Are We Having Fun Yet? Exploring the Motivations of MPA and MPP Program Directors in the United States

Jerri Killian
Wright State University

Mary Wenning
Wright State University

ABSTRACT

The typical role of the graduate program director in higher education combines the responsibilities of both academic faculty and staff. This study uses survey data to investigate the motivations, expectations, and levels of satisfaction of Master of Public Administration and Master of Public Policy program directors in the United States. We explore the job characteristics that are primary motivators and look at what characteristics program directors expect and assign importance to. We also glean estimates of job satisfaction from the survey data. This study is preliminary, a first step in understanding the motivations, expectations, and job satisfaction of program directors.

KEYWORDS

Motivation, higher education, university administration, university faculty

Academic faculty and administrative staff typically have clearly defined roles within institutions of higher education. The role of program director, however, is usually a hybrid of faculty and staff responsibilities, and the nature of this dual role varies from one institution to another. For example, beyond the faculty norms of teaching and research, the responsibilities of the Master of Public Administration (MPA) or Master of Public Policy (MPP) program director at university number one may include developing course schedules, overseeing the program budget, and managing all aspects of the program. In contrast, the program director at university number two may develop course schedules but not manage the budget. And while the program director at university number one may earn a stipend and receive a course release (i.e., exemption from teaching) to compensate for the administrative responsibilities of directing a program, the director at university number two may enjoy no additional compensation, though he or she is responsible for managing multiple aspects of the degree program.

Given the variations in institutional and program missions, cultures, and norms, as well as variations in what motivates individuals, one may assume that MPA and MPP program directors seek and/or accept the director position for reasons that are equally varied. This study aims to explore the motivations, expectations, and realities of MPA and MPP directors' roles. We also approximate levels of job satisfaction and offer recommendations for future research.

THE CONCEPTUAL FRAME

This research is based on four well-known models of motivation: (1) rational-economic models (e.g., Taylor, 1947); (2) self-actualizing models (e.g., Maslow, 1943; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959); (3) social models (e.g., Mayo, 2003); and (4) complex models (e.g., Schein, 1985; Vroom, 1964). The first two are content models of motivation that attempt to explain the intrinsic job factors that serve as motivators for employees. The second two are process models of motivation that seek to understand the impacts of extrinsic environmental and cultural influences on a person's motivation (Rowley, 1996). Conclusions concerning job satisfaction may also be drawn by analyzing and interpreting data using these theories of motivation.

Content Models of Motivation

During the Industrial Revolution of the 20th century, Frederick Taylor—a mechanical engineer turned management consultant—sought to optimize efficiency to increase production in the workplace. He conducted experiments to determine optimal performance levels of workers, whom Taylor believed were lazy and lacked intelligence. In Taylor's view, the intrinsic job element of money paid for work performed was the primary (and perhaps sole) worker motivator, and that places Taylor's thinking squarely within the content models of motivation.

Taylor applied the scientific method by analyzing each step in a given process to determine the optimal way to perform any given task. He claimed that he could develop the "one best way" (Taylor 1947) or most efficient way, to complete a given task. However, some scholars say that Taylor made "adjustments" in his data, ranging "from 20 percent to 225 percent," to make his scientific method—now commonly known as scientific management—appear more valid and attractive to potential clients (Stewart, 2006). Nonetheless, Taylor's research represents the rational-economic models of organizational theory in this study.

