chapter four presents an analysis of the data in terms of the research questions. Chapter five contains a summary of the study, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.

Chapter 2

Introduction

The following examination of the literature addresses self-leadership, online learning, job satisfaction and job performance. Self-leadership, a topic that has been explored in numerous organizational settings, is introduced, explained and contextualized for higher education and online course facilitation. Campbell's Theory of Performance (1990) provides the theoretical framework for understanding job performance while Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory (1968) informs job satisfaction. Online education is framed by Moore's Transactional Distance Theory (1973).

Self-Leadership

Self-leadership (Manz, 1986; Manz & Neck, 2004) is a process through which individuals control their own behavior, influencing and leading themselves through the use of specific sets of behavioral and cognitive strategies (Neck & Houghton, 2006). The concepts used in self-leadership are derived primarily from theories of social cognition (Bandura, 1986) and intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Manz, 1983, 1986, 1992a; Neck & Manz, 1996a). For example, social cognition and learning theory suggests that individuals experience continuous reciprocal interaction between their inner forces and environmental conditions (Bandura, 1977). "Behavior is controlled based on the predicted consequences learned from observing the social environment and its responses, as well as self-imposed demands," (Bandura, 1977; Brown & Fields, 2011, p. 277; McCormick & Martinko, 2004).

Self-leadership is widely considered a practice-oriented theory (Alves, Lovelace, Manz, Matsypura, & Toyasaki, 2006). There are three distinct but complimentary categories of self-leadership strategies, covering (a) behavior-focused strategies, directed at increasing a

leader's self-imposed efforts in doing difficult and unattractive, but necessary tasks; (b) natural reward strategies, directed at increasing awareness of the pleasant, rather than unpleasant aspects of tasks; and (c) constructive thought strategies which are directed at ways to make tasks more satisfying, often by identifying the inherently enjoyable aspects of a task (Brown & Fields, 2011; Houghton & Neck, 2002; Manz, 1992a, 1992b; Manz & Neck, 2004; Manz & Sims, 2001).

According to Neck & Houghton (2006), behavior-focused strategies aim at the management of behaviors and include: self-observation, self-goal setting, self-rewards, self-punishment, and self-cueing. Behavioral strategies guide self-assessment; self-reward and self-discipline – and result in significant performance improvement (Bandura, 1986; Georgianna, 2007). These strategies are intended to encourage positive, desirable behaviors that lead to successful outcomes, while suppressing negative, undesirable behaviors that lead to unsuccessful outcomes (Neck & Houghton, 2006).

Natural reward strategies are designed to help create feelings of competence and self-determination, which have an energizing effect on performance-enhancing task-related behaviors. These strategies, which include building more enjoyable features into a given activity while focusing attention away from unpleasant aspects of the task, allow individuals to experience motivation and reward. According to Neck & Houghton (2006), these strategies are likely to create feelings of competence and self-determination, two primary mechanisms of intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Natural reward strategies center on increasing an individual's emphasis and awareness on the pleasant, rather than the unpleasant aspects of tasks (Anderson & Prussia, 1997). These strategies focus on identifying ways to make tasks more satisfying, often by identifying the inherently enjoyable aspects of a task, even in situations in which one must deal with problems and concerns that are part of the job (Brown & Fields, 2011,

p. 277; Manz & Neck, 2004; Manz & Sims, 2001).

Constructive thought pattern strategies are intended to facilitate the development of constructive thought patterns and habitual ways of thinking that can positively impact performance (Manz & Neck, 2004; Neck & Manz, 1992). Constructive thought pattern strategies include identifying and replacing dysfunctional beliefs and assumptions with mental imagery and positive self-talk (Neck & Houghton, 2006). "Self-leadership is mostly concerned in explaining ways to enhance organizational performance through individual-dependent thinking and acting," (Alves et al., 2006, p.342).

Intrinsic motivation theory provides a foundational influence toward the development of self-leadership. "Intrinsic motivation is based on one's opportunity to act with purpose," (Alves, et al., 2006, p. 343). According to Anderson and Prussia (1997), self-leadership is a global concept that involves cognitive and intrinsic motivational aspects. In a study in which a cultural analysis of self-leadership was examined, Alves et al. (2006) suggest that "self-leadership is conceptually robust and may have a broad range of applications" (p. 357).

Social cognitive theory explains human behavior as a system of interrelationships among internal influences, external influences, and behavior that alternates the production with reduction of dysfunctions, and vice versa, leading towards equilibrium (Bandura, 1986). Self-leadership includes cognitive-focused strategies that stem from social cognitive theory and cognitive therapies (Houghton & Neck, 2002). Examples of such strategies are self-analysis, improvement of beliefs and assumptions, and mental imagination and rehearsal of a desired performance (Manz, 1986, 1992; Manz & Neck, 1991; Markham & Markham, 1995; Neck & Manz, 2006). Behavior modification theories such as self-regulation (Carver & Scheier, 1981), self-management (Manz & Neck, 1991), and self-control (Thoresen & Mahoney, 1974) suggest

behavior-oriented strategies of self-leadership (Georgianna, 2007).

Employee empowerment has become an important concern in coping with current competitive demands (Anderson & Prussia, 1997). While a great deal exists in the literature to frame self-leadership in the organizational context, it is also prudent to consider from the individual perspective of self-management. "Control in organizations is shifting from external, downward influence by management on employees to a decentralization of power, and an opportunity for workers at all levels to exercise increasing influence over themselves and their tasks," (Manz, 1992, p. 48). As many organizations are compelled to establish dynamic structures in which operatives at each level of the model have varying levels of responsibility, influence, and power, Anderson and Prussia (1997) go so far as to suggest that, "at the heart of empowerment lies the ability of employees to lead themselves" (p.119). Self-leadership is considered pivotal to employees' enthusiasm, commitment, and performance in empowering organizations (Manz, 1986). Certain behaviors and mental processes characterize self-leadership and are thought to positively influence subsequent outcomes (Anderson & Prussia, 1997).

Self-management

Some organizational theorists have focused on a process usually referred to as self-management (Godwin, Neck & Houghton, 1999). Manz and Sims (1980) define self-management as the degree to which an individual takes responsibility for the managerial aspects of his or her job above and beyond the mere execution of traditional role responsibilities, such as working toward pre-set goals and the self-administration of consequences such as rewards and punishments (Bligh, Pearce & Kohles, 2006). The authors further explain that self-management may act as a substitute for either traditional leader-initiated behaviors or the need for more structurally imposed controls on behavior (Manz & Sims, 1980). Self-leadership

builds upon behaviors that are consistent in instances of self-management such as "incorporating control and regulation components, as well as emphasizing the importance of intrinsic motivation resulting from the inherent rewards of completing a task" (Bligh et al., 2006, p. 299). In summary, self-management incorporates leadership substitutes and addresses how to complete a task, while self-leadership incorporates what should be done and why, in addition to addressing how the task should be completed (Manz, 1992). Therefore, self-leadership involves the processes through which individuals influence themselves to self-direct and self-motivate their own performance (Bligh et al., 2006; Manz, 1986; Manz & Neck, 1999).

Self-leadership has garnered increasing attention from both researchers and practitioners interested in the application of behavioral and cognitive self-leadership strategies to performance outcomes (Bligh et al., 2006; see also, Blanchard, 1995; Cashman, 1995; Manz, 1992; Manz & Neck, 1999; Manz & Sims, 1994, 2001). One aspect of this study explores the effects of self-leadership behaviors and strategies on self-reported levels of job performance for online instructors. According to self-leadership theory, "a primary objective of all three categories of self-leadership strategies is the enhancement of self-efficacy perceptions, which should, in turn, lead to higher levels of performance" (Houghton et al., 2003, p. 126; see also Manz, 1986; Manz & Neck, 1999; Neck & Manz, 1992, 1996; Prussia et al., 1997). Self-efficacy refers to beliefs in one's capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce desired results (Carmeli, Meitar, & Weisberg, 2006). According to Houghton et al. (2003), there is substantial empirical evidence that supports self-leadership as an effective strategy for increasing perceptions of self-efficacy.

Training and development

The results of this study may identify a need for training and development initiatives

aimed at facilitating changes that can impact performance and satisfaction. The literature suggests that self-leadership characteristics can be influenced through training (Frayne & Geringer, 2000; Neck & Manz, 1996), thus improving job performance, job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and outcome expectancy (Boss & Simms, 2008, p.143). The process of self-leadership prescribes an active role for members of a work system and thus may involve more advanced forms of self-influence (Brown & Fields, 2011; Godwin et al., 1999).

Self-leadership is a process by which a leader's self-capabilities and self-perceptions are refined and improved (Brown & Fields, 2011; Manz & Sims, 1989; Neck & Houghton, 2006). This concept touches only lightly on emotion and concentrates more fully on the behavioral and cognitive aspects of self-regulation (Boss & Simms, 2008). The fundamental idea behind self-leadership is that individuals look first within themselves for the necessary tools and strategies to motivate and control behavior and thought (Boss & Simms, 2008). Interestingly, Yun, Cox and Simms (2006) found that "not all people want to exercise self-leadership, and that the use of self-leadership is contingent on an individual's need for autonomy" (Boss & Simms, 2008, p. 143). Since self-leadership practices may be related to behaviors indirectly through mechanisms such as self-regulation and a person's self-efficacy, it is possible that personal attributes will work to augment or limit the effects of self-leadership (Brown & Fields, 2011; Neck & Houghton, 2006).

Carmeli, Meiter and Weisberg (2006) suggest that self-leadership is a process through which employees motivate and navigate themselves to attain desired behaviors and ends. The relationships between self-leadership and performance outcomes have rarely been investigated empirically (Brown & Fields, 2011) yet "a growing body of evidence shows a positive connection between self-leadership and work outcome," (Carmeli et al., 2006, p. 78).

Improvements in job satisfaction can support employee retention and commitment, but the greatest reward that comes from self-leadership is improved employee job performance (Brown & Fields, 2011; see also Carmeli et al., 2006; Manz, 1986; Neck & Houghton, 2006; Neck & Manz, 1992). Previous research has found that use of all three self-leadership strategies were positively related with an individual's personality tendency towards conscientiousness (Houghton et al., 2004). However, the likelihood of the thought processes of self-leadership actually affecting behaviors may depend on the extent to which a person believes his/her behaviors make a difference (Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989). People who possess good self-leadership qualities know how to achieve high levels of self-direction and self-motivation (Houghton et al., 2003; Manz, 1986; Manz & Neck, 1999). "During this process, people learn to lead themselves" (Carmeli et al., 2006, p. 79).

The literature suggests that people can be trained to adapt and enhance their self-leadership skills and thereby improve their work outcomes (Neck & Manz, 1996). This suggests that organizations need to invest efforts in developing self-leaders to improve the overall functioning of the organization (Carmeli et al., 2006). DiLiello and Houghton (2006) suggest that individuals with strong self-leadership will consider themselves to have more innovation and creativity potential than individuals who have weak self-leadership, and that individuals who have innovation and creativity potential will be more likely to practice innovation and creativity when they perceive strong support from the workplace than individuals who perceive weak support from the workplace. While questions remain as to which self-leadership strategies may be acquired and fostered by training or intervention programs (Furtner, Sachse, & Exenberger, 2012), decision makers are well advised to encourage the practice of self-leadership among the members of organizations while striving to build work

environments that support creativity and innovation at various levels of the organization (DiLello & Houghton, 2006).

Research on theories of motivation include motivational strategies such as tackling long-term goals by setting intermediate goals, using self-rewards during goal striving, or viewing unpleasant tasks as part of a larger learning experience (Deci, 1975; Deci & Ryan, 1985). In a 2005 exploratory study of self-leadership in the Chinese culture, Georgianna (2007) reported that the understanding of performance outcomes as performance-approach goals or mastery goals increased motivation and performance outcomes, especially in situations without contingencies, such as external performance based rewards or time constraints. The success of self-leadership strategies is influenced by personal as well as environmental factors. Individuals who exercise self-leadership will put more or less effort into certain strategies depending on the contexts and situations where they are involved, and as these situations unfold over time (Alves et al., 2006).

Job performance

Measuring the job performance of online instructors is a challenging enterprise. Campbell's Model of Performance (1990) provides the theoretical framework for job performance in this study. The instruments and basis of research contained in Bailee (2015) and of Maxson (2017) supports the self-designed survey that has been developed to collect job performance data.

In 2017, Maxson conducted a study that compared instructional outcomes of adjunct faculty with that of full-time faculty. The researcher questioned whether students learn as well under adjunct faculty as compared to those who teach full-time (Maxson, 2017). A survey instrument containing 29 items related to online learning was developed to address the research

question. A six-point Likert-style rating scale was used to determine the level of importance of statements such as "online instructors should provide an orienting post at the beginning of each week that provides guidelines on what the instructor expects from students' posts that week" and "online instructors should provide at least one extending post each week that deepens the students' critical engagement with course topics" (Maxson, 2017, p. 13). The contents of Maxson's survey serves as one of two guides for the instrument developed for this study to collect self-reported job performance data from online instructors.

In a 2005 study, Ortiz-Rodriquez, Teig, Irani, Roberts and Rhodes found that student satisfaction with online courses can be attributed to regular communication, timeliness of instructor feedback, straightforwardness of course design, and available learner support (Bailee, 2015). In 2015, Bailie conducted a study aimed partly at understanding common instructional practices that online faculty and students perceive as being central to effective online instruction within the higher education setting. The purpose of the Bailee paper was to "examine instructional practices commonly prescribed to online faculty in the higher education setting to determine if students and faculty could arrive at a consensus of opinion concerning the aptness of three domains related to administratively defined faculty performance expectations in online instruction" (p. 42). These three domains featured in the study were communication, presence/engagement, and timeliness/responsiveness (Bailie, 2015). With respect to communication, Bailie's (2015) survey was designed to learn about the frequency of phone and email contact, as well as the prevalence of learning objectives, due dates and personal imagery in online exchanges. Participants informed the presence and engagement domain by responding to prompts about accessibility, discussion participation and engagement as well as instructor availability during designated times (Bailie, 2015). "The domain of timeliness and

responsiveness focuses on the amount of time that it takes online instructors to respond to student email and voice mail inquiries as well as the amount of time that it takes online instructors to return graded assignments" (Bailee, 2015, p. 45). The content of Bailee's survey is the second of two instruments that has guided the development of the survey instrument used in this study of the effects of self-leadership behaviors on the self-reported job performance of online instructors.

Learning involves two types of interaction: interaction with content and interpersonal interaction (Berge, 1995). Berge categorizes the necessary conditions for successful online tutoring into four areas: pedagogical, social, managerial, and technical. The pedagogical area focuses on intellectual tasks. An educational facilitator uses questions and prompts for student responses that focus discussions on critical concepts, principles and skills (Berge, 1995). In order to achieve social cohesion, Berge further explains that "facilitators strive to maintain the group as a unit intended to work together for a mutual cause" (p. 3). The managerial focus involves activities that are organizational, procedural and administrative in nature. Even though Berge suggests that "the use of technology is secondary to well-designed learning goals and objectives" (Berge, 1995, p 1), reasonable emphasis is still placed on technical provisions and requirements. This involves making participants comfortable with the system and the software that is being used. By removing the technical challenges, the facilitator has created an environment in which the learner may focus on academic tasks (Berge, 1995).

Numerous factors lead to learner satisfaction in online courses (Bair & Bair, 2011). These include factors such as clarity of course design and organization, responsiveness of the instructor, and a sense of community in the online class (Liu, Magjuka, Bonk, & Lee, 2007; McInnerney & Roberts, 2004). While there is much attention paid to students' experiences in

online courses, the information that is available about the experiences of faculty who teach online courses is comparatively limited (Bair & Bair, 2011; Kearsley, 2010; Shedletsky & Aitken, 2001). The growth of online learning has led to an increased emphasis by institutions on the adaptation of traditional learning experiences to online learning experiences. When moving from traditional face-to-face delivery to online delivery, it is generally accepted that online educators experience a change in their role from instructor to guide (Ryan, Carlton, & Ali, 2004). "Teaching online involves a shift to the sidelines, from being a visible center of attention in the face-to-face classroom to serving as a designer and facilitator of online experiences" (Bair & Bair, 2011, p. 2). In terms of curriculum development and online teaching, faculty required different skillsets than their traditional, face-to-face teaching experience had provided for them (King & Alperstein, 2015; Ko & Rossen, 2010; Maxson, 2017; Shattuck, Dubins, & Zilberman, 2011). Many faculty members are unprepared for this shift; however the ability to adapt to a new environment through modified tasks and altered processes may affect job performance.

Campbell's Model of Performance

According to Jex and Britt (2008), the definition of job performance can be simplified as "all of the behaviors employees engage in while at work" (p. 88). Campbell (2012) reports that "performance is the action, not the thinking that preceded the action" (p. 8). Because job performance is behavior and behaviors are rarely measured directly, some external assessment is used as a measure of job performance (Jex & Britt, 2002). According to Campbell (2012), for performance assessment to take place, "the key operative goals of the organization, within some meaningful time frame, must be known; and the methods by which individual actions are judged to be goal relevant, and scaled in terms of what represents high and low proficiency, must be legitimized" (p. 9). Consequently, it is not a violation of this definition of performance for

individual organization members to identify what actions are most relevant for what they think the organizational goals are, or should be (Campbell, 2012).

Campbell's Model of Performance features eight basic performance components:

1. Core task proficiency
2. Demonstrated effort
3. Maintenance of personal discipline
4. Facilitating peer and team performance
5. Non-job-specific task proficiency
6. Communication task proficiency
7. Supervision/leadership
8. Management/administration

In the research, Campbell (1990) explains that individual differences in performance are a function of three main determinants of performance components: declarative knowledge; procedural knowledge and skill; and motivation. The model suggests that declarative knowledge represents the knowledge about facts, principles, and objects while procedural knowledge and skill involves cognitive, perceptual and interpersonal skill. Additionally, Campbell (1990) explains that motivation refers to the combined effect from three specific behaviors – the choice to expend effort; the choice of the level of effort to expend; and the choice to persist in the expenditure of that level of effort. Individuals may be motivated to perform if they believe a positive correlation exists between efforts and performance (Vroom, 1964).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is described as an emotional state in which a person perceives a variety of features of his/her work or the work environment (Dunnette, Campbell & Hakel, 1967; Robbins,

2001). Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969) suggested that job satisfaction can be categorized on the basis of individual's needs. Locke (1976) indicated that the most common outcome of job satisfaction is on a person's physical health, mental health and social life. Rain, Lane and Steiner (1991) suggest that job satisfaction is linked to life satisfaction, and people who are satisfied with their jobs will tend to be happy with their lives as well, and vice versa.