Taking a more humanistic approach, psychologist Abraham Maslow wanted to understand what motivates people. He believed that people are motivated by factors unrelated to rewards or unconscious desires. Instead, Maslow (1943) posited that people are motivated to meet specific needs. The most widespread version of Maslow's model includes five types of motivational needs: three basic needs (physiological, safety, and belonging) and two growth needs (esteem and self-actualization). According to Maslow, unmet basic needs motivate people, and the motivation to meet these needs becomes stronger the longer they are denied. Maslow further argued that one must generally satisfy lower-level basic needs before being motivated to satisfy higher-order growth needs and ultimately the highest need level—self-actualization.[1]

Building on Maslow's model of motivation, psychologist Frederick Herzberg set out to determine the effects of attitude on motivation by asking people to describe situations where they felt good and bad about their jobs (Herzberg et al., 1959). Not surprisingly, people who felt positive about their jobs gave very different responses from the people who felt negative. These results form the basis of Herzberg's two-factor theory which, along with Maslow's approach, represents the self-actualizing models of motivation.

Herzberg believed, in contrast to Maslow, that lower-order needs are not by themselves motivators of employee behavior. Rather, he posited that employees are motivated to satisfy higher-order needs such as achievement, responsibility, professional growth, status, and valuing the work itself. These characteristics are inherent in the job and Herzberg considered them to be intrinsic motivating factors. Intrinsic job characteristics tend to involve the content of the job itself rather than the processes determined by organizational rules, norms, or culture. Herzberg also reported that intrinsic characteristics of a job are consistently related to job satisfaction, while extrinsic job characteristics—the hygiene factors—may affect levels of employee job dissatisfaction. Extrinsic hygiene factors tend to be oriented toward process rather than job content and include elements such as organizational policies, the nature of supervision, relationships with supervisor and peers,

compensation, and job security. The extent to which hygiene factors exist tends to depend on organizational policies, norms, and cultures as opposed to being inherent parts of a job. Figure 1 identifies the intrinsic motivating factors and extrinsic hygiene factors relevant to this study.

Herzberg further concluded that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not opposites. Rather they are independent of each other: eliminating the causes of dissatisfaction will not create satisfaction nor will adding job satisfaction factors eliminate dissatisfaction. For example, if a program director does not like the content of his or her job, giving that person a raise will not make him or her satisfied with the position.

Similarly, if someone has a healthy working relationship with his or her peers but the position has none of the intrinsic factors related to job content, the level of employee dissatisfaction will likely not be altered. According to Herzberg, the intrinsic factors leading to job satisfaction are motivators and distinctly separate from extrinsic hygiene factors. Eliminating hygiene job factors may not necessarily enhance employee motivation, satisfaction or performance. Similarly, when hygiene factors are met, people are not necessarily satisfied with their jobs. Only the higher-order, intrinsic job characteristics determine a person's level of motivation and job satisfaction (Herzberg et al., 1959).

FIGURE 1.
Job Characteristics in Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

Motivating Factors
(Intrinsic)

Promote program mission   Increase responsibility

Promote program core values   Increase professional status

Professional growth

Hygiene Factors
(Extrinsic)

Work more closely with central administration   Increase professional network

Work more closely with dean   Increase job security

Work more closely with department chair   Increase authority

Work more closely with peers in unit   Increase autonomy

Receive stipend   Receive course release(s)

Lower demands for research   Adequate clerical/admin support

Process Models of Motivation

On the process side, and representing the social models of motivation, psychologist Elton Mayo (2003) led a team of researchers from Harvard University in 1924 in studying the effects of changed environmental conditions on worker productivity. The original research focused on changes in workplace lighting and resulted in inconclusive findings. Also inconclusive were findings related to changes to the structure of work, such as working hours and the timing of breaks, along with subsequent experiments of direct observation designed to better understand worker motivation and productivity. These experiments, commonly known as the Hawthorne experiments, continued for eight years, during which researchers interviewed employees to determine what actually affected worker productivity (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939).

The Hawthorne studies ultimately showed, unlike Taylor's thinking, that human resources are not motivated merely by financial incentives or optimized work efficiencies, but rather by social and other "soft" factors. Mayo (2003) and his team of researchers thus concluded that supervisor and coworker behaviors—such as inclusion in decision making, providing and receiving constructive feedback, demonstrating genuine interest in the employee, and meeting desires to belong to a group—are critical when seeking to motivate employees.