Bakotić (2016) reports that workers who have a high level of job satisfaction generally love their job. The researcher explains that workers feel justice in an environment in which they work, and feel that their job gives them some positive features such as variety, challenge, good pay and security, autonomy, and pleasant co-workers (Bakotić, 2016). According to Walsilik and Bollinger (2016), numerous studies suggest the existence of a positive correlation between job satisfaction and individual performances (Brayfield & Crockett, 1955; Harter, Schmidt, & Keyes, 2003; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Locke, 1979; Near, Rice, & Hunt, 1980; Rain, Lane, & Steiner, 1991; Schwab & Cummings, 1970; Tait, Padgett, & Baldwin, 1989; Vroom, 1964; and Wright & Cropanzano, 2000). Satisfied employees will devote their free time to their work activities, they will seek a way to overcome obstacles which might exist in the realization of their jobs, and they will assist their colleagues and superiors (Bakotić, 2016). "These workers will have extraordinary performance, and the companies with these kinds of workers will be successful" (Bakotić, 2016, p. 119). Satisfied workers provide economic advantages to their employers by decreasing absenteeism, reducing medical expenses, limiting turnover, and reducing the need for new-employee training expenses (Schubert-Irastorza & Fabry, 2014).

Much like satisfaction in other occupations, describing and predicting the satisfaction of faculty is a complex undertaking. In addition to personal issues and lifestyle changes, Bollinger

and Wasilik (2009) categorize other influencing factors into three groups: student-related, instructor-related, and institution-related. According to the research of Bollinger and Wasilik (2009), faculty satisfaction and student performance are positively correlated. When students perform well in a course, the faculty generally experiences a higher level of job-related satisfaction, (Hartman, Dziuban & Moskal, 2000). The value that institutions place on policies that support the faculty positively also impacts faculty satisfaction. Manageable workloads, adequate compensation and equitable reward systems are also factors that affect satisfaction (Bollinger & Wasilik, 2009).

Online learning has proven to be a successful delivery method for many higher education institutions. Faculty satisfaction is an important factor influencing the overall success of online education programs (Wasilik & Bollinger, 2009). Student motivation and performance in online courses can be directly affected by levels of faculty satisfaction (Hartman, Dzuiban, & Moskal, 2000).

Many instructors report high levels of satisfaction with online teaching (Wasilik & Bollinger, 2009). Even though faculty perspectives vary significantly from instructor to instructor, Thompson (2002) reported that only 10 percent of online instructors reported dissatisfaction with their overall online teaching experience. Conceição (2006) reported that the majority of the participants in a phenomenological study on the topic of distance education indicated that online teaching "gave them some type of satisfaction" (p. 40). In considering personal satisfaction, participants in a study conducted by Hislop and Atwood (2002), reported that 78% of respondents consider face-to-face teaching to be a much more satisfying experience yet the online delivery of courses also provides faculty with opportunities for personal and professional growth (Betts, 1998; Wasilik & Bollinger, 2009).

Faculty may be able to acquire new skills and knowledge about online teaching with new technologies or new instructional strategies. However, employee attitudes can shape perceptions about opportunities to become involved in instructional design and development (Wasilik & Bollinger, 2009). Satisfied workers not only lead to better performances, but provide a higher level of customer service experience which could result in creating customer satisfaction (Robbins, 2001). In the context of higher education, the value of a customer service experience may be reflected in the degree of satisfaction that a student perceives. It is important that institutions implement the proper policies for online teaching and learning in order to create an environment where satisfaction can exist (Walsilik & Bollinger, 2016). One of the disadvantages of the online environment is the absence of face-to-face contact with students and the lack of group interaction (Almeda & Rose, 2000).

In a 2014 study that states that its purpose is to investigate methods for creating more positive work environments and fostering faculty well-being in the academic department, Shubert-Irastorza & Fabry report that "job satisfaction has been an important area of the investigation for organizational psychologists, academic researchers, and human resource professionals since the early 1900s" (p.37). During the last 50 years, numerous researchers have tried to determine what factors influence worker behavior and how that behavior impacts job performance (Cabrita & Perista, 2006; Judge, Thorensen, Bono & Patton, 2001; Spector, 1997; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969).

While there is no consensus on how to measure and monitor job satisfaction, Spector's (1997) description of job satisfaction as an attitudinal value that indicates that how people feel about their job is a generally accepted definition (Shubert-Irastorza & Fabry, 2014). Moorman (1993) suggested that job satisfaction is a bi-dimensional concept consisting of intrinsic

(affective) and extrinsic (cognitive) satisfaction dimensions. Intrinsic job satisfaction is the one-dimensional emotional feeling individuals have about their job as a whole, which reflects the degree of pleasure and enjoyment they experience in the workplace (Moorman, 1993). Extrinsic rewards are opportunities to be innovative or creative, finding personal pleasure in learning new skills, or the excitement of discovery (Moorman, 1993). Individual needs may be fulfilled, but any feeling of satisfaction will depend on whether the worker sees his position as comparing satisfactorily with others (Oshagbemi, 2013).

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory, sometimes called the Two-Factor Theory, provides a lens through which researchers may understand job attitudes, including satisfaction. It will provide support for this study of online instructors. This theory was developed from a 1959 study that involved the analysis of the feelings of 200 engineers and accountants from several companies in the United States. Since that time, Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory has become one of the most replicated studies in the field of job attitudes (Herzberg, 2003). It has received widespread attention for having a practical approach toward motivating employees (Tech-Hong & Waheed, 2011). According to Robbins (2001), motivation is a needs-satisfying process suggesting that when an individual's needs are satisfied or motivated by certain factors, the individual will exert superior effort toward attaining organizational goals. Dawson (2005) suggests that employee satisfaction is associated with positive employee behavior. Understanding the role of self-leadership behaviors by instructors in online learning environments may inform aspects of employee satisfaction.

In the theory, Herzberg identifies characteristics of a job that are consistently related to job satisfaction and other factors that are related to job dissatisfaction. The growth or motivator

factors that are intrinsic to the job are: achievement, recognition for achievement, the work itself, responsibility, and growth or advancement (Herzberg, 2003). The dissatisfaction-avoidance or hygiene factors that are extrinsic to the job include: company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relationships, working conditions, salary, status, and security (Herzberg, 2003).

An important distinction is made in Herzberg's work: Factors that cause job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not opposites because the elimination of one does not create the other. "Findings of these studies, along with corroboration from many other investigations using different procedures, suggest that the factors involved in producing job satisfaction (and motivation) are separate and distinct from the factors that lead to job dissatisfaction" (Herzberg, 2003, p. 5). The research further explains that the opposite of satisfaction is *no satisfaction* while the opposite of dissatisfaction is *no dissatisfaction*. This informs the understanding that eliminating aspects of a job that makes it dissatisfying does not necessarily lead to job satisfaction.

Herzberg's study (1966) identified two different needs of human beings:

- To avoid pain from the environment
- To experience psychological growth through achievement

Herzberg (2003) crafted the term "Eternal Triangle" to describe three general philosophies of personnel management: organizational theory, industrial engineering and behavioral science. Organizational theorists believe that if jobs are organized in a proper manner, they reason, the result will be the most efficient job structure, and the most favorable job attitudes will emerge (Herzberg, 2003). Industrial engineers hold that humankind is mechanistically oriented and economically motivated suggesting that personnel management should develop incentive

systems and working conditions conducive to operational efficiency (Herzberg, 2003). "Behavioral scientists focus on group sentiments, attitudes of individual employees, and the organization's social and psychological climate" (Herzberg, 2003, p. 7). It is suggested that the work itself be enriched to bring about effective utilization of personnel. According to the theory, job enrichment, which is an ongoing process of employee management, is a requirement of intrinsic motivation. According to Herzberg (2003), the task should be challenging enough to utilize the full ability of the employee. Additionally, those that demonstrate increasing levels of ability should be given increasing levels of responsibility. Finally, if a job cannot be designed to use an employee's full abilities, then the organization should automate the task or replace the employee with one who has a lower skill level. Individuals are more satisfied when they feel that their abilities, values and experiences are adequately used in the organization (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005). Herzberg (1966) suggests that those who are not fully utilized will experience issues with motivation.

Many studies of higher education focus on students as 'customers,' and these studies tend to evaluate educational services on the basis of the level of satisfaction of these customers (Chen, 2011; Comm & Mathaisel, 2000). Chen further suggests that this approach often ignores the question of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) of faculty members, the employee group that has the greatest impact on the satisfaction of the customer (student). Because the instructor has been identified as the single most important factor in determining success in the online environment (Krebitchi, Lipschuetz & Santiague, 2017; Tunks, 2012), it seems plausible that a better understanding of what factors predict the job satisfaction of online instructors would be valuable to higher education leaders as they work to meet strategic goals.

For this study, the Job Satisfaction Survey, crafted in 1985 by Paul Spector, was selected

to report job satisfaction data for online instructors. Initially, this instrument was developed to measure major dimensions of job satisfaction in human service, public, and nonprofit organizations (Spector, 1985). Because higher education is considered a service industry for measurements of quality (Chase, 1978; Chen, 2011; Katouzian, 1970), it seems appropriate to use an instrument that was initially designed for the service industry to measure the job satisfaction of higher education instructors.

In Spector's 1985 development publication, "Measurement of Human Service Staff Satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey," the JSS was psychometrically tested for reliability (the ability of the instrument to produce consistent results), validity (the ability of the instrument to produce true results), and sensitivity (the probability of correctly identifying the existence of a condition). The development of this instrument was "predicated on the theoretical position that job satisfaction represents an affective or attitudinal reaction to a job" (Spector, 1985, p. 694). The researcher further explains that satisfied employees are more likely to perform in a manner that positively affects the organization. Job satisfaction is assumed to represent a cluster of evaluative feelings about a job (Spector, 1985). Nine aspects of job satisfaction were identified from the literature on job satisfaction dimensions. These aspects are: pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work and communication (Spector, 1985).

Since its development, the JSS has been used in more than 50 studies in a number of different research arenas. For example, the instrument was used to measure the job satisfaction of public library employees in studies by Parmer and East (1993), Voelck (1995), and Sierpe (1999). It has been used in numerous studies in the health services industry including a 2010 study by Sauer, Canter and Shanklin published in the Journal of the American Dietetic

Association which explored the job satisfaction of dietitians with managerial responsibilities. Wittenberg and Norcross (2001) used the JSS to measure the relationship of ambiguity tolerance and job satisfaction among clinical psychologists. Following a search of the existing literature, this is believed to be its first use in cooperation with the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire to analyze the job satisfaction of online instructors.

Online education

Institutions of higher education have increasingly embraced online education, and the number of students enrolled in distance programs is rapidly rising in colleges and universities throughout the United States (Kim & Bonk, 2006). In fall 2014, 5.8 million students were enrolled in distance education courses with nearly half taking all of their coursework online (Allen & Seaman, 2016). In response to these changes in enrollment demands, many states, institutions and organizations have been working on strategic plans to implement online education (Kim & Bonk, 2006). At the same time, "misconceptions and myths related to the difficulty of teaching and learning online, technologies available to support online instruction, the support and compensation needed for high-quality instructors, and the needs of online students create challenges for such vision statements and planning documents" (Kim & Bonk, 2006, p. 22). Allen and Seaman (2016) report more than 70 percent of chief academic leaders say that online learning is critical to the long-term strategy of their institutions. Online delivery has become a conventional option in higher education. As a result, more emphasis is being placed on the training and development of instructors who facilitate online courses.

Online learning environments differ from traditional classrooms where content is generally delivered by instructors to students in a face-to-face, shared-space forum. "The advent of distance education delivery systems and the widespread use of online instruction have

redefined the way that higher-education faculty experience teaching" (Conceicão, 2006, p. 27). In contextualizing this shift in delivery and experience, Benson and Samarawickrema (2009) suggest that "the design of an e-learning component for use in a lecture theatre or computer laboratory is likely to be quite different from a similar component designed for use at home by off-campus students, or for use in a classroom in another country" (p. 5). Today, graphic-based interfaces support student engagement in highly structured interpersonal interactions (Tallent-Runnels, Thomas, Lan, Cooper, Ahern, Shaw, & Liu, 2006).

The rapid growth of online education and its importance to postsecondary institutions makes it imperative that colleges and universities provide quality online programs as well as faculty training and support in order to ensure the delivery of quality online education (Kim & Bonk, 2006). Allen and Seaman (2016) report that 71. 4 percent of academic leaders rate the learning outcomes in online education as the same or superior to those in face-to-face instruction. Learning outcomes are dependent upon a number of variables. In a 2006 study led by Tallent-Runnels, it was revealed that "students in well-designed and well-implemented online courses learned significantly more, and more effectively, than those in online courses where teaching and learning activities were not carefully planned and where the delivery and accessibility were impeded by technology problems" (p. 116).

Training

The expansion of online education programs is one of the most rapidly changing issues to challenge faculty members and administration in higher education (Herman, 2012). "Faced with pressure from declining state budget appropriations, increased competition for recruiting graduating high school seniors, and rising costs, many institutions turn to online instruction as a way to recruit and retain students" (Herman, 2012, p. 87). With increasing market pressure, rapid

growth in online instruction nationwide (Allen & Seaman, 2010), and with faculty resistance to online instruction, one of the biggest challenges faced by higher education institutions is faculty training (Herman, 2012).

In order to fully understand the scope of this study, it is necessary to discuss various theories that provide a basis for understanding online learning. Additionally, it is important to consider the focus of existing training initiatives for online instructors. Few would argue that facilitator training has a significant impact on student learning (Gibbons, 2001). "Successful online course development is dependent upon the commitment (Magnussen, 2008), enthusiasm, internet and skills of dedicated faculty" (Fish & Wickersham, 2009; Winkler-Prins, Weisenborn, Group, & Arbogast, 2007). Training provides an opportunity for facilitators to learn about online learning, but also provides a model for best practices.

Faculty development is a systematic effort to increase effectiveness in professorial roles, including teaching (Graf, Albright, & Wheeler, 1992). Long before the advent of online learning through computer-aided instruction, Gaff (1975) defined faculty development as "enhancing the talents, expanding the interests, improving the competence, and otherwise facilitating the professional and personal growth of faculty members, particularly in their role as instructors" (p. 14). A study of faculty development programs conducted by Herman (2012) revealed that "while many institutions are effectively supporting faculty through investing in faculty development programs, this support is not universal, and institutions looking to expand online education must be cognizant of the need to invest in faculty in order to maintain and improve the quality of online education programs" (p. 104). Baran and Correia (2014) suggest that support and professional development programs are critical for promoting faculty engagement and pedagogical problem solving within their disciplines. Because training is essential to the

successful design and delivery of an online course, to allow instructors to teach online without formal training may be condemning the process to failure (Gibbons, 2001).

Fish and Wickersham (2009) explain that online instruction requires a faculty member to think differently about teaching and learning, learn a host of new technological skills, and engage in ongoing faculty development for design and development of quality online instruction. Research suggests that delivering quality online courses is more difficult and time consuming than delivering the same content in a traditional face-to-face setting (Almala, 2007; Darrington, 2008; Dykman & Davis, 2008; Fish & Wickersham, 2009; Li & Irby, 2008). The increase in the number of online courses has resulted in an emphasis toward adult learning theory, in which the instructor serves as a facilitator of learning rather than a distributor of content (Ruiz, Mintzer, & Leipzig, 2006). By recognizing the critical role of online teachers to successful online learning and allowing their influence at different design levels of support and development, schools will motivate and empower their faculty members to construct learner-centered, innovative online learning (Baran, Correia, & Thompson, 2013).

In order to meet strategic online learning objectives, institutions are charged with providing ongoing faculty training and support (Appana, 2008) through professional development opportunities that expose instructors to current technologies and related software (Evans & Champion, 2007). Additionally, these faculty members must establish specific self-directed behaviors that support facilitation in online environments. According to Zsohar and Smith (2008), properly trained instructors will likely have the knowledge to build successful courses that enhance faculty productivity, engage learners and optimize student learning outcomes" (Fish & Wickersham, 2009).According to Dykman and Davis (2008), detailed organization and planning is the first step in teaching online. Planning and organizing are

fundamental behaviors connected to effective self-management and self-leadership. "Components to planning online courses include developing course objectives, identifying reading material and assignments, determining interaction options and clarifying student expectations" (Fish & Wickersham, 2009, p. 281). A variety of ongoing professional development opportunities should be made available to assist faculty in developing the technical and instructional design skills necessary to create a quality online course and engaging learning experience for students, (Fish & Wickersham, 2009).

Despite the strategic emphasis on online education, few institutions have written guidelines or policies for online courses (Tallant-Runnels et al., 2006). "Faculty members want training and course development assistance as well as rewards for preparing courses to be taught online" (Tallent-Runnels et al, 2006, pp. 116-117). According to Baran and Correia (2014), the quality of online programs in higher education is strongly correlated with how the professional development addresses the needs of online teachers. Improving the quality of online education through the training and development of online instructors may positively impact learning outcomes. This study aims to better understand the self-leadership behaviors and practices of online instructors so that the designs of training and development programs may be adapted to meet the needs of this employee group.

The last four decades have witnessed the formalization of distance education as a discipline (Saba, 2003). Several theoretical frameworks have been developed in an attempt to encompass and explain the activities in distance education. As theorists have tried to position their thinking, there seems to have been considerable discussions among scholars about what is the most appropriate or most comprehensive theory to interpret the activities that take place within the scope of online or distance education (Saba, 2003). Goel, Zhang and Templeton

(2012) report that a particular factor of interest for educational institutions is the intention of learners to enroll in e-learning courses in the future. For educational institutions that provide e-learning offerings, such intentions can reflect the success of e-learning initiatives (Goel et al., 2012). Earlier technologies included synchronous online messaging, tele-conferencing, and videoconferencing but with technological advancements such as improved broadband capacity and the use of more interactive multimedia, participatory online learning resources have become a viable option for many institutions (Falloon, 2011).

New challenges emerge as educational delivery systems evolve. "Conceptual confusion is created with the advent of new terminology (virtual, open, distributed and distance education), new technologies, new program demands, new audiences, and new commercially competitive providers" (Garrison, 2000, p. 1). The researcher further explains that such developments present enormous challenges for educators to make sense of the distance educational options that are available. Moore (2012) suggests that there is a universe of educational programs and practices that are distinctly different from those where teachers and learners occupy the same space and time. "Theories of learning show that interactions between, and among students and teachers, play a role in determining student learning outcomes" (Kayode & Teng, 2014, p. 414).

Transactional Distance Theory

M. G. Moore first introduced the idea of *transactional distance* in 1972 but did not connect it to education until 1980 (Stirling, 1997). Today, Moore's Transactional Distance Theory is seen as a useful instrument that effectively informs institutional as well as broader educational development (Gokool-Ramdoo, 2008). Considered alongside existing theory, it has not only stood the test of time but has been extended upon and has even seen practical applications (Saba, 2003). The features and tenets of Moore's Transactional Distance Theory

will provide the basis of understanding the concepts of online learning and distance education in this study.

Distance education was first defined in a 1972 presentation to the World Conference of the International Council for Correspondence Education. It was explained to be: "the family of instructional methods in which the teaching behaviors are executed apart from the learning behaviors so that communication between the learner and the teacher must be facilitated by print, electronic, mechanical, or other device" (Moore, 1972, p. 76). Distance education was defined as "the universe of teacher-learner relationships that exist when learners and instructors are separated by space and/or by time" (Moore, 1993, p. 22). This definition includes both synchronous and asynchronous delivery formats (Gorsky & Caspi, 2005). Saba (1988) suggests that much research centers on the concept of *distance* as physical (Lowe, 2008). The researchers go on to explain that "the *distance* in distance education is transactional, not spatial or temporal" (Gorsky & Caspi, 2005, p. 2). Tallent-Runnels et al. (2006) discuss the inconsistency in terminology used in education research and suggest that courses taught online should be called *online courses*. According to the influential definition by Keegan (1996):

> "Characteristics of distance education include the quasi-permanent separation of teacher and learner; the influence of an educational organization in planning and preparing learning materials and providing student support; the use of technical media; the provision of two-way communication; and the quasi-permanent absence of the learning group so that students are usually taught as individuals rather than in groups" (p. 22-23)

For the purpose of this study, the terms: distance learning, eLearning, and online learning will be used interchangeably to identify courses that are taught in environments in which students and

teachers use Web-based technologies to conduct learning activities that do not occur at the same time and/or space.

During the 1970s, there was limited academic research and no theories that frame the out-of-classroom practice of distance education (Moore, 2013). All scholarly research in education was grounded in the almost universally accepted assumption that "instruction refers to the activity which takes place during schooling and within the classroom setting" (Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971; Moore, 2013). As noted in Moore and Kearsley (1996), the term 'transactional' is rooted in John Dewey's (1938) explanation that an experience is always what it is because of a transaction taking place between an individual and his or her environment (Aluko, Hendrikz & Fraser, 2011). "The term *transaction* was developed by Boyd and Apps, and recontextualized by Moore to the distance education field" (Kang & Gyorke, 2008, p. 204). From the theoretical standpoint, the term "distance" was used to refer to the distance in the relationship between the instructor and student, rather than the physical or geographic separation between them (Goel et al., 2012).

Moore (1993) designed the variable "transactional distance" as "a psychological and communications space to be crossed, a space of potential misunderstanding between the inputs of the instructor and those of the learner" (p. 23). Transactional distance refers to a physical separation that causes a psychological and communicative chasm - a potential fall-space of misunderstanding between the actors (instructor and learner) in an educative event (Stirling, 1994). Furthermore, "transactional distance is conceptualized as a cognitive phenomenon in the mind of the learner" (Goel et al., 2012, p. 1122).

Transactional distance is related to teaching and learning, and it involves three variables: dialogue, structure and learner autonomy (Aluko et al., 2011; Moore, 2002). This understanding

is pertinent to the separation between the teacher and learner in online environments. In discussing the role of the factors of Transactional Distance Theory, Moore (1997) prioritizes the quality over the frequency of dialogue while considering the extent to which the dialogue is effective in supporting learning problems experienced by a distance learner. The second factor Moore (1997) refers to is the nature of the course structure. This factor includes aspects such as "the extent to which course goals and objectives are pre-prescribed, the pedagogical model used in teaching the course (e.g., teacher- vs. student-centered), the nature of course assessment, and the ability of the course to accommodate individual student needs" (Goel et al., 2003, p. 1123). The third factor, learner autonomy, is contingent upon the previous two in that it refers to the sense of both independence and interdependence perceived by learners as they engage in the course. Learner autonomy is closely connected to a learner's sense of self-direction or self-determination. These constructs may be affected by the dialogue, the level of rigidity or flexibility that exists in the design of the course and its delivery, and the extent to which the learner takes control of learning procedures (Giossos, Koutsouba, Lionarkakis, & Skavantzos, 2009).

Distance education is "all planned learning that normally occurs in a different place from teaching, requiring special techniques of course design and instruction, communication through various technologies, and special organization and administrative arrangements" (Moore & Kearsley, 2005, p. 2). In traditional distance education where the learner is separated from the instructor and other students in time and physical space, the only method of communication was often by regular posts and occasional meetings (Lowe, 2000).

The theory evolved from basic insights regarding independent learning and learner autonomy (Moore, 1972) into a multi-dimensional set of interrelated definitions, propositions

and constructs that is widely known today as the Theory of Transactional Distance (Gorsky & Caspi, 2005; Moore, 1993). Since its first appearance, the theory has been reworded to adapt to changes in the external conditions of distance education, particularly as the delivery technologies have evolved (Jung, 2001). In a 2001 study that measured the impact of individual and instructional variables on learners' perceived transactional distance in a World Wide Web learning environment, Chen defines transactional distance as a "distance of understandings and perceptions between learner-instructor, learner-learner, learner subject matter and learner-interface" (Chen, 2001, p. 462; Gorsky & Caspi, 2005, p. 6).

Based on a survey of 2,500 colleges and universities, Allen and Seaman (2013) provides operational definition of course classifications based on mode of content delivery. The researchers describe traditional face-to-face as an exchange that features no online technology with content delivered in writing or orally. In Web-facilitated courses, a traditional face-to-face course is supplemented by or augmented with a "web-based technology such as a course management system, or assignment- or syllabus-related web pages" (Allen & Seaman, 2013, p. 5). Blended/Hybrid courses feature a combination of both online and traditional face-to-face delivery; with more online meetings than face-to-face meetings (Allen & Seaman, 2013). In online courses, "most or all of the course and its content is delivered online, with non/negligible face-to-face meetings" (Allen & Seaman, 2013, p. 5).

Structure, dialogue and learner autonomy are the three key variables that affect the transactional distance in distance education programs (Moore, 1993). Moore relied on these pedagogical components (structure, dialogue, and autonomy) to describe the psychological separation between the teacher and learner (Reyes, 2013). A theoretical understanding of these three components is foundational to this study.

Structure

In Moore's Transactional Distance Theory, *structure* refers to the ways in which the teaching program is designed and usually reflects the "rigidity or flexibility of the program's educational objectives, teaching strategies and evaluation methods while accommodating or responding to each learner's individual needs" (Aluko et al, 2011, p. 117; Gorsky & Caspi, 2005, p. 3; Moore, 1993, p. 26). Saba and Shearer (1994) define structure as "a measure of an educational program's responsiveness to learners' individual needs" (p. 42). To identify the most effective structure, an instructor or design team might test parts of the course on a pilot group of students, to find out, for example, precisely how long it will take each student to accomplish each objective and the suitability of the test questions aimed at evaluating performance (Moore, 2013).

Increased program structure decreases the extent of dialogue which, in turn, increases the extent of transactional distance, (Gorsky & Caspi, 2005). "It may be argued that every teaching program needs to be structured since this refers to its organization, but with regard to the theory, the extent of the structure would be determined by the proposed intervention between learning material and the learner, based on the envisaged learning outcomes" (Saba, 2003, p. 118). The transactional distance that is created when dialogue is decreased through an increase in program structure can affect the teaching and learning experiences of online instructors.

Dialogue

Dialogue is the predominant determinant of transactional distance, with the other two variables affecting dialogue (Goel, Zhang, & Templeton, 2012). In mentioning the need for a provision of freedom in educational environments, Rogers (1969) discussed the centrality of the interpersonal relationship (dialogue) in the facilitation of learning. In dialogue, each participant

is a respectful, active listener and contributor that builds upon the contributions of the other participant or participants (Moore, 1993). The subject matter of the course; personality of the teacher; ability of a learner to competently participate in the dialogue; and cultural and language differences between instructors and students determine the extent of dialogue in a learning course (Moore, 2012)

Saba and Shearer (1994) defined dialogue operationally "as the extent of verbal interaction between the educator and the learner" (p. 42). Dialogue is developed by teachers and learners in the course of the interactions that occur when the one communicates information and the other responds (Moore & Kearsley, 1996). "The content of the course, the nature of the medium of delivery, the philosophy and emotional characteristics of teachers, and the learners' personalities have a direct effect on the extent and quality of the dialogue, and transactional distance will be overcome depending on the extent of this variable" (Aluko et al, 2011, p. 117; Moore & Kearsley, 1996). Dialogue is intended to improve the student's understanding (Gorsky & Caspi, 2005; Moore, 1993). Jung (2001) identified three types of dialogue: academic, collaborative, interpersonal. Similarly, through exploratory analysis, Chen (2001) proposes four dimensions of dialogue: instructor-learner, learner-learner, learner-content, and learner-interface transactional distance.

The ability of the student to manage the learning process affects the dialogue. Highly autonomous learners can cope with a lower degree of dialogue while less autonomous learners require a relatively high degree of dialogue (Moore, 2013). While technology imposes certain limitations, successful outcomes are also dependent upon the capacity of the learner, the nature of the subject and the teaching philosophy of the instructor (Moore, 2013). In explaining the factors of Transactional Distance Theory, Moore states that "dialogue is not the number of verbal

interactions that occurred and transactional distance is not a perceived value of closeness" (Moore, 1993, p. 7). Dialogue is a particular kind of interpersonal constructive interaction that works like a scaffold building upon the contributions of others. This occurs after a course is designed, as teachers exchange words and other symbols with learners, for the purpose of creating knowledge for the learner (Moore, 1993).

Moore (2013) explains that one of the common causes for a course falling short of expectations is the failure to design the balance of structure and dialogue that is appropriate for a particular group of students and a given subject. Dialogue and transactional distance are inversely proportional; as one increases, the other decreases (Gorsky & Caspi, 2005). Genuine dialogue is not located within any one of the participants but rather is found in their "between-ness," in what Buber calls the reality of the "interhuman" (p. 184). According to Gorsky and Caspi (2005), Moore's definition of dialogue rests firmly in the philosophical tradition of humanism.

A responsibility exists on the part of online instructors to maintain a balance of dialogue and structure in order to limit transactional distance. The results of a 1994 Saba and Shearer study revealed that "as dialogue increases, transactional distance decreases; as structure increases, transactional distance increases" (Saba & Shearer, 1994, p. 42). Instructor-learner transactional distance was defined by three items: the degree to which learners understood the concepts and theories presented by the instructors and the degree to which they agreed with the comments and feedback posted by the instructor, the degree of instructor accessibility; and the overall quality of interaction between instructor and learner (Saba & Shearer, 1994). Learner-content transactional distance was defined by the degree that learners understand the ideas presented in course materials, and that the materials, objectives, and requirements met their

learning needs and expectations (Saba & Shearer, 1994). Learning interface transactional distance has been defined by the degree of user friendliness as experienced by the learner (Saba & Shearer, 1994).

Learner autonomy

In Transactional Distance Theory, learner autonomy is the extent to which the learner rather than the teacher determines the goals, the learning experiences and the evaluation decisions of the learning program (Moore, 1993). Transactional distance and learner autonomy are directly proportional (Gorsky & Caspi, 2005, p. 3). According to Peters (1998), learner autonomy refers to "a state of affairs in which a person is no longer the object of educational guidance, influences, effects and obligation, but he or she is the subject of his or her own education" (Aluko et al., 2011, p. 118). In order to learn more about the behaviors of students in the online learning environment, a study was conducted in 2006 by Tallent-Runnels, Thomas, Lan, Cooper, Ahern, Shaw, & Liu which revealed that students prefer to move at their own pace even though such an approach required a high degree of self-management. Students in the study did not want to be required to complete their assignments at the same time as others and wanted to be able to move ahead in their courses at their own pace. The literature shows that online instruction is welcomed by students because it provides learners with convenience and autonomy (Tallent-Runnels et al., 2006).

During the research that led to the development of the Theory of Transactional Distance, it became clear that some programs allow or demand the greater exercise of learning autonomy than others and that there are conditions under which greater learner autonomy may be exercised and others where a lower degree of autonomy is more appropriate (Moore, 2013). Thus it was hypothesized, and demonstrated, that "teaching-learning programs can be organized, not only

according to the extent of structure and dialogue, but also according to the extent of self-management, or learner autonomy, permitted by each program" (Moore, 2013, p. 11). Such decisions, therefore, lie in the hands of class facilitators, many of whom practice self-directed behaviors.

In speaking to the significance of Transactional Distance Theory, Moore (2007) stated that it "allows the generation of an almost infinite number of hypotheses for research into the interactions between course structures, dialogue between teachers and learners, and the student's propensity to exercise control of the learning process" (Kang & Gyorke, 2008, p. 204; Moore, 2007, p. 101). It is concerned with independent study and highlights the shared responsibility of the teaching/learning enterprise with the independence of the learners seen as the most important and desired outcome (Moore, 1993). Such an outcome is the result of "shared negotiation through dialog and structure between teacher and learner" (Gokool-Ramdoo, 2008, p. 7). Learner autonomy has also been operationalized as an independent or interdependent trait of an individual (Chen, 2001; Goel et al., 2012).

Technology in learning

From the late twentieth century, distance education has entered into its post-modern development phase (Saba, 2007) and has shifted from a structural paradigm to a transactional paradigm (Garrison, 2000; Kang & Gyorke, 2008). Implementation of e-learning, whether in academic institutions or in the corporate world, is fast growing. Computer mediated environments are increasingly being used as education platforms (Goel et al., 2012). Overall, research on web-based instruction has indicated "student-centered learning environment," full of multimedia resources, "expanded interactivity," and "adaptability to different student characteristics" as distinctive features of web-based instruction, most of which reflect integration

of technological features of Web into web-based instruction (Jung, 2001, p. 528). These are notable considerations as online instructors/facilitators design and implement learning experiences for students. "Although our perceptions regarding distance education have changed significantly, there still remains a perceived lack of quality in the development, management and delivery of (distance education) programs" (Aluko et al., 2011, p. 115). This study does not measure perceptions about the quality of program development. Instead it analyzes the effects of self-leadership behaviors on the job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors. An understanding of the interrelationships of these variables may lead to improvements in the quality of program development.

Garrison (2000) explains that education is a purposeful activity and theory provides us with the understanding necessary to take effective action, therefore online learning theories must reflect both the purposeful and spontaneous nature of an educational experience (p. 2). "It cannot be emphasized too strongly that transactional distance is a relative rather than an absolute variable" (Moore, 1993, p. 23). Grow (1991) explains that teaching should be "matched to learners with the explicit purpose of helping them attain knowledge, skills, motivation, and goals of becoming more autonomous in learning and in life" (p. 142). Saba and Shearer (1994) concluded that it is not location that determines the effect of instruction, but the amount of transaction between learner and instructor (Chen, 2001). "A learner evaluates his/her experience as encompassing both the content and the technological medium in which it is delivered" (Goel et al., 2012, p. 1122; Moore and Kearsley, 1996).

Some aspects of traditional face-to-face learning cannot be duplicated in online forums; however, technology makes it possible to facilitate a similar environment. According to Conceicão (2007), advancements in technology act as an "important education promise for

engendering active and experiential learning, encouraging reflection and application, and fostering collaborative and individualized construction of meaning in learning communities" (p. 26). Innovations in technology have led to changes in the academic perspective on Transactional Distance Theory. In 2011, Falloon (2011) suggested that "Moore's theory provides a useful conceptual lens through which to analyze online learning practices" but cautions that "its tenets may need revisiting to reflect the move toward the use of synchronous communication tools in online distance learning" (p. 187). Kayode and Teng (2014) explain that modern distance education is often difficult to define by the mode of delivery via information and communication technology, or the physical separation between learners and instructors, due to the rapid and ongoing technological evolution.

Today's Web-based instruction shares many features with traditional forms of distance education such as correspondence study, videoconferencing lectures, and TV courses. What it offers that is unique among communications technologies, is "the facility of combining the attributes of each of the older media, and thus provide a learning environment in which texts, pictures, video and audio are integrated into one system, access to huge databases is simple and easy, and more flexible interactions-especially asynchronous learner-learner interaction- are far simpler than before" (Jung, 2001, p. 526). Particularly after the occurrence of social software (blog, wiki, Twitter, Myspace, YouTube, social bookmarking, etc.) and the rapid development of modern communication technologies (Web 2. 0, mobile, Wi-Fi, etc.), individual students have been empowered with more control over the learning process (Kang & Gyorke, 2008).

Computer mediated environments are increasingly being used as platforms for education (Goel, Zhang & Templeton, 2012). The World Wide Web and Internet are not necessarily new technologies, and the challenges of facilitating a class using these technologies is not totally new

nor, in instruction via these media, necessarily pedagogically innovative (Jung, 2001). Goel et al. (2012) concur: "The phenomenon of e-learning is not new; the acceleration towards developing and leveraging e-learning strategies is fueled by drivers such as globalization, technological advancements, and demand from learners that have grown up in a digital era" (p. 1122). In keeping with the demand generated from the forces above, many higher education institutions have adopted e-learning in some form as part of their curriculum offering. Courses that are branded as online, distance, hybrid, or virtual, have some component which leverages electronic tools for education (Goel et al., 2012).

Transactional distance theory is often chosen because of the association or interaction between the distance education practitioner and distance learners, who are engaged in distance learning practices, activities and interventions (Aluko et al., 2011, p. 116). Keegan (1993) believes that distance education should be carried out along lines that replicate the face-to-face educational transaction. He argues that there is need to reconstruct the moment in which the teaching-learning interaction occurs (Keegan, 1993). Just as such a moment is difficult to pinpoint in the traditional classroom, transactional distance and online delivery systems in which students and teachers do not share the same time and space pose challenges for course facilitators to identify this moment of interaction.

Saba (1988) concluded that instructional designers can only control the "management of conditions" of teaching and learning, and they cannot assess the quality of learning and teaching first hand (Lowe, 2018, p. 4). The challenge for contemporary online education theorists is to recognize and consider the opportunities and limitations that exist in the facilitation of teaching and learning at a distance with a number of emerging methods and technologies (Garrison, 2000). Online communication can have varying effects on learning experiences. Transactional

distance may explain why distance education students expect more social and practical support from their instructors than what is expected by their local peers (Wheeler, 2007). Lowe (2018) questions whether strategies to increase dialogue [in online learning environments] may move the student away from the instructional design of the material, or it is the job of a skilled facilitator to carefully control the dialogue to comply with a defined curriculum.

According to Lowe (2018), transactional distance refers to the quality of the learning transaction with the quality dependent on both participants in the transaction as well as variables of media. Explaining the technical features of a given medium does not help explain how that medium interacts with the pedagogical process associated with media-based instruction (Jung, 2001). A more recent review of Transactional Distance Theory by Moore reiterated the role of course structure, but underscored the need to also consider the capacity of the learners for autonomous learning by taking into account their personality traits and learning styles (Moore, 2007). An increased emphasis by institutions to introduce, improve and integrate online learning experiences for students has posed unique challenges for facilitators to establish materials and processes that effectively reach students.

Moore (2013) posits that his theory explains the flexibility of distance education or online learning. He further suggests that the theory is based on "behaviorist and cognitivist theories of learning, as well as those – at the other extreme – that reflect the humanists' (and nowadays, constructivists') perspective of a learner-centered pedagogy, in which learners engage in a relatively high degree of dialogue with a more-or-less supportive tutor" (Moore, 2003, p. 68). The use of computer-mediated communication, which began to accelerate during the 1980s (e. g. Mason & Kaye, 1989), has evolved to include a focus on online communities of practice (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002), based on ideas from social constructivism (Vygotsky,

1978), which have been dominant in conceptualizing social engagement online (Benson & Samarawickrema, 2009). "Teaching and learning in separate locations is better understood, not as an aberration from the classroom, but as a significantly different pedagogical domain" (Moore, 2013, p. 67). By placing transaction at the core of distance education, Moore offered new insights into the mechanisms of distance education programs and pointed toward new and important research directions, (Gorsky & Caspi, 2005, p. 2).

The theory can have applications along all supply chain of the distance education enterprise (Gokool-Ramdoo, 2008). Much like the work of Gokool-Ramdoo (2008), this paper "adopts the view that the theoretical impasse can be crossed with the recognition of Moore's Transactional Distance Theory as the global theory that can explicate and ensure the sustainability of distance education in a technology-driven world (Gokool-Ramdoo, 2008, p. 1). The theory may lend itself as an application not only for learning resources, but to the totality of a given program (Aluko et al., 2011).

Transactional Distance Theory may provide a framework for conceptualizing online learning or distance education, in general (Jung, 2001). The design of online learning tasks, learning resources, and assessments are primarily influenced through the management of transactional distance (Benson & Samarawickrema, 2009, p. 10). This is a particularly important consideration as higher education institutions formulate new adaptive plans to train and develop instructors to effectively deliver online content.

The following literature review summary table identifies key contributions to the research on self-leadership, online learning, job performance and job satisfaction. This reference may provide an abridged framework to enhance the reader's understanding of the research topic and questions. The literature fails to yield any work that examines the self-leadership strategies and

behaviors practiced by online instructors and how such strategies and behaviors may affect the job performance and job satisfaction of these employees.

Table 1

Literature Review Summary Table

Authors	Methodology	Focus	Key Findings
Crawford-Ferre & Wiest (2012)	Qualitative Empirical - Considers interaction of online course participants through lens of constructivism	Online education is reviewed as an alternative to face-to-face delivery and attempts to identify approaches to effective online instruction	College faculty have had little training in pedagogy for online instruction. Online instructors need adequate technology to facilitate a course. Faculty need access to training to learn how to use the functions of the technology. Online instructors are isolated from colleagues and miss out on feedback opportunities.
Kebretchi, Lipschuetz, & Santiague (2017)	Empirical – Literature synthesis including and analysis of qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods research 104 articles analyzed teaching and learning issues within online courses, not institutional issues, related to online programming.	The rapid integration of online education into higher education has diverted educators' attention from closely identifying significant challenges in facilitating online courses. Research question: "What are the major categories of issues and challenges that affect teaching online courses in higher education institutions in the United States?"	There are challenges associated with the transition from face-to-face to online instruction. Identified concerns include: communication barriers; student vs. faculty leading course; instructor's interest, teacher preparation programs. Issues exist related to learners, content and instructors.

Authors	Methodology	Focus	Key Findings
Georgianna, S. (2007)	Quantitative, survey Exploratory Self-leadership in the Chinese culture	The study focuses on the volitional and self-awareness components of self-leadership strategies within the native Chinese population	The understanding of performance outcomes as performance-approach goals or mastery goals increased motivation and performance outcomes, especially in situations without contingencies, such as external performance based rewards or time constraints
Tallent-Runnels, Thomas, Lan, Cooper, Ahern, Shaw, & Liu. (2006)	Empirical review of 40 studies based on quantitative analysis, 10 of which collected data with survey instruments along with 18 correlational and causal-comparative studies (nonexperimental), 20 qualitative studies (best defined as case studies), 16 mixed method studies (most of which used surveys and open-ended questions)	Students in the online learning environment The focus was organized into four topics: course environment, learners' outcomes, learners' characteristics, and institutional and administrative factors.	Students prefer to move at their own pace even though such an approach required a high degree of self-management. Students in the study did not want to be required to complete their assignments at the same time as others and wanted to be able to move ahead in their courses at their own pace.

Authors	Methodology	Focus	Key Findings
Baran & Correia (2014)	Empirical – literature review, framework proposal	The quality of online programs in higher education is strongly correlated with how the professional development initiatives address the needs of online teachers	Authors propose a framework for improving the quality of online teaching by offering professional development from the organization and community support from peers. There should be a shift away from a tech-nological emphasis in professional development and toward those who are transforming learning.
Sierpe, E. (1999)	Quantitative – using JSS Library staff members	The study focuses on the job satisfaction library employees in three English-language universities in Quebec	Low satisfaction with promotion opportunities and salaries, communication and operating procedures

Authors	Methodology	Focus	Key Findings
Voelck (1995)	Quantitative – using JSS Librarians	The job satisfaction of support staff members of thirteen state-supported libraries in Michigan were the focus of this study.	Ways to improve job satisfaction of the support staffs were identified as: fair compensation based on education and experience; insufficient participation in organizational communications. There are too few contingent rewards. Shared responsibility positively impacts job satisfaction
Parmer & East (1993)	Quantitative – using JSS Library staff members	The job satisfaction of the library staffs of twelve Ohio universities were examined.	The support staff in Ohio are satisfied with their employment situation. Strong satisfaction with supervision, the work itself, benefits, and pay. Dissatisfaction with operational conditions, communication, continent rewards, and promotion. Part-time workers were more satisfied with pay than full-time counterparts.

Authors	Methodology	Focus	Key Findings
Anderson & Prussia (1997)	Quantitative Surveys, Self-Leadership questionnaire issued to three different groups	The role of self-leadership in employee empowerment and non-traditional relationships between organizations and their employees The article discusses the decentralization of power in organizations and an increase in employee autonomy.	Self-leadership is important to performance, enthusiasm, commitment Self-leadership is a global concept that incorporates cognitive and intrinsic motivational aspects Results suggest the refinement and development of scales to measure self-leadership to support recurring themes in organizational restructuring.
Carmeli, Meitar, & Weisberg (2006)	Quantitative Surveys to employees and supervisors	The study examines the relationship between self-leadership skills and innovative behaviors at work.	A three-dimensional scale of self-leadership skills is positively associated with both self and supervisor ratings of innovative behaviors. People can be trained to adapt and enhance their self-leadership skills and improve work outcomes, as a result.
Godwin, Neck & Houghton (1999)	Empirical – theoretical modeling	To apply self-leadership theory, particularly *thought self-leadership* to goal-setting theory to enhance the effectiveness of individual goal performance.	Field experiments in natural settings could be used to test theories advanced herein. Cognitive strategies of *thought self-leadership* can possibly enhance goal performance

Authors	Methodology	Focus	Key Findings
Bakow, Bowen, Guthrie, Lack& Long (2012).	Qualitative Data collected through interviews Sample: Presidents, provosts, and other senior leaders at 25 colleges and universities; Additionally, more intensive "deep dive" analyses were conducted at five institutions for the purpose of gaining an in-depth understanding of the specific challenges posed by emerging educational technologies	The purpose of the study is to explore key obstacles to widespread adoption of highly integrated, adaptive online education programs. Today's students have grown up in a digital world. We are in a transition period as faculty attempts to catch up to students. "Unbundle" the activity of teaching to take full advantage of the opportunity that technology provides to perform some functions more effectively and at a lower cost. Implement responsible cost-cutting strategies while supporting an emphasis on online education.	Traditional processes continue to govern approval of online offerings; little data exist to compare learning outcomes for online versus traditional instruction; students say they prefer online while research suggests otherwise; highly motivated students outperform others on online courses; experienced online faculty embrace additional information generated by learning management systems Online instruction is alien to most faculty; faculty fear that online instruction will be used to diminish faculty ranks; higher investment of time is required to prepare for online courses; faculty reluctant to teach online courses developed by a third party; faculty prefer courses that allow for customization; accrediting bodies are not inhibiting the growth of online offerings

Summary

This chapter reviews the literature on self-leadership, online learning, job satisfaction and job performance. Throughout this theoretical framework, overlapping connections can be found between autonomy, motivation, satisfaction, performance, competence and a number of other related concepts. An understanding of how self-leadership behaviors affect the satisfaction and performance of online instructors can aid higher education stakeholders to make informed decisions about training for these employees. It is important for professional development initiatives to include activities that promote the types of self-leadership behaviors that are found to be most important to the job satisfaction and job performance of online instructors. This may be done by evaluating existing faculty development programs while considering research that measures the impact of self-leadership behaviors on performance and satisfaction. It may also be beneficial to study the constructs before and after an intervention in order to understand the actual impact of self-leadership in this context. This study reveals which dimension of self-leadership predicts the job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors. It focuses on online instructors that vary in age, rank and experience at both two-year and four-year colleges and universities. Chapter 3 discusses the methodology that was used to investigate the interrelationships.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Individual self-leadership behaviors, patterns, and strategies can shape employees' perceptions about their job and affect levels of performance and satisfaction. This quantitative study quantifies the interrelationship between the variables of self-leadership, self-reported job performance and job satisfaction. Specifically, while controlling for age, ethnicity, training, employment type and rank, each dimension of self-leadership, that is: behavior focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought patterns strategies, were tested to determine its influence on job satisfaction and on job performance. Understanding how these individual self-leadership variables influence the performance and satisfaction of online instructors may aid higher education stakeholders who make decisions regarding training for this faculty group.

The expansion of online learning programs raises questions about the quality and flexibility of the offerings and how well institutions are meeting the demands of today's students. Compared to traditional face-to-face courses, online delivery requires instructors to possess unique skills while adapting to new styles of course facilitation. Effective online instructors identify connections that facilitate the blending of technology, pedagogy, and content to produce effective discipline-based teaching via technology (Burns, 2013). Instructors that integrate self-leadership behaviors and practices into the various stages of the online teaching process may realize a greater level of effectiveness with these emerging themes. Because it is largely based on motivation and cognitive behaviors, self-leadership is often connected to organizational behavior, the management discipline, and the business environment. Competition has led higher education institutions to adopt strategies that align with other types of customer-focused

organizations that are reducing costs or expanding services. Frenkel, Schechtman and Koenigs (2006) note that variations within the educational sector itself have been identified, however the gap in the educational literature is a scholarly application of self-leadership to the higher education arena – particularly online instruction. This study will attempt to address this void.

Research Methodology

The postpositivist worldview served as the philosophical foundation for this quantitative research. The knowledge that develops through a postpositivist lens is based on careful observation and measurement of the objective reality that exists in the world (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). In this view, *reality* is real and *truth* is universal, but as researchers, we cannot directly access either – they may only be approximated (Phillips & Burbules, 2000). Creswell & Creswell (2018) provide five key assumptions about the postpositivist world view:

- Knowledge is conjectural (and foundational).
- Research is the process of making claims and then refining them based on tested theories.
- Data, evidence, and rational considerations shape knowledge.
- Research seeks to develop relevant, true statements that explain a situation or describe causal relationships of interest.
- Being objective is an essential aspect of competent inquiry (p. 7).

The scientific method is the process used to identify causal relationships between research variables. Science is considered objective, empirical, systematic and cumulative, and predictive, (Wimmer & Dominick, 2014). Creswell & Creswell (2018) explain that the postpositivism is reductionistic in that "the intent is to reduce ideas into a small, discrete set to test, such as the variables that comprise hypotheses and research questions" (p. 6).

Research design

This research aims to explore how each of the three dimensions of self-leadership – behavior-focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought-pattern strategies- affects the job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors. Hierarchical linear regression analyses was used to address the following research questions:

To what extent do self-leadership practices and behaviors predict self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors?

- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the global score on self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?
- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the presence of behavior-focused strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?
- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the presence of natural reward strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?
- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the presence of constructive thought pattern strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?

Correlations are used in many measurement studies, such as studies aimed at obtaining validity and reliability evidence (Goodwin & Leech, 2006). Fundamentally, a correlation describes the relationship between variables. Investigators use the correlational statistic to describe and measure the degree of association (or relationship) between two or more variables or sets of scores (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Hierarchical linear regression can easily integrate heterogeneous variables in a single model allowing their significances to be estimated, (Chi & Voss, 2005). "Results based on hierarchical linear models duplicate the results of many classic ANOVA models and expand the possibilities of data analysis (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002, p. 462). In this study, the researcher will use statistical procedures to measure the interrelationship between the variables of self-leadership and the variables of self-reported the job performance and job satisfaction levels of online instructors. In the postpositivistic approach, correlations may suggest a relationship, however they do not prove them to exist (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Hierarchical linear regression is a form of multiple regression that allows the researcher to control for and identify the significance of several variables in a single function.

Survey research focuses on a population sample and quantitatively or numerically describes the trends, attitudes, or opinions of the population from which a sample was drawn. (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Four instruments was combined into a single online survey to collect quantitative data for this study. Online surveys are quantitative in nature and, according to De Vaus (2013), are considered effective for collecting, organizing, and analyzing data. Advantages of this approach include low cost, lack of geographic limitations, lack of time constraints, and flexibility in data collection (Wimmer & Dominick, 2014).

Population

In its broadest conceptualization, this study was intended to analyze the population of

online instructors in the United States. However, the span of this population and other related variables makes such a wide-reaching endeavor nearly impossible. As a result, it was necessary to delineate a sample from the larger population. Convenience sampling is appropriate in studies in which the population is highly homogenous (Zhang, 2016). The population for the proposed study consists of full-time and part-time faculty members, ranked as "instructor" or higher who teach online coursework at a two-year or four-year college or university. Eleven institutions were identified based on size, geographic location, and the availability of online learning. A recruitment email containing a link to the survey, listed as Appendix E, was sent to those identified as participants. Qualtrics software was used to facilitate the survey.

The population identified for this study met the criteria for survey research by identifying themselves when prompted on the introductory screen of the survey link as a current full-time or part-time faculty member with online teaching experience. Those receiving a recruitment email also had a valid email address at one of eleven U.S. colleges and universities identified for this study

Table 2

Higher Education Institution Type, Geographic location and enrollment

Higher education institution (HIEDI)	Institution type	Geographic location	Total enrollment (2018)
HIEDI 1	Four-year	Eastern U.S.	9,909
HIEDI 2	Four-year	Central U.S.	1,904
HIEDI 3	Four-year	Eastern U.S.	21,630
HIEDI 4	Two-year	Eastern U.S.	5,507
HIEDI 5	Four-year	Central U.S.	17,297
HIEDI 6	Four-year	Western U.S.	19,351
HIEDI 7	Four-year	Eastern U.S.	34,287
HIEDI 8	Four-year	Central U.S.	14,730
HIEDI 9	Four-year	Western U.S.	42,496
HIEDI 10	Four-year	Western U.S.	57,855
HIEDI 11	Two-year	Eastern U.S.	2,676

Sampling

This research endeavor used homogenous sampling to generate a group to study. Homogenous sampling focuses on participants that share similar traits or specific characteristics (Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim, 2016). Participants may be similar in age, culture, occupation or life experience, for example. Because the population identified for the study includes full-time and part-time higher education faculty members with online teaching experience, it is plausible to rely on homogenous sampling to accomplish the research objectives identified herein. While this is a non-random method, homogeneous sampling facilitated a group of participants that possess the required, mitigating characteristics for the intended study (Smith Dissertation, 2017).

Differences in the age, ethnicity, training, employment type and employment rank of the sample population are considerable factors in the study. An analysis of the data reveals new information to enhance our understanding of how self-leadership and its specific dimensions predict the job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors.

Setting

Allen and Seaman (2016) report that online learning has been identified by college and university presidents as a critical factor in the long term strategy of their institutions. As such, this research focuses on those who deliver higher education learning experiences in the online environment. Online learning is growing in popularity at both two-year and four-year colleges and universities. This study collected data from instructors at each of these institution types in order to gain a broader data set to analyze.

Because this research involves a survey instrument that was administered online, the setting may have been different for each individual. Participants had the option of choosing when and where to engage in the survey. Because this information was not recorded, the time of day

and conditions that existed at the time of survey administration were variable, and specifically unknown.

Data were be collected over a one-month period which allowed participants ample time to receive the email link and to participate. The sample size was determined using a 95 percent confidence interval and a margin of error of 0.1. Likert-style scales were used on three of the survey instruments. The fourth instrument collected demographic and job-related data. The data collected was electronically transferred from Qualtrics into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21, so that it could be analyzed statistically.

Data Collection

Quantitative data was collected through an electronic survey. Participants in the study were located in each of the four time zones of the continental United States. Participants were identified by Online Learning Consortium, a membership organization devoted to driving quality digital and online learning by advancing the best practice guidance to higher education stakeholders (Online Learning Consortium Annual Report, 2017), and from institutional websites. For recruitment purposes, publicly available contact information was compiled. Using Qualtrics survey management software, the investigator initiated contact with potential participants by sending a recruitment email containing a link to the survey. Email recipients choosing to participate in the online survey were required to click a link inside the email that connected the recipient to the survey introduction page. Each participant was then prompted to respond to a series of demographic questions and to three instruments: the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ); the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS); and the Job Performance Survey (JPS).

The survey was designed so that personally identifiable information and the IP addresses

of participants were not recorded in order to preserve individual anonymity. Data from the survey was stored on password protected data management and analysis software and may only be accessed on password protected machines. Access to this information is limited to the investigator. No further communication between the researcher and the participants will take place.

Institutional Review Boards apply standards of research ethics when reviewing research proposals. A proposal of this research study was sent for review to the Institutional Review Board of the University of Memphis. An approval letter from the IRB is documented herein as Appendix H.

Instrumentation

The Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ), developed in 2002 by Houghton and Neck, features 35 items which focus on nine (9) interpretable factors that represent distinct self-leadership dimensions as specified by self-leadership theory. According to Neck and Houghton (2002), self-leadership is generally portrayed as a broader concept of self-influence that derives from intrinsic motivation theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986). The RSLQ provides an empirically supported measurement tool that considers different aspects of self-leadership ranging from behavioral elements of self-management to cognitive strategies of internal control. Each item is categorized into one of three dimensions: behavior focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought pattern strategies. Each of the three dimensions is further broken down into sub-scales. The instrument features a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Not at all accurate*) to 5 (*Completely accurate*), based on a set of statements, listed as Appendix A.

The Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), developed in 1985 by Paul Spector, is a 36 item, nine

facet scale used to assess employee attitudes about a particular job and the aspects of the job. Each facet is assessed with four items and a total score is computed using responses to all items. Pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, coworkers, nature of work, and communication are factors considered in the JSS. The instrument uses a six-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Disagree very much*) to 6 (*Agree very much*), based on a set of statements, listed as Appendix B. Nineteen of the items on this survey required reverse scoring.

Years of research have yet to produce a single instrument for measuring job performance that is vastly superior to other measures. Because online instructors are typically not directly observed by performance evaluators, measuring the job performance of this group is particularly difficult. As a result, self-reported data will be used to measure job performance. The research of Bailie (2015) and of Maxson (2017) was resourced to form an instrument to measure the job performance of online instructors. This instrument considers Bailie's protocols of Presence and Engagement, Communication, and Timeliness and Responsiveness (2015). It also focuses on key elements of Maxon's Priorities for Instructional Behavior Survey (2017). Seventeen questions were designed to learn more about these aspects as they relate to self-leadership strategies and behaviors. The instrument features a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*Always*) to 5 (*Never*), based on a set of statements, listed as Appendix C.

An additional set of questions designed by the investigator was used to gain demographic and work-related information from study participants, listed as Appendix D.

The survey contains eight quality assurance questions intended to limit survey manipulation by requiring participants to provide a specific response to a survey item. For example, participants will receive the following prompt: "Respond *Never* to the current item."

These questions have been distributed across the RSLQ, JSS, and the JPS. Quality assurance questions do not appear in the portion of the survey that collects demographic and job-related information. Only survey responses from participants achieving 75 percent accuracy or greater on quality assurance questions were included in the data analyses.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment, and rank, a relationship exists between the global score on self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education.

Hypothesis 2: Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment, and rank, a relationship exists between the presence of behavior-focused strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education.

Hypothesis 3: Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment, and rank, a relationship exists between the presence of natural reward strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education.

Hypothesis 4: Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment, and rank, a relationship exists between the presence of constructive thought pattern strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education.

Data Analysis

This study uses hierarchical linear regression to control for the demographic variables of age, ethnicity, training, employment type, and rank while analyzing the predictive influence of global self-leadership and the individual dimensions of self-leadership on the self-reported job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors. This method simultaneously investigates relationships within and between hierarchical levels of grouped data, thereby making it an efficient method for analyzing data while accounting for variance among variables at different levels (Woltman, Feldstain, MacKay, & Rocchi, 2012). Hierarchical linear regression enables researchers to account for the shared variance in hierarchically structured data by isolating variables making it possible to determine the significance of each, independently.

For coding purposes, each participant was assigned a numeric identifier. Each participant received a score for global self-leadership as well as an overall score for job performance and for job satisfaction. The independent variable is the predictor or explanatory variable for scale dimensions of self-leadership while controlling for demographic variables. In this study, overall job satisfaction and job performance scores are dependent variables. Hierarchical linear regression was used to understand the strength of the relationship between each scale dimension and the overall scale.

In order to protect the integrity of the data analysis, quality control safeguards in the form of forced responses were placed inside the survey. Data from participants that failed to correctly respond to 75 percent of the forced response questions was excluded from the analysis. In research, a failure to collect enough data on the dimensions and constructs can result in an erroneous representation. Incomplete data sets may also affect results. In order to control for missing data, any data set with more than two missing data prompts in each instrument was

removed from the analysis. In his guide for handling missing data on the Job Satisfaction Survey, Spector (1997) recommends replacing the missing value with the mean score for the variable in question. This method was employed throughout this survey.

On the demographics section of the survey, participants were provided a text box in which to type a response to the prompt, "*In your own words, specify your ethnicity*." Coding was required for responses to this prompt. Based on the language used by participants and the types and frequencies of responses, the researcher identified five categories for ethnicity: African American/Black, Asian, Caucasian/White, Hispanic, and Other. For example, participants that responded by typing the words "African American" or "black" were categorized as African American/Black. Unique responses such as "European" or "southerner" were categorized as "Other." Each category was then assigned a numeric identifier for the purpose of analysis.

Chronbach's alpha was used to test the internal consistency of reliability. This measure was determined for the overall constructs of job performance and job satisfaction. To do this, it was necessary to generate an alpha score on each scale in order to understand the reliability of each scale in relation to how participants are responding to the survey. Alpha scores at 0.7 or above are acceptable and considered reliable (Nunnally, 1967). Alpha values at or above 0.9 are considered very reliable. Limits in the amount of data can make it more difficult to establish a highly consistent alpha score. In social science research, *r* values ranging between 0.2 and 0.3 are considered a moderately positive relationship. Because human behavior is difficult to predict, *r* values of 0.5 and 0.6, for example, indicate that the variables being measured have a higher degree of correlation.

The level of significance is always set by the researcher. The *p* value is the level of significance within a tested hypothesis that represents the probability of the occurrence of a

given event. In social science disciplines, researchers tend to set the *p* value at 0.05 or $p < .05$. The *p* value is important because it determines if the null hypothesis is true or not. Each *r* value has its own *p* value. Smaller *p* values make significance more difficult to establish. Extremely high *p* values increase the chances that the research will yield a false positive score. In this study, the null hypotheses suggest that there is no relationship between either of the dimensions of self-leadership and the outcome variables of job performance and job satisfaction. If a *p* value is less than 0.05, then the null hypothesis is rejected in favor of the experimental hypothesis. This means that there is less than a 5 percent chance that the result was generated by chance. If significance was discovered with an alpha set at 0.05, then there is less than a 5 percent chance that the same significance would be found if the null hypothesis was true.

Potential limitations

Larger samples provide a broader representation and a more robust data set. The combination of three instruments, a list of demographic questions and forced response prompts may seem extensive to some participants. Lengthy surveys require more time and, while email recipients may have agreed to participate, some may have left the survey incomplete due to its length. In an effort to avoid incomplete surveys, a population bar was featured on the survey so that participants could monitor their progress.

Another limitation of this study is the reliance on self-reported data. The survey asks participants to measure how well they perform certain tasks. An online instructor's self-evaluation may differ from that of a peer, a subordinate, a supervisor, or a third party, such as a student. Demographics may also be a limitation because the sample may not provide a diversified representation of online instructors. A greater response by adjunct professors, for example, may provide a more meaningful study of this group as opposed to online instructors at

all ranks.

The Job Performance Scale used in this study derived from Maxson's (2017) research on essential online instructional behaviors as well as Bailie's (2015) work on identifying online instructional behaviors that online students and online instructors feel are important. Because the scale has not been empirically validated, more research should be conducted using this instrument in order to better understand its functionality and usefulness. Reliability is a concern in self-reported job performance measures. For future studies, it may be prudent to combine supervisor evaluations and student evaluations along with self-reported measures to produce a composite score for job performance of online instructors. The inclusion of observer-rated performance data as well as the different types of online delivery modes, such as synchronous, hybrid, and adaptive learning may also be considerable.

Summary

Online learning provides a competitive advantage for many colleges and universities that make it a priority. As higher education institutions and systems operate as traditional business organizations in a competitive global economy, training and development initiatives must be evaluated and changed to fulfill new organizational objectives. In summary, this chapter describes the methodology for studying how the job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors relates to self-leadership behaviors and practices.

The following chapter will include a data analysis of the relationships between behavior focused strategies; natural reward strategies; and constructive thought pattern strategies and the outcome variables of job performance and job satisfaction. Effective online teachers possess a unique set of knowledge, skills and abilities. Higher education stakeholders who embrace online education as a strategy of the future may use the results of this study to evaluate existing faculty

development programs and introduce new training initiatives that better support online instructors and current organizational objectives.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this study was to quantify the interrelationship between self-leadership and the variables of self-reported job satisfaction and job performance of online instructors. Using hierarchical regression analyses, data from 154 participants was analyzed. Controlling for demographic variables age, ethnicity, training, employment type and rank; the global self-leadership score was analyzed in terms of the dependent variables: job performance and job satisfaction. Also controlling for the aforementioned demographic variables, the three dimensions of self-leadership - behavior-focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought pattern strategies -were analyzed in terms of the dependent variables: job satisfaction and job performance.

This analysis is based on quantitative data collected through an electronic survey conducted in April 2018. Participants in the study were online instructors at two-year and four-year colleges and universities in the United States. Qualtrics was used to facilitate the study, electronically. The survey was emailed to 3,226 online instructors and yielded 213 participants resulting in an overall response rate of .067, however some responses were disqualified or incomplete causing the effective rate to vary across each construct. Each participant was prompted to respond to a series of demographic questions and three instruments: the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ); the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS); the Job Performance Survey (JPS).

The survey yielded responses from 89 females and 53 males. The ages of survey participants ranged from 18 to 74 years old with more than three quarters (77 percent) falling into the 35 to 64 years old range. Fifty-two percent of the respondents were ages 45 to 64. In

response to a question about highest degree earned, 105 of 143 participants or 73 percent reported holding a doctoral degree. More than 80 percent hold full time positions. Of 141 responses to a question about the place of employment, 122 (87 percent) reported teaching at a four-year institution. The rank of assistant professor, associate professor, or professor is held by 68 percent of those participating, while instructors accounted for 17 percent of the sample. Of those responding, 39 percent have taught ten or more online courses, while 27 percent have taught four to nine courses and 33 percent reported having taught one to three courses.

The sample size, mean, standard deviation, and confidence intervals for self-leadership, job satisfaction and job performance can be found in Table 4. The mean indicates the average value for each of the constructs. The standard deviation indicates the spread of the values for each construct. The confidence interval indicates the range of values that likely contain the true value of the construct. Prior to analyzing the hypotheses, reliability analyses were performed. All scales met sufficient reliability criteria. With Chronbach's alpha values ranging from .81 to .94, we can be sufficiently confident in the measurement of each construct. Cronbach's alpha values can be located in Table 5.

Table 3

Frequency Statistics for Age, Ethnicity, Training, Employment Type, and Rank

Measure	Characteristic	Frequency	%	Valid %
Age				
	18 to 24 years old	1	0.6	0.7
	25 to 34 years old	11	7.1	7.6
	35 to 44 years old	35	22.4	24.1
	45 to 54 years old	36	23.1	24.8
	55 to 64 years old	40	25.6	27.6
	65 to 74 years old	22	14.1	15.2
	Total	145	92.9	100.0

Table 3 (Continued)

Measure	Characteristic	Frequency	%	Valid %
Ethnicity				
	African American/Black	10	6.9	7.5
	Asian	107	73.8	79.8
	Caucasian/White	4	2.8	3.0
	Hispanic	4	2.8	3.0
	Other	9	6.2	6.7
	Total	134	92.5	100
Training				
	Bachelor's degree	2	1.3	1.4
	Master's degree	27	17.3	18.9
	Professional degree	4	2.6	2.8
	Doctoral degree	105	67.3	73.4
	Other	5	3.2	3.5
	Total	143	91.7	100.0
Employment Type				
	Full-time	114	73.1	80.9
	Part-time	27	17.3	19.1
	Total	141	90.4	100.0
Rank				
	Instructor	25	16.0	17.5
	Assistant Professor	26	16.7	18.2
	Associate Professor	31	19.9	21.7
	Professor	40	25.6	28.0
	Other	21	13.5	14.6
	Total	143	91.7	100

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics for Self-Leadership, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance

				95% Confidence Interval	
Measure	*N*	*SD*	*M*	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Self-Leadership	154	.56	3.79	3.65	3.86
Job Satisfaction	147	.79	3.88	3.74	4.04
Job Performance	108	.48	3.98	3.90	4.08
Behavior-Focused	145	.60	3.80	3.70	3.90
Natural Reward	145	.70	3.95	3.83	4.07
Constructive Thought Pattern	145	.71	3.70	3.58	3.81

Table 5

Summary of Chronbach's Coefficient Alpha and Intercorrelations for Scores on Self-Leadership, Job Satisfaction, and Job Performance

Measure	α	1	2	3
1. Self-Leadership[a]	.92	-		
2. Job Satisfaction[b]	.94	.02	-	
3. Job Performance[c]	.81	.34**	-.08	-

Note. α = Cronbach's coefficient alpha.
[a]n = 154, [b]n = 145, [c]n = 107.
**p < .001.

Hierarchical Linear Regression

Hierarchical linear regressions were performed to address the research questions of the study. Participants' global self-leadership scores and its accompanying dimensions were used to predict self-reported job performance and job satisfaction. Prior to performing hierarchical linear regressions, the relevant assumptions of this statistical analysis were tested. A minimum sample size of 96 was deemed adequate given the five demographic variables (age, ethnicity, training, employment type, and rank) along with the constructs of job satisfaction, job performance, and self-leadership including the three dimensions (behavior-focused strategies, constructive thought pattern strategies, and natural reward strategies) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2018). An analysis of histograms and scatterplot charts on all HLR models indicate that the assumptions of multivariate normality and linearity were met (Pallant, 2013). Given that no pattern was found after examining a residual scatterplot, the assumption of homogeneity was met (Pallant, 2013). This indicates that the assumption of equal variances has been met across samples.

Four two-stage hierarchical linear regressions were conducted to test the hypotheses in this study.

Hypothesis 1: Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment, and rank, a

relationship exists between the global score on self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education.

Hypothesis 2: Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment, and rank, a relationship exists between the presence of behavior-focused strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education.

Hypothesis 3: Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment, and rank, a relationship exists between the presence of natural reward strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education.

Hypothesis 4: Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment, and rank, a relationship exists between the presence of constructive thought pattern strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education.

In regressions 1 and 2, while controlling for demographic variables, global self-leadership is entered at stage two to determine its relationship to job satisfaction and job performance, respectively. In regressions 3 and 4, while controlling for demographic variables, the three dimensions of self-leadership are entered at stage two to determine the relationship of each to the constructs of job satisfaction and job performance.

Hierarchical Linear Regression 1

The first hierarchical regression analyzed age, ethnicity, training, employment type, and rank as these predicted job satisfaction scores to control for demographic variables. Results indicated that demographic variables did not significantly predict job satisfaction, $F(5, 126) =$

1.04, $p = .400$, $R^2 = .039$. See Table 6 for β values and partial correlations. The second model added global self-leadership after controlling for demographic variables. Global self-leadership was not found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction, $\Delta F(1,125) = .098$, $p = .754$, $\Delta R^2 = .001$. The global self-leadership accounted for less than .001 variance in the model.

Table 6

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Global Self-leadership Predicting Job Satisfaction

Variable	β	*t*	pr^2	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1				.039	.039
Age	.08	.80	.01		
Ethnicity	-.12	-1.29	.01		
Training	-.04	-.41	.001		
Employment Type	-.12	-1.30	.01		
Rank	-.12	-1.25	.01		
Model 2				.04	.001
Age	.08	.82	.01		
Ethnicity	-.12	-1.31	.01		
Training	-.04	-.37	.00		
Employment Type	-.12	-1.32	.01		
Rank	-.11	-1.20	.01		
Global Self-leadership	.03	.314	.00		

Note. $N = 131$; $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$, $***p < .001$

Hierarchical Linear Regression 2

The second hierarchical regression analyzed age, ethnicity, training, employment type, and rank as these predicted job performance scores to control for demographic variables. Results indicated that demographic variables did not significantly predict job performance, $F(5,95) = 2.15$, $p = .066$, $R^2 = .10$. See Table 7 for β values and partial correlations. The second model added global self-leadership after controlling for demographic variables. Global self-leadership was a significant predictor of job performance, $\Delta F(1,94) = 16.85$, $p < .001$, $\Delta R^2 = .14$. The relationship between global self-leadership and job performance was significant and positive, β =

.39, $t(94) = 4.10$, $p < .001$, $pr^2 = .152$. Self-reported job performance scores increased as global self-leadership scores increased.

Table 7

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Global Self-leadership Predicting Job Performance

Variable	β	*t*	pr^2	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1				.10	.10
Age	.27	2.56*	.06		
Ethnicity	.04	.39	.002		
Training	.04	.42	.002		
Employment Type	.12	1.21	.02		
Rank	.09	.83	.007		
Model 2				.24	.14
Age	.29	2.98	.09		
Ethnicity	.03	.34	.00		
Training	.10	.98	.01		
Employment Type	.06	.57	.00		
Rank	.13	1.36	.02		
Global Self-leadership	.39	4.10***	.15		

Note. $N = 100$; *$p < .05$, **p < .01, ***$p < .001$.

Hierarchical Linear Regression 3

While controlling for age, ethnicity, training, employment type, and rank, the third hierarchical regression analyzed the interrelationship between behavior-focused strategies (BFS), natural reward strategies (NRS), and constructive thought pattern strategies (CTPS) and self-reported job satisfaction scores. As previously reported in the first regression, results indicated that demographic variables did not significantly predict job satisfaction, $F(5,126) = 1.04$, $p = .400$, $R^2 = .04$. Age, ethnicity, training, employment type and rank did not account for significant variance in job satisfaction. See Table 8 for β values and partial correlations. The second model added the self-leadership dimensions of behavior-focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought pattern strategies while controlling for demographic variables and was shown to be significant, $\Delta F(3,123) = 4.87$, $p = .003$, $\Delta R^2 = .102$. The

relationship between scores on the behavior-focused strategies dimension and job satisfaction was not significant, β = -.149, $t(123) = -1.29$, $p = .198$, $pr^2 = .039$. Additionally, the relationship between scores on the constructive thought pattern strategies dimension and job satisfaction was not significant, β = -.081, $t(123) = -0.70$, $p = .483$, $pr^2 = .004$. The dimensions of behavior-focused and constructive thought pattern strategies did not account for significant variance in job satisfaction. However, the relationship between scores on the natural reward strategies dimension and job satisfaction was found to be significant, β = .365, $t(123) = 3.76$, $p < .001$, $pr^2 = .103$. The dimension of natural reward strategies accounted for 10 percent of the variance in job satisfaction. Self-reported job satisfaction scores increased as natural reward strategies scores increased.

Table 8

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for the Dimensions of Self-leadership Predicting Job Satisfaction

Variable	β	*t*	pr^2	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1				.039	.039
Age	.08	.80	.00		
Ethnicity	-.12	-1.29	.01		
Training	-.04	-.41	.00		
Employment Type	-.12	-1.30	.01		
Rank	-.12	-1.25	.01		
Model 2				.14	.102
Age	.05	.52	.002		
Ethnicity	-.13	-1.54	.02		
Training	-.05	-.55	.003		
Employment Type	-.14	-1.60	.02		
Rank	-.16	-1.69	.023		
BFS	-.15	-1.29	.013		
NRS	.37	3.76***	.10		
CTPS	-.08	-.70	.003		

Note. $N = 131$; *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Hierarchical Linear Regression 4

While controlling for age, ethnicity, training, employment type, and rank, the fourth hierarchical regression analyzed the interrelationship between the three dimensions of self-leadership and self-reported job performance scores. As previously reported in the second regression, results indicated that demographic variables did not significantly predict job performance, $F(5, 95) = 2.15$, $p = .066$, $R^2 = .10$. See Table 9 for β values and partial correlations. The second model added the self-leadership dimensions of behavior-focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought pattern strategies while controlling for demographic variables and was shown to be significant, $\Delta F(3,92) = 6.84$, $p < .001$, $\Delta R^2 = .164$. The relationship between scores on the behavior-focused strategies dimension and job performance was not significant, $\beta = .17$, $t(92) = 1.32$, $p = .189$, $pr^2 = .019$. The dimension of behavior-focused strategies accounted for 1.90 percent of the variance in job satisfaction. The relationship between scores on the constructive thought pattern strategies dimension and job performance was not significant, $\beta = .09$, $t(92) = .762$, $p = .448$, $pr^2 = .006$. The dimension of constructive thought pattern strategies accounted for .60 percent of the variance in job satisfaction. The relationship between scores on the natural reward strategies dimension and job performance was significant, $\beta = .26$, $t(92) = 2.54$, $p = .013$, $pr^2 = .065$. The dimension of natural reward strategies accounted for 6.50 percent of the variance in job satisfaction. Self-reported job performance scores increased as natural reward strategies scores increased.

Table 9

Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analysis for the Dimensions Self-leadership Predicting Job Performance

Variable	β	*t*	pr^2	R^2	ΔR^2
Model 1				.10	.10
Age	.27	2.56	.06		
Ethnicity	.04	.39	.002		
Training	.04	.42	.002		
Employment Type	.12	1.21	.02		
Rank	.09	.83	.007		
Model 2				.27	.16
Age	.29	2.87**	.08		
Ethnicity	.03	.30	.00		
Training	.08	.77	.006		
Employment Type	.05	.51	.003		
Rank	.13	1.29	.018		
BFS	.17	1.32	.018		
NRS	.26	2.54*	.065		
CTPS	.09	.76	.006		

Note. $N = 100$; $*p < .05$, **p < .01, $***p < .001$.

Summary

Based on the hierarchical regression models, self-reported job performance scores increased as global self-leadership scores increased which indicates that online instructors who practice self-leadership behaviors perform better on the job. The analyses also reveal that the natural reward strategies dimension of self-leadership have a predictive effect on the self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors in higher education. As the scores of the natural reward strategies dimension increase, the scores on self-reported job performance and job satisfaction also increase.

According to Houghton and Neck (2002), the natural reward strategies dimension of self-leadership focuses on creating feelings of competence and self-determination, which results

in performance-enhancing task-related behaviors. The following prompts from the Revised Self-leadership Questionnaire inform the natural reward strategies dimension of self-leadership:

- *I focus my thinking on the pleasant rather than the unpleasant aspects of my job (school) activities.*
- *I try to surround myself with objects and people that bring out my desirable behaviors*
- *When I have a choice, I try to do my work in ways that I enjoy rather than just trying to get it over with.*
- *I seek out activities in my work that I enjoy doing.*
- *I find my own favorite ways to get things done.*

Tasks become naturally rewarding when the more pleasant and enjoyable features are built into a job. Additionally, perceptions may be shaped by redirecting attention away from unpleasant aspects of a task and refocusing that energy on the task's inherently rewarding aspects (Manz & Neck, 2004). Based on the results of this study, as the presence of natural reward strategies increase, so do the measures of the job satisfaction and job performance of online instructors.

Chapter 5

Conclusion

The growth and rapid expansion of online learning and its importance to postsecondary institutions makes it imperative that colleges and universities provide quality online programs as well as faculty training and support in order to ensure the delivery of quality online education (Kim & Bonk, 2006). Self-leadership behaviors and practices can be influenced through training which, in turn, improves job performance and job satisfaction (Boss & Simms, 2008; Frayne & Geringer, 2000; Neck & Manz, 1996). According to DiLello & Houghton (2006), personnel managers are encouraged to facilitate the practice of self-leadership in organizations in order to build work environments that support creativity and innovation.

The purpose of this study was to quantify the interrelationship between self-leadership behaviors and practices and the self-reported levels of job satisfaction and job performance of online instructors. This research intends to understand the extent to which self-leadership itself, as well as the individual dimensions of self-leadership predict performance and satisfaction levels for these higher education employees. The following research questions were addressed:

- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the global score on self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?
- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the presence of behavior-focused strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?

- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the presence of natural reward strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?
- Controlling for the effects of age, race, training, employment type, and rank, does a relationship exist between the presence of constructive thought pattern strategies of self-leadership and self-reported levels of job performance and job satisfaction for online instructors in higher education?

Summary of findings

The results of this study indicated that, while controlling for age, ethnicity, training, employment type and rank, global self-leadership predicts the self-reported job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors in higher education. Online instructors that are more engaged in the practice of self-leadership behaviors perform better on the job and experience greater levels of job satisfaction. Houghton and Neck (2002) interpret self-leadership across three dimensions: behavior-focused strategies, natural reward strategies, and constructive thought pattern strategies. Hierarchical linear regression was used to explore the interrelationship of each of these dimensions and the constructs of self-reported job performance and job satisfaction. These analyses revealed that the natural reward strategies dimension of self-leadership is predictive of both job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors while other dimensions of self-leadership - behavior-focused strategies and constructive thought pattern strategies - are not. The demographic variables of age, ethnicity, training, employment type, and rank did not have a significant effect on the self-reported levels of job performance or job satisfaction of this employee group.

Discussion

Gibbons (2001) suggests that formal training for online instructors is essential to the successful design and delivery of an online course. Since this study establishes that self-leadership behaviors and practices are related to performance and satisfaction, the challenge for higher education leaders is to evaluate existing online instructor training programs to learn the role that self-leadership plays.

There is a growing body of evidence to show a positive relationship between self-leadership and work outcomes (Carmeli et al., 2006). The results of this study support this premise by indicating a significant relationship between global self-leadership and job performance with respect to online instructors in higher education. Specifically, the natural reward strategies dimension of self-leadership was identified as the most important dimension to this employee group. By increasing NRS scores, the level of self-reported job performance increases. Higher education institutions are challenged to identify ways to improve natural reward strategies in order to improve self-reported job performance. Because the literature suggests that people can be trained to adapt and enhance their self-leadership skills, and thereby improve work outcomes (Neck & Manz, 1996), it seems plausible that training programs aimed at improving these skills will result in improved job performance levels.

Individuals who possess attributes such as autonomy and self-efficacy are more likely to practice self-leadership strategies (Norris, 2008). Organizations, including institutions and systems of higher education, may find value in having individual members regulate their own actions. According to Houghton and Neck (2002), self-leading employees have more fulfilling careers along with a more productive and positive impact at work.

Neck & Houghton (2006) report that behavior-focused strategies are concentrated on the management of behaviors such as self-observation, self-goal setting, self-rewards, self-punishment, and self-cueing. The BFS dimension of self-leadership was not found to be a significant predictor of self-reported job performance or job satisfaction in this study of online instructors. This may be due to the lack of identification by survey participants. Five prompts on the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire focus on self-goal setting. Goals vary in scope. Some are large such as earning a promotion and others are small such as submitting a form by a deadline. It is plausible that online instructors may have considered only goals of a certain scope when responding to survey questions about this aspect of the BFS dimension. Writing down a specific goal creates a tangible record of the practice. During the reflective exercise of completing a survey, individuals can easily recall whether or not they write down the goals they identify for themselves. Conversely, the presence of self-goal setting activities may not be as easily identified. For example, goals may be established subconsciously or indirectly without the process of a self-goal setting act such as a written or mental note. Participants in this study may have failed to identify certain goals because they are perceived as goals that are less important in scope. Instructors may not set goals for routine tasks such as grading term papers or facilitating an effective online discussion.

The constructive thought pattern strategies of self-leadership focus on habitual ways of thinking that can positively impact performance (Manz & Neck, 2004; Neck & Manz, 1992). Four prompts on the RSLQ address the ways that employees evaluate beliefs and assumptions about their jobs. Online instructors typically hold one or more graduate degrees and are generally expected to stay informed on developments in their various disciplines of expertise as a condition of employment. It is plausible that this employee group evaluates their own beliefs and

assumptions as they perform work-related tasks. In addition to teaching responsibilities, higher education faculty members often conduct academic research. As such, these individuals rely heavily on what is known as they investigate the unknown. Faculty may find themselves evaluating their own beliefs and assumptions as they consider responses to questions from students and peers or when conducting research.

The RSLQ includes five items that address the visualization of successful performance. Visualization may be a less effective self-leadership technique for online instructors. Individuals may be more inclined to engage in visualization behaviors depending on the nature of a task. For example, those working in a creative field or vocational trade may visualize a finished product prior to engaging in the work that produces the end result. Prior to prescribing treatment, a physician may visualize an x-ray revealing the absence of a tumor. Conversely, a physician may have greater difficulty visualizing the outcome for a patient that is being treated for anxiety, for example. While a medical condition exists in each of these examples, for purposes of visualization behaviors, the absence of a tumor on an x-ray may be more mentally accessible than a measure of reduced anxiety. Those working in fields with philosophical or abstract elements may have more difficulty visualizing outcomes. Learning experiences may not yield a tangible result that online instructors may easily visualize prior to task engagement. This may attribute to lower self-leadership scores in the CPTS dimension for online instructors.

Herzberg's Motivator Hygiene Theory was referenced in this study to provide a framework for understanding job satisfaction. The three general philosophies of personnel management, also known in the literature as the "Eternal Triangle," are organizational theory, industrial engineering and behavioral science. Favorable job attitudes and efficient job structures emerge when jobs are organized in a proper manner (Herzberg, 2003). Industrial engineers

suggest that humans are mechanistically oriented and economically motivated which suggests that operational efficiency may be improved with the development and implementation of incentive systems and favorable working conditions (Herzberg, 2003). "Behavioral scientists focus on group sentiments, attitudes of individual employees, and the organization's social and psychological climate" (Herzberg, 2003, p. 7). The natural reward strategies dimension of self-leadership is closely related to the philosophies of the Eternal Triangle. Online instructors that focus on the pleasant rather than the unpleasant aspects of the work are more attuned to this dimension. Tasks that are designed to be naturally rewarding for online instructors will lead to increased levels of job performance and job satisfaction. Online instructors who have the autonomy to incorporate enjoyable features into the job and to perform work in ways they find enjoyable are more likely to be satisfied employees that achieve defined objectives.

To improve satisfaction and performance of online instructors, employee perceptions should be shifted away from the unpleasant aspects of the job, and toward more rewarding tasks. Herzberg's Motivator Hygiene Theory suggests that the work itself be enriched or adapted so that personnel are effectively utilized. Personnel managers in higher education may consider improving existing training and development initiatives by establishing clearly defined organizational objectives, increasing autonomy while decreasing the structural rigidity that often exists in online instruction. Buitendach and DeWitte (2005) suggest that employees are more satisfied when they feel that their abilities, values and experiences are adequately used to achieve organizational objectives. It may be recommended that education personnel managers equip online instructors with the autonomy and flexibility to replace modular course designs with options that offer a greater number of customizable features or to perform the work in a way that brings out desirable employee behaviors.

Campbell's Theory of Performance was used to provide the theoretical framework for the job performance construct. The model points to three key determinants of performance: declarative knowledge; procedural knowledge and skill; and motivation (Campbell, 1990). Using Bailee's (2015) protocols of presence and engagement, communication, and timeliness and responsiveness, the Job Performance Survey contains items to address each of Campbell's determinants. For example, online instructors are evaluated on the timeliness of responses to emails and phone calls. Teachers that are regularly visible in the online classroom and extend discussion threads in a way that deepens students' critical thinking skills are considered to be more effective and higher performers. Procedural knowledge and skills such as incorporating voice and video technology in the online classroom is a key element to communication in today's distance learning environment.

Because global self-leadership behaviors and practices are found to predict job performance in the online instructor employee group, one may conclude that, in this instance, increases in global self-leadership, and particularly the dimensions of NRS and the self-observation aspects of BFS, would provide theoretical support Campbell's determinants of performance. The opportunity for an employee to choose the more enjoyable rather than the less enjoyable aspects of a task has been shown to increase job performance scores. The self-observation factor of the BFS dimension focuses on tracking progress and the awareness of work-related performance. The performance determinants of knowledge, skill, and motivation may be complemented by increases in self-leadership behaviors and practices.

Moore's Transactional Distance Theory provided the framework for understanding online education. In this theory, the *distance* in distance education is not physical or spatial, but transactional referring to the space of potential misunderstanding that exists in the online

learning environment between the learner and the instructor. In this study, the Job Performance Survey includes items that focus on understanding how well online instructors achieve the responsibilities of this employment role. It may be concluded that the transactional distance is reduced when online instructors are routinely visible in the online classroom or when discussions are extended beyond an initial exchange to further enrich the class experience.

Limitations

One limitation to this study is sample size. A larger sample may provide a broader representation and a more robust data set. A greater number of participants completed the Revised Self-leadership Survey than completed the Job Satisfaction Survey. Even fewer finished the Job Performance Survey. Another limitation of this study is the reliance on self-reported data, particularly with respect to questions about job performance. Participants were asked to measure how well they perform certain tasks. An online instructor's self-evaluation may differ from that of a peer, a subordinate, a supervisor, or a third party, such as a student.

Demographics may also be a limitation because this sample may not provide a properly diversified representation of online instructors. Eighty-seven percent of the respondents reported teaching at a four-year institution. Perhaps, a study that provides more data about online instructors at two-year institutions may help to better understand the overall online instructor segment. Also, only 17 percent reported their employee rank as "instructor." Given the current landscape of higher education institutions and the emphasis on online strategies, the number of adjunct professors or instructors that teach many online courses is considerable. A greater representation of this teacher group may yield meaningful data to aid decision makers in implementing and managing strategic plans.

The Job Performance Scale used in this study derived from Maxson's (2017) research on essential online instructional behaviors as well as Bailie's (2015) work on identifying online instructional behaviors that online students and online instructors feel are important. Because the Job Performance Survey has not been empirically validated, more research should be performed using this instrument in order to better understand its functionality and usefulness. Reliability is a concern in self-reported job performance measures. For future studies, it may be prudent to combine supervisor evaluations and student evaluations along with self-reported measures to produce a composite score for job performance of online instructors.

Excluding a portion of the survey designed to collect demographic and job-related data, self-reported Likert-type scales were used for all instruments in this study. Perhaps, more may be learned by examining other methods for measuring these variables, such as observer-rated performances. Future studies may also consider the different types of online delivery modes, such as synchronous, hybrid, and adaptive learning, as each of these may require instructors to possess unique skills.

Finally, the survey length can affect response rates. Participants may become disengaged with a lengthy or complex survey instrument and fail to provide responses to all of the items. In this study, the three instruments along with a bank of survey questions aimed at gathering demographic and job-related data totaled 105 questions. Separating the constructs of job performance and job satisfaction into two separate surveys would reduce the number of overall survey questions and limit the time necessary to complete the survey. Despite its relatively strong psychometric properties, the effectiveness of the Revised Self-leadership Questionnaire is likely impacted by its length (Houghton, Dawley & DiLello, 2012). Replacing the 35-item RSLQ with the nine-item Abbreviated Self-leadership Questionnaire (ASLQ) could provide the

researcher with valuable self-leadership data, albeit a less comprehensive set that, according to Houghton, Dawley and DiLello (2012), does not directly measure the natural rewards dimension of self-leadership – the dimension determined to be most predictive in this study.

Recommendations for Practice

Three groups of higher education stakeholders would benefit from the application of the findings of this study: higher education personnel managers, online instructors in higher education and students. The parameters and findings of this study suggest that additional research is needed. The importance of online education to the long-term strategies of higher education institutions is well documented. Higher education leaders should allocate adequate resources to allow personnel managers to prioritize training and development programs for online instructors. Identifying the importance of self-leadership behaviors and practices and then adapting existing training exercises or introducing new initiatives to cover self-leadership development would support the larger institutional objective of improving education for all stakeholders.

Recommendations for Future Research

The research in this study focused on the interrelationship between self-leadership and self-reported job performance and job satisfaction of online instructors. Expanding the scope of this study to include online instructors from a larger number of institutions may provide new perspectives and additional insights. A broader representation of institution types should also be included to determine if the findings are unique or more global. While the results of this study did not reveal a significant relationship between the age, ethnicity, training, employment type or rank and the constructs of job performance and job satisfaction, a larger sample may provide a better understanding of these relationships.

Future research should be aimed at understanding what types of training and development programs exist for online instructors. It is important to consider how personnel managers in higher education measure the effectiveness of training and development programs and to what extent self-leadership is covered. What objectives are expected to be met through training and development? How often are online instructors required to participate in these programs and what does the training involve? Answers to these questions may provide a guide for higher education managers wishing to identify ways to improve the job satisfaction and job performance of online instructors by supplementing effective training programs with self-leadership training.

Final Thought

The establishment, maintenance and expansion of online education is expected to be remain a key strategy of college and university administrations for the foreseeable future. As higher education decision makers evaluate their organizational strategies for facilitating online instruction, it is important to understand how the collective online teaching experience may differ from that of traditional face-to-face delivery methods. As higher education evolves, associated theories and concepts should be reevaluated periodically to ensure continued validity. Understanding how self-leadership plays a role in the satisfaction and performance of online instructors can lead to innovations in educator training, advancements in program development, and potentially, improvements in learning experiences.

References

Allen, E. I., & Seaman, J. (2013). *Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States.* Babson Survey Research Group Report. Retrieved February 11, 2018 from http://www. onlinelearningsurvey. com/reports/changingcourse. pdf

Allen, E. I., & Seaman, J. (2016). *Online report card. Tracking online education in the United States.* Babson Survey Research Group. Retrieved February 11, 2018 from https://files. eric. ed. gov/fulltext/ED572777. pdf

Almala, A. H. (2007). Preview of current issues in quality e-learning environments. *Distance Learning*, *4*(3), 23-30.

Almeda, M. B., & Rose, K. (2000). Instructor satisfaction in University of California Extension's on-line writing curriculum. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 4*(3), 180−195 Retrieved February 20, 2018, from http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.mtsu.edu/ps/i.do?p=AONE&u=tel_middleten&id=GALE|A284451511&v=2.1&it=r&sid=ebsco&authCount=1

Aluko, R. F., Hendrikz, J. & Fraser, W. J. (2011). Transactional distance theory and total quality management in open and distance learning. *Africa Education Review, 8* (1), 115-132, DOI: 10. 1080/18146627. 2011. 586155

Alves, J. C., Lovelace, K. J., Manz, C. C., Matsypura, D., Toyasaki, F., & Ke, K. (2006). A cross cultural perspective of self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *21*, 338-359.

Anderson, T. (2008). Teaching in an online learning context. In T. Anderson (Ed.) *Theory and practice of online learning* (2nd ed.), 343-361.

Anderson, J. S., & Prussia, G. E. (1997). The self-leadership questionnaire: Preliminary assessment of construct validity. *The Journal of Leadership Studies*, *4*, 119-143.

Appana, S. (2008). A review of benefits and limitations of online learning in the context of the student, the instructor, and the tenured faculty. *International Journal on E-Learning, 7*(1), 5-22.

Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1971). Criteria for assessing the formal properties of theories of instruction. In R. Hyman (Ed.), *Contemporary thought on teaching* (p. 123). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bailie, J. L. (2015). Online graduate instruction: What faculty consider reasonable in relation to what students expect. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching, 11*(1). 42-54.

Bair, D. E. and Bair, M. A. (2011). Paradoxes of online teaching. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5(2), 1-17. Retrieved February 16 from https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/ij-sotl/vol5/iss2/10/

Bakotić, D. (2016). Relationship between job satisfaction and organizational performance. *Economic Research 29*(1), 118-130. Doi: 10.1080/1331677X.2016.1163946

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review 84*(2), 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Baran, E. & Correia, A.-P., (2014). A professional development framework for online teaching. *TechTrends 58*(5), 96-102.

Baran, E., Correia, A. –P., & Thompson, A. (2013). Tracing successful online teaching in higher education; Voices of exemplary online teacher. Teachers College Record 115(3), 1-16.

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders*. New York: Harper & Row.

Benson, R. & Samarawickrema, G. (2009). Addressing the context of e-learning: Using transactional distance theory to inform design. *Distance Education, 30* (1), 5-21. DOI: 10. 1080/01587910902845972

Berge, Z. (1995). The role of the online instructor/facilitator. Educational Technology, 35(1), 22–30.

Betts, K. S. (1998). An institutional overview: Factors influencing faculty participation in distance education in postsecondary education in the United States: An institutional study. *Online Journal of Distance learning Administration, 1*(3). Retrieved on February 3, 2018 from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/betts13.html

Blanchard, K. (1995). Points of power can help self-leadership. *Manage 46*(3).

Bligh, M. C., Pearce, C. L., & Kohles, J. C. (2006). The importance of self- and shared leadership in team based knowledge work. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 296-318.

Bolliger, D. U., & Wasilik, O. (2009) Factors influencing faculty satisfaction with online teaching and learning in higher education, *Distance Education, 30* (1), 103-116.

Boss, A. D., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2008). Everyone fails! Using emotion regulation and self-leadership for recovery. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *23*,135-150.

Boyd, R. & J. Apps, (eds.) (1980). Redefining the Discipline of Adult Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Brayfield, A. H., & Crockett, W. H. (1955) Employee attitudes and employee performance. *Psychological Bulletin, 52*, 396–424.

Brown, R. T., & Fields, D. (2011). Leaders engaged in self-leadership: Can followers tell the difference*? Leadership, 7*(3), 275-293.

Buitendach, J. H., DeWitte, H. (2005). Job insecurity, extrinsic and intrinsic job satisfaction and effective organizational commitment of maintenance workers in a parastala. *South African Journal of Business Management, 36*(2), 27-37.

Burns, M. (2013). Success, failure or no significant difference: Charting a course for successful educational technology integration. *International Journal of Emerging Technologies in Learning, 8*(1), 38-45.

Cabrita, J., & Perista, H. (2006). *Measuring job satisfaction in surveys – Comparative analytical report.* European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Accessed February 3, 2018 from https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/report/2006/measuring-job-satisfaction-in-surveys-comparative-analytical-report

Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organization psychology. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press,

Campbell, J. P. (2012). Behavior, performance, and effectiveness in the 21st century. In S. W. J. Kozlowski (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology (pp. 159– 195). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carmeli, A., Meitar, R., & Weisberg, J. (2006). Self-leadership skills and innovative behavior at

work. *International Journal of Manpower, 27,* 75-90.Cashman, K. (1995). Mastery from the inside out. *Executive Excellence 12*(12).

Carver, C. S. & Scheier, M. F. (1981). *Attention and self-regulation: A control-theory approach to human behavior.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Chase, R. B. (1978). Where does the customer fit in a service operation? *Harvard Business Review 56*(6), 137-142.

Chen, S. (2011). A performance matrix for strategies to improve satisfaction among faculty members in higher education. *Quality & Quantity 45*(1), 75-89.

Chen, Y. (2001). Dimensions of transactional distance in the world wide web learning environment: a factor analysis. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 32* (4). 459-470.

Chi, G., & Voss, P. R. (2005). Migration decision-making: A hierarchical regression approach. *Journal of Regional Analysis and Policy, 35*(2), 11–22.

Comm, C. L. & Mathaisel, D. F. X. (2000). Assessing employee satisfaction in service firms: An example in higher education. *Journal of Business Economic Studies 6*, 43-53.

Conceicão, S. (2006). Faculty lived experiences in the online environment. *Adult Education Quarterly, 57* (1), 26-45.

Crawford-Ferre, H. G. & Wiest, L. R. (2012). Effective online instruction in higher education. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 13*(1), 11-14.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design; Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Darrington, A. (2008). Six lessons in e-learning: Strategies and support for teachers new to online environments. *Teaching English in the Two Year College, 35*(4), 416-421.

Dawson, B. (2005). Motivation leaders to better results. *Journal of Rubber and Plastics*, *37*, 11-15.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* New York: Collier MacMillan.

Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. (1985). The support of autonomy and control of behavior, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*. 1024-37.

Deci, E. L., Connell, J. P. & Ryan, R. M. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 580-590.

De Vaus, D. (2013). *Surveys in social research*. New York: Routledge.

DiLiello, T. C., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Maximizing organizational leadership capacity for the future: Toward a model of self-leadership, innovation and creativity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 319-337.

Dimeo, J. (2017). Marketing strategies in overdrive: Colleges and universities employ a variety of tactics – increasingly digital as well as more unusual approaches – to attract online students. *Inside Higher Education*. Retrieved February 1, 2018 from https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2017/10/04/how-colleges-market-online-courses-and-programs

Dunnette, M. D., Campbell, J. P., & Hakel, M.D. (1967). Factors contributing to job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in six occupational groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, *2*, 143-174.

Dykman, C. A & Davis, C. K. (2008). Online education forum: Part two-teaching online versus conventionally. *Journal of Information Systems Education, 19*(2), 157-164.

Etikan, I. Musa, S. A., Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1-4.

Evans, R., & Champion, I. (2007). Enhancing online delivery beyond PowerPoint. *The Community College Enterprise, 13*(2), 75-84.

Falloon, G. (2011). Making the connection. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *43*(3), 187-209, DOI: 10. 1080/15391523. 2011. 10782569

Fish, W. W., & Wickersham, L. E. (2009). Best practices for online instructors. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 10*(3), 279-284.

Frayne, C. A., & Geringer, J. M. (2000). Self-management training for improving job performance: A field experiment involving salespeople. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 361-372.

Frenkel, M. T., Schechtman, J. L. and Koenigs, R. J. (2006). Too much of a good thing? Values in leadership for educational organizations. *International Journal of Educational Management, 20*(7). 520-528.

Furtner, M. R., Sachse, P., & Exenberger, S. (2012). Learn to influence yourself: Full-range self-leadership training. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 38*(2), 294-304.

Gaff, J. G. (1975). *Toward faculty renewal: Advances in faculty, instructional and organizational development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Garrison, R. (2000). Theoretical challenges for distance education in the 21st century: A shift from structural to transactional issues. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 1*(1), 1-17.

Georgianna, S. (2007). Self-leadership: A cross-cultural perspective, *Journal of Managerial Psychology 22*(6), 569-589.

Gibbons, H. S. (2001). Andrological and pedagogical training differences for online instructors.

Online Journal of Distance Education, 4(3), 1-5.

Giossos, Y., Koutsouba, M., Lionarakis, A., & Skavantzos, K. (2009). Reconsidering Moore's transactional distance theory. *European Journal of Open Distance and ELearning, 2009* (2), 1-6.

Godwin, J. L., Neck, C. P., Houghton, J. D. (1999). The impact of thought self-leadership on individual goal performance: A cognitive perspective. *Journal of Management Development, 18*, 153-169.

Goel, L, Zhang, P., & Templeton, M. (2012). Transactional distance revisited: Bridging face and empirical validity. *Computers in Education, 28*, 1122-1129.

Gokool-Ramdoo, S. (2008). Beyond the theoretical impasse: Extending the applications of transactional distance theory. *International Review of Research and Distance Learning*, 9 (3), 1-17.

Gomes, C., Curral, L., & Caetano, A. (2014). The mediating effect of work engagement on the relationship between self-leadership and individual innovation. *International Journal of Innovation Management, 19*(1). Retrieved from https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S1363919615500097

Goodwin, L. D. & Leech, N. L. (2006). Understanding correlation: Factors that affect the size of *r*. The Journal of Experimental Education, 74(3), 249-266.

Gorsky, P. & Caspi, A. (2005). A critical analysis of transactional distance theory. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 6* (1), 1-11.

Graf, D. L., Albright, M. J., & wheeler, D. W. (1992). Faculty development's role in improving undergraduate education. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 51*, 101-109.

Grow, G. O. (1991). Teaching learners to be self-directed. *Adult Education Quarterly, 41*(1),

125-149.

Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes, *A Review of the Gallup Studies, Flourishing, The Positive Person and the Good Life, Chapter 9*. In Keyes, C. L. M., & Haidt, J. (Ed). (pp. 205–224). American Psychological Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja 129 Association. http://www.nhsemployers.org/~/media/Employers/Documents/Retain%20and%20improve/Harter%20et%20al%202002%20WellbeingReview.pdf

Hartman, J., Dziuban, C., & Moskal, P. (2000). Faculty satisfaction in ALNs: A dependent or independent variable? Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 4(3), 155-179.

Herman, J. H. (2012). Faculty development programs: The frequency and variety of professional development programs available to online instructors. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 16*(5), 87-105.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. Cleveland: World Publishing.

Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, *46*(1), 53-62.

Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, January, 1-13.

Hillman, D. C. A., Wills, D. J. & Gunawardena, C. N. (1994). Learner-interface interaction in distance education: An extension of contemporary models and strategies for practitioners. The American Journal of Distance Education 8(2) 30-42.

Hislop, G. & Atwood, M. (2000). ALN teaching as routing faculty workload. Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 4(3), 216-230.

Holmberg, B. (1989). *Theory and Practice of Distance Education*. London: Routledge.

Houghton, J. D., Bonham, T. W., Neck, C. P., & Singh, K. (2004). The relationship between self-leadership and personality: A comparison of hierarchical factor structures. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 19*, 427-441.

Houghton, J. D., Dawley, D., & DiLello, T. C. (2012). The abbreviated self-leadership questionnaire (ASLQ): A more concise measure of self-leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 7*(2), 216-232.

Houghton, J. D., & Neck, C. P. (2002). The revised self-leadership questionnaire: Testing a hierarchical factor structure for self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *17*, 672 - 691.

Houghton, J. D., Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (2003). We think we can, we think we can, we think we can: The impact of thinking patterns and self-efficacy on work team sustainability. *Team Performance Management, 9*, 31-41.

Iaffaldano, M. T., & Muchinsky, P. M. (1985). Job satisfaction and job performance: A meta analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 97*, 251–273.

Jex, S. M., & Britt, T. W. (2008). Organizational psychology: A scientist-practitioner approach. 2nd ed. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Bono, J. E., & Patton, G. K. (2001). The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 127* (3). 376-407.

Jung, I. (2001). Building a theoretical framework of web-based instruction in the context of distance education. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 32*(5), 1-18.

Kang, H. & Gyorke, A. S. (2008) Rethinking distance learning activities: A comparison of

transactional distance theory and activity theory. *Open Learning, 23* (3), 203-214.

Katouzian, M. A. (1970). The development of the service sector: A new approach. *Oxford Economic Papers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kayode, C. V. E. & Teng, T. (2014). The impact of transactional distance dialogic interactions on student learning outcomes in online and blended environments. *Computers in Education, 78*, 414-427.

Kearsley, G. (2010). Online teaching: State of the art. *Contemporary Educational Technology, 1*(1), 1-4.

Keegan, D. (2005). *Theoretical principles of distance education*. Routledge: New York.

Kim, K. J. & Bonk, C. J. (2006). The future of online teaching and learning in higher education: The survey says… *Educause Quarterly, 4*, 22-30.

King, E., & Alpertstein, N. (2015). *Best practices in online program development: Teaching and learning in higher education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Ko, S., & Rossen, S. (2010). *Teaching online: A practical guide* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kozlowski (Ed.), The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology (pp. 159– 195). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Krebitchi, M., Lipschuetz, A. & Santiague, L. (2017). Issues and challenges or teaching successful online courses in higher education: A Literature review. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 46*(1), 4-29.

Li, C. S., & Irby, B. (2008). An overview of online education: Attractiveness, benefits, challenges, concerns and recommendations. *College Student Journal, 42*, 442-458.

Liu, X., Magjuka, R. J. , Bonk, C. J. , & Lee, S. (2007). Does sense of community matter? An

examination of participants' perceptions of building learning communities in online courses. *Quarterly Review of Distance Education, 8*(1), 9-24.

Locke, J. (1979). *An essay concerning human understanding*. P. Nidditch (Ed). Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Lowe, W. (2000). Transactional distance theory as a foundation for developing innovative and reactive instruction. *Journal of Educational Technology & Society, 3* (1), 1-13.

Magnussen, L. (2008). Applying the principles of significant learning in the e-learning environment. *Journal of Nursing Education, 47*(2), 82-86.

Manz, C. C. (1983). *The art of self-leadership: Strategies for personal effectiveness in your life and work.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Manz, C. C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Review, 11*, 585-600.

Manz, C. C. (1992a). *Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Manz, C. C. (1992b). Self-leadership…The heart of empowerment. *The Journal for Quality and Participation, 15* (4), 80-89.

Manz, C. C., & Neck, C. P. (1999*). Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for personal excellence (Second edition).* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (1980). Self-management as a substitute for leadership: A social learning perspective. *Academy of Management Review, 5*, 361-367.

Manz, C. C., & Sims, H. P., Jr. (2001). *The new SuperLeadership: Leading others to lead themselves.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Manz, C. C., & Neck, C. P. (2004). *Mastering self-leadership: Empowering yourself for*

personal excellence (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Maslow, A. H. (1968). Some educational implications of the humanistic psychologies, *Harvard Educational Review, 38*(4).

Mason, R. & Kaye, A. (Eds.). (1989). *Mindweave: Communication, computers and distance education*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Maxson, C. (2017). Full-time and adjunct faculty priorities for online instructional behavior. *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, *20*(2). Retrieved October 18, 2017 from https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/summer202/maxson202.html

McCormick, M. & Martinko, M. (2004). Identifying leader social cognitions: Integrating the causal reasoning perspective into social cognitive theory. *Journal of Leadership and Organization Studies, 10,* 2-11.

McIllhatton, S., Johnson, N. & Holden, J. (1993). What can educational managers learn from private enterprise? *International Journal of Educational Management, 7*(1).

McInnerney, J. M., & Roberts, T. S. (2004). Online learning: Social interaction and the creation of a sense of community. *Educational Technology and Society*, *7*(3), 73-81.

Moore, M. G. (1972). Learner autonomy: The second dimension of independent learning. *Convergence*, *5*(2), 76-97.

Moore, M. G. (1973). Toward a theory of independent learning and teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education 44* (9). 661-679.

Moore, M. G. (1991). Editorial: Distance education theory. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 5*(3), 1 – 6

Moore, M. (1993). Theory of transactional distance. In D. Keegan (Ed.), *Theoretical Principles of Distance Education*, 22-38. London: Routledge.

Moore, M. G. (2013). Handbook of distance education. (3rd Ed.). New York: Routledge.

Moorman, R. H. (1993). The influence of cognitive and affective based job satisfaction measures on the relationship between satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Relations, 4*(6). 759-776.

Muijs, D., Harris, A., Lumby, J., Morrison, M. & Sood, K. (2006). Leadership and leadership development in highly effective further education providers. Is there a relationship? *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 30*(1), 87-106.

Murphy, K. L., & Cifuentes, L. (2001). Using Web tools, collaborating, and learning online. *Distance Education: An International Journal*, *22*(2), 285-305.

Near, J. P., Rice, R. W., & Hunt, R. G. (1980). The relationship between work and nonwork domains: A review of empirical research. *Academy of Management Review, 5*, 415–429.

Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and research: Past developments, present trends, and future possibilities. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 270-295.

Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (1996a). Total leadership quality: Integrating employee self-leadership and total quality management. In S. Goush and D. Fedor (Eds.), *Advances in the Management of Organizational Quality*, *1*, pp. 39-77). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Neck, C. P., Neck, H. M., Manz, C. C., & Godwin, J. (1999). "I think I can; I think I can": A self-leadership perspective toward enhancing entrepreneurial thought patterns, self-efficacy, and performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 14*, 477-501.

Neck, C. P., Stewart, G., & Manz, C. C. (1995). Thought self-leadership as a framework for enhancing the performance of performance appraisers. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 31*, 278-302.

Norris, S. E. (2008). An examination of self-leadership. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, *1*(2). 43-61.

Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Online Learning Consortium. (2018). *Online Learning Consortium Annual Report 2017*. Retrieved from https://onlinelearningconsortium.org/about/2017-annual-report/

Ortiz-Rodriquez, M., Teig, R., Irani, T., Roberts, T. G., & Rhoades, E. (2005). College students' perceptions of quality in distance learning. *The Quarterly Review of Distance Education*, 6(2), 97-105.

Oshagbemi, T. (2013). *Job satisfaction in higher education*. London: Trafford Publishing.

Palloff, R. & Pratt, K. (2003). *The virtual student. A profile and guide to working with online learners.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS Survival Manual. A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS*, (5th ed). Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Parker, N. (2008). The quality dilemma in online education. In T. Anderson (Ed.) *Theory and practice of online learning* (2nd ed.), 343-361.

Parmer, C., & East, D. (1993). Job satisfaction among support staff in twelve Ohio academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries*, *54*, 43-57.

Peters, O. (1998). *Learning and teaching in distance education*. U. K: Kogan Page.

Phillips, D. C., & Burbules, N. C. (2000). *Postpositivism and educational research*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Prussia, G. E., Anderson, J. S., & Manz, C. C. (1998). Self-leadership and performance outcomes: The mediating influence of self-efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19*, 523-538.

Rain, J. S., Lane, I. M., & Steiner, D. D. (1991). A current look at the job satisfaction/life satisfaction relationship: review and future considerations. *Human Relations, 44*, 287–307.

Raudenbush, S.W. & Bryk, A.S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Reyes, J. A. (2013). Transactional distance theory: Is it here to stay? *Distance Learning, 10* (3), 43-50.

Rickets, K. G., Carter, H. S., Place, N. T., McCoy, T. (2012). A look inside: Self-leadership perceptions of extension educators. 50(5). 1-14. Rogers, C. (1969). *Freedom to learn.* Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Organizational Behavior, 9th ed*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Ruiz, J. G., Mintzer, M. J., & Leipzig, R. M. (2006). The impact of e-learning in medical education. *Academic Medicine, 81*, 207-212.

Rumble, G. (1986). *The planning and management of distance education*. London: Croom Helm.

Ryan, M., Carlton, K. H. , & Ali, N. S. (2004). Reflections on the role of faculty in distance learning and changing pedagogies. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 25*(2), 73-80.

Saba, F. (1988). Integrated telecommunications systems and instructional transaction. *The American Journal of Distance Education, 2*(3), 17-24.

Saba, F. (2003). Distance education theory, methodology, and epistemology: a pragmatic approach. In Moore, M. and Anderson, W. G. (Eds.). *Handbook of distance education*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Saba, F., & Shearer, R. (1994). Verifying key theoretical concepts in a dynamic model of distance education. *The American Journal of Distance Education* 8(1), 36–59.

Sauer, K., Canter, D., & Shanklin, C. (2010). Job satisfaction of dietitians with management responsibilities: An exploratory study supporting ADA's research priorities. *Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 110*, 1432.

Schubert-Irastorza, C. & Fabry, D. L. (2014). Job satisfaction, burnout and work engagement in higher education: A survey of research and best practices. *Journal of Research in Innovative Teaching, 7*(1). 37 - 50.

Schwab, D. P., & Cummings, L. L. (1970). Theories of performance and satisfaction: a review. *Industrial Relations, 9*, 408–430.

Semradora, I. & Hubackova, S. (2016). Teacher responsibility in distance education. *Social and Behavioral Science, 217*. 544-550.

Sharma, P. (2017). Organizational culture as a predictor of job satisfaction: The role of age and gender. *Management, 22*(1), 35-48.

Shattuck, J., Dubins, B. , & Zilberman, D. (2011). Maryland Online's inter-institutional project To train higher education adjunct faculty to teach online. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 12*(2), 40-61.

Shedletsky, L. J., & Aitken, J. E. (2001). The paradoxes of online academic work. *Communication Education, 50*(3), 206-217.

Shannon, D. M. (2002). Effective teacher behaviors and Michael Moore's theory of transactional distance. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science, 43* (1). 43-46.

Shin, N. (2003). Transactional presence as a critical predictor of success in distance learning. *Distance Education, 24* (1). 69-86. Doi: 10.1080/01587910303048.

Sierpe, E. (1999). Job satisfaction among librarians in English-language university in Québec. *Library and Information Science Research, 21*, 479-499.

Sims, H. P., Jr., & Manz, C. C. (1996). *Company of heroes: Unleashing the power of self-leadership.* New York: Wiley.

Smith, B. E., Jr. (2017). Retention of degree-seeking community college students based on age, enrollment intensity, and academic progress. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/1941457640?pq-origsite=gscholar

Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The Measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes*. Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the job satisfaction survey. *American Journal of Community Psuychology,13* (6). 693-713.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Spendlove, M. (2007). Competencies for effective leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *21*(5).407-417.Stein, D. S.,

Stirling, D. (1997). Toward the theory of distance education: Transactional distance. http://www. stirlinglaw. com/deborah/stir4. htm (Accessed February 3, 2018).

Stewart, G. L., Carson, K. P., & Cardy, R. L. (1996). The joint effects of conscientiousness and self-leadership training on self-directed behavior in a service setting. *Personnel Psychology, 49,* 143-164. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540710760183

Stodel, E., Thompson, T. L., & MacDonald, C. J. (2006). Learners' perspectives on what is missing from online learning. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning, 7*(3), 1-24.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2018). *Using multivariate statistics* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Tait, M., Padgett, M. Y., & Baldwin, T. T. (1989). Job and life satisfaction: a re-examination of

the strength of the relationship and gender effects as a function of the date of the study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74*, 502–507.

Tallent-Runnels, M. K., Thomas, J. A., Lan, W. Y., Cooper, S., Ahern, T. C., Shaw, S. M., & Liu, X. (2006). Teaching courses online: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research. 76* (1), 93-135.

Thompson, M. (2002). Practice: *Ongoing study/enhancement of faculty satisfaction*. Needham, MA: Sloan-C. Retrieved February 3, 2018 from http://www.sloan-c. org/effective/details4.asp?FS_ID=12

Thoresen, C. E. & Mohoney, M. J. (1974). *Behavioral self-control*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Tunks, K. W., (2012). An introduction and guide to enhancing online instruction with web 2.0 tools. *Journal of Educators Online, 9*(2). Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ985402

Voelck, J. (1995). Job satisfaction among support staff in Michigan academic libraries. *College & Research Libraries, 56*, 157-170.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). Work and motivation. New York: Wiley.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wanstreet, C. E., Calvin, J., Overtoom, C., & Wheaton, J. E. (2005). Bridging the transactional distance gap in online learning environments, *The American Journal of Distance Education, 19* (2), 105-118, DOI: 10. 1207/s15389286ajde1902_4.

Wasilik, O. & Bollinger, D. U. (2009). Faculty satisfaction in the online environment: An institutional study. *The Internet and Higher Education, 12*, 173-178.

Wenger, E., McDermott, R. & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Wheeler, S. (2007). The influence of communication technologies and approaches to study on transactional distance in blended learning. *ALT-J: Research in Learning Technology*, *15*(2), 103–117.

Wilson, J. H. (2011). Freedom at work: Psychological empowerment and self-leadership. *International Journal of Business & Public Administration, 8*(1), 106-124.

Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (2014). *Mass media research: An introduction* (10th ed.). Boston: Cengage Learning.

Winkler-Prins, A. M., Weisenborn, B. N., Group, R. E., & Arbogast, A. F. (2007). Developing online geography courses: Experiences from Michigan State University. *The Journal of Geography*, *106*(4), 163-170.

Witte, M. M., & Wolf, S. E. (2003). Infusing mentoring and technology within graduate courses: Reflections in practice. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 11*(1), 95–103.

Wittenberg, K. J., & Norcross, J. C. (2001). Practitioner perfectionism: Relationship to ambiguity tolerance and work satisfaction. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *57*, 1543-1550.

Woltman, H., Feldstain, A., MacKay, J. C., & Rocchi, M. (2012). An introduction to hierarchical linear modeling. *Tutorials in Quantitative Methods for Psychology, 8*(1), 52-69.

Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 84–94.

Yukl, G. (1981). *Leadership in organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, JR: Prentice-Hall.

Yun, S., Cox, J., Sims, H. P., Jr. (2006). The forgotten follower: A contingency model of leadership and follower self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 21*, 374-388.

Zhang, R. (2016). Video summary on research types, research designs, data collection instruments, and sampling. [Video File]. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/WY9j_t570LY

Zsohar, H. & Smith, J. A. (2008). Transition from the classroom to the web: Successful strategies for teaching online. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 29*(1), 23-28.

Appendix A

The Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire

INSTRUCTIONS: Read each of the following items carefully and try to decide how true the statement is in describing you.

Not at all Accurate	*Somewhat Accurate*	*A little Accurate*	*Mostly Accurate*	*Completely Accurate*
1	2	3	4	5

1. I use my imagination to picture myself performing well on important tasks.
2. I establish specific goals for my own performance.
3. Sometimes I find I'm talking to myself (out loud or in my head) to help me deal with difficult problems I face.
4. When I do an assignment especially well, I like to treat myself to some thing or activity I especially enjoy.
5. I think about my own beliefs and assumptions whenever I encounter a difficult situation.
6. I tend to get down on myself in my mind when I have performed poorly.
7. I make a point to keep track of how well I'm doing at work (school).
8. I focus my thinking on the pleasant rather than the unpleasant aspects of my job (school) activities.
9. I use written notes to remind myself of what I need to accomplish.
10. I visualize myself successfully performing a task before I do it.
11. I consciously have goals in mind for my work efforts.
12. Sometimes I talk to myself (out loud or in my head) to work through difficult situations.
13. When I do something well, I reward myself with a special event such as a good dinner, movie, shopping trip, etc.
14. I try to mentally evaluate the accuracy of my own beliefs about situations I am having problems with.
15. I tend to be tough on myself in my thinking when I have not done well on a task.
16. I usually am aware of how well I'm doing as I perform an activity.
17. I try to surround myself with objects and people that bring out my desirable behaviors.

18. I use concrete reminders (e.g., notes and lists) to help me focus on things I need to accomplish.
19. Sometimes I picture in my mind a successful performance before I actually do a task.
20. I work toward specific goals I have set for myself.
21. When I'm in difficult situations I will sometimes talk to myself (out loud or in my head) to help me get through it.
22. When I have successfully completed a task, I often reward myself with something I like.
23. I openly articulate and evaluate my own assumptions when I have a disagreement with someone else.
24. I feel guilt when I perform a task poorly.
25. I pay attention to how well I'm doing in my work.
26. When I have a choice, I try to do my work in ways that I enjoy rather than just trying to get it over with.
27. I purposefully visualize myself overcoming the challenges I face.
28. I think about the goals I that intend to achieve in the future.
29. I think about and evaluate the beliefs and assumptions I hold.
30. I sometimes openly express displeasure with myself when I have not done well.
31. I keep track of my progress on projects I'm working on.
32. I seek out activities in my work that I enjoy doing.
33. I often mentally rehearse the way I plan to deal with a challenge before I actually face the challenge.
34. I write specific goals for my own performance.
35. I find my own favorite ways to get things done.

Appendix B

	JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY Paul E. Spector Department of Psychology University of South Florida 	
	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
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7	I like the people I work with.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1 2 3 4 5 6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1 2 3 4 5 6
16	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
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1 2 3 4 5 6

	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
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1 2 3 4 5 6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1 2 3 4 5 6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1 2 3 4 5 6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1 2 3 4 5 6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1 2 3 4 5 6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1 2 3 4 5 6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1 2 3 4 5 6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1 2 3 4 5 6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1 2 3 4 5 6
30	I like my supervisor.	1 2 3 4 5 6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1 2 3 4 5 6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1 2 3 4 5 6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1 2 3 4 5 6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1 2 3 4 5 6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1 2 3 4 5 6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1 2 3 4 5 6

Job Satisfaction Survey, copyright Paul E. Spector, 1994, All rights reserved. October 8, 2001.

Appendix C

	JOB PERFORMANCE SURVEY PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT. As an online instructor...	Always Very Frequently Occasionally Rarely Very Rarely Never
1	I provide an orienting post at the beginning of each discussion period that provides guidelines on what is expected from students	1 2 3 4 5 6
2	I provide a summarizing post at the end of each discussion period.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3	I provide redirecting posts to guide student discussions toward the main themes.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4	I provide extending posts during each discussion period that deepens the students' critical engagement with course topics.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5	I return graded assignments within five days	1 2 3 4 5 6
6	I provide feedback to the student for each written assignment.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7	I respond to phone calls from students within 24 hours.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8	I respond to emails from students within 24 hours.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9	I post announcements and/or reminders to the class.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10	I provide supplemental resources to enhance students' understanding of the class material.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11	I am visible in the online classroom five out of seven days through forum posts or announcements.	1 2 3 4 5 6
12	My actions have a positive impact on students' learning outcomes	1 2 3 4 5 6
13	I am improving in my ability to effectively perform the tasks of my job	1 2 3 4 5 6
14	I provide students with a detailed syllabus that was created for an online course.	1 2 3 4 5 6
15	Students usually rate me favorably during course evaluations	1 2 3 4 5 6
16	I use voice to communicate with students and/or to deliver content	1 2 3 4 5 6
17	I use video to communicate with students and/or to deliver content	1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix D

DEMOGRAPHIC AND JOB RELATED INFORMATION

PLEASE SELECT THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.

Have you taught an online course?

Yes

No

What is your age?

18-24 years old

25-34 years old

35-44 years old

45-54 years old

55-64 years old

65-74 years old

75 years or older

In your own words, please specify your ethnicity.
[Box provided]

To which gender do you most identify?

Female

Male

Transgender Female

Transgender Male

Gender Variant/Non-Conforming

Not Listed (please type response) [Box provided]

Prefer Not to Answer

What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? *If currently enrolled, please identify the highest degree received.*

Bachelor's degree

Master's degree

Professional degree

Doctorate degree

As an instructor, I am currently employed…

Part-time

Full-time

As an instructor, I am currently employed…

At a two-year institution

At a four-year institution

Employment Rank: My employment rank is…

Instructor

Assistant Professor

Associate Professor

Professor

Other

The number of online courses that I have taught is…

1 to 3

4 to 6

7 to 9

More than 10

Appendix E

Text of Recruitment Email

Dear Participant,

My name is John Hall and I am a graduate student at the University of Memphis. For my doctoral dissertation, I am examining the self-leadership practices of online instructors. Because you are a higher education instructor, I am inviting you to participate in this research study by completing the survey available at the link below.

Your experience makes your perspectives particularly valuable to this study. Your responses to this survey may lead to improvements in the professional training and development initiatives that are available to online instructors. The brief survey will take about 10 minutes to complete. There is no compensation for responding nor is there any known risk. Please click the link below to go to the survey Web site (or copy and paste the link into your Internet browser).

Your participation in the survey is completely voluntary and all of your responses will be kept confidential. Participation is strictly voluntary and you may refuse to participate at any time. No personally identifiable information will be associated with your responses to any reports of these data. The Institutional Review Board at the University of Memphis has approved this study. Dr. Wendy Griswold is the acting research advisor. Should you have any comments or questions, please feel free to contact me at jrhall4@memphis.edu.

Thank you for taking the time to assist me.

Sincerely,

John Hall

Appendix F

Permission letter

January 31, 2017

John Hall
Assistant Manager, Parking & Transportation Services
Middle Tennessee State University
1403 East Main St.
Box 147
Murfreesboro, TN 37132

Dear Mr. Hall,

Thanks for your interest in self-leadership! Your research topic sounds very interesting and you are certainly welcome to use the Revised Self-Leadership Questionnaire (RSLQ) in your work. We ask only that you cite our work appropriately and share your results, especially any scale reliability data. I have attached a .pdf file containing a copy of the JMP article (Houghton & Neck, 2002) in which we published the RSLQ. I have also attached an MS Word documents containing the scale for your convenience.

As you will see from the paper, you can calculate a score for each of the SL strategy dimensions (behavior focused, natural reward and constructive thought) or an overall score for self-leadership. There's no magic scoring formula...you can just use the items the best way they fit within your research design. I usually just total all of the items when I want to get an overall score for self-leadership. But it's a large number...somewhere in the 70 to 140 range. You can also divide by the total number of items to convert the overall SL score back to a 5-point scale.

I have also attached a file containing an updated list of self-leadership references that may be helpful to you. Please let me know if you have any questions about the RSLQ or self-leadership in general. I wish you all the best with your research endeavors.

Kind regards,

Jeffery D. Houghton
Associate Professor of Management
West Virginia University
PO Box 6025 University Avenue
Morgantown, WV 26505-6025

Appendix G

Permission letter

From: Spector, Paul
Sent: Monday, November 27, 2017 1:38 PM
To: John R. Hall
Subject: RE: Job Satisfaction Survey

Dear John:

You have my permission to use the JSS in your research. You can find copies of the scale in the original English and several other languages, as well as details about the scale's development and norms, in the scales section of my website. I allow free use for noncommercial research and teaching purposes in return for sharing of results. This includes student theses and dissertations, as well as other student research projects. Copies of the scale can be reproduced in a thesis or dissertation as long as the copyright notice is included, "Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved." Results can be shared by providing an e-copy of a published or unpublished research report (e.g., a dissertation). You also have permission to translate the JSS into another language under the same conditions in addition to sharing a copy of the translation with me. Be sure to include the copyright statement, as well as credit the person who did the translation with the year.

Your study should be interesting. One of my former doctoral students supports himself by teaching online classes. He has told me many times that the worst day of live teaching is better than the best day of online teaching. He misses the human connection of the classroom. I guess you will see if that feeling is widespread.

Thank you for your interest in the JSS, and good luck with your research.

Best,

Paul Spector, Distinguished Professor
Department of Psychology
PCD 4118
University of South Florida
Tampa, FL 33620

Appendix H

Institutional Review board Approval Letter – University of Memphis

Institutional Review Board
Office of Sponsored Programs
University of Memphis
315 Admin Bldg
Memphis, TN 38152-3370

March 2, 2018

PI Name: John Hall
Co-Investigators:
Advisor and/or Co-PI: Wendy Griswold
Submission Type: Initial
Title: The Effects of Self-leadership Strategies on Job Satisfaction and Job Performance for Online Instructors
IRB ID **:** #PRO-FY2018-355
Exempt Approval: March 1, 2018

Approval of this project is given with the following obligations:

1. When the project is finished or terminated, a completion form must be submitted.

2. No change may be made in the approved protocol without prior board approval.

3. Exempt approval is considered to have no expiration date and no further review is necessary unless the protocol needs modification.

Thank you,
James P. Whelan, Ph.D.
Institutional Review Board Chair
The University of Memphis.