Whereas Maslow, Herzberg, and Mayo examined the relationship between individuals' needs and the effort required to fulfill them, management theorist Victor Vroom's expectancy theory posits that people are motivated by the expectations and levels of importance perceived to exist for specific actions. According to Vroom (1964), three perceptions—expectancy, instrumentality, and valance—can separately motivate individual behavior, but they are most powerful when utilized in combination. That is, an individual is motivated to the extent that he or she believes that a certain amount of effort will lead to a given level of performance or outcome (expectancy), that level of performance or outcome will be rewarded (instrumentality), and that the reward or outcome is highly valued (valance). These three elements of expectation theory interact with one's personal preferences to motivate behavior. Vroom's theory is represented by the following equation: Motivation = Expectancy x Instrumentality x Valance.

Taking a different approach and representing the complex models of motivation, in the 1980s noted management scholar Edgar Schein began positing that the culture of an organization also affects employee behavior. According to Schein, organization culture reflects the essence of a given organization in the same way that social culture reflects the essence of a given society. The culture is based on an inherent set of "values, beliefs, assumptions, perceptions, behavioral norms, artifacts, and patterns of behavior" that determine what is and is not deemed acceptable within the confines of the organization itself (Ott, 1989, p. 50). New organization members are exposed to and taught accepted norms and thus become socialized into the culture of the organization. Organization culture may therefore be viewed as a normative adhesive that holds an organization together and expresses the shared ideals and beliefs of organization members. As Schein (1985) argues, culture sets the boundaries for and direction of behavior within the organization. Thus, Schein would likely agree with Herzberg that the extent to which Herzberg's hygiene factors exist tends to be a function of organizational policies, norms, and cultures as opposed to being inherent parts of the job.

METHODOLOGY

Informed by the content and process models of motivation discussed above, previous studies of motivation, and the experiences of both authors, we developed a survey and administered it using Qualtrics software. We tested the survey among graduate program directors employed by the same university as the authors. Based on feedback, we made minor adjustments to several survey questions.

For our survey, we targeted the 173 directors of MPA and MPP programs in the United States accredited by the Network of Schools in Policy, Affairs, and Administration (NASPAA) as listed

on NASPAA's website in the 2015–2016 roster of accredited programs. We identified the names and e-mail addresses of the program directors by looking up each program on its website.

In addition to questions concerning demographics, the survey asked about each of the 17 intrinsic motivating and extrinsic hygiene factors associated with the job of program director identified in Figure 1. On a 5-point Likert scale, response choices for these questions were Extremely, Very, Moderately, Slightly, and Not At All Important. We coded these responses 1 to 5 (1 = Extremely Important). We asked a second set of questions concerning these same 17 job elements and the reality program directors found in the position. We asked specifically to what extent respondents' expectations were met for each of the 17 intrinsic and extrinsic job factors. Again on a 5-point Likert scale, response choices were All, Most, Some, Few, and No Expectations Were Met. We also coded these responses 1 to 5 (1 = All Expectations Were Met).

Finally, we asked a third set of questions about respondents' satisfaction concerning their ability to promote their program's mission, promote their program's core values, contribute to student success, and effect positive change. The final question in this set asked about respondents' overall satisfaction vis-à-vis the job of program director. We again used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Extremely Satisfied, 5 = Not At All Satisfied).

We distributed the survey electronically, along with an invitation to participate, to 173 MPA and MPP program directors on October 23, 2016, and the survey remained open until November 5, 2016. We sent two reminder e-mails before the closing date. Three of the 173 email addresses were invalid, thus leaving 170 potential participants. Of those, 57 program directors participated, resulting in a response rate of 33.5%.

Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the survey participants; Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of their programs and institutions. Only one of the respondents is considered staff, and the remaining respondents

TABLE 1.
Demographic Summary

Respondent characteristics	Percentage
Gender identity (*n* = 48)	
Male	62.5
Race/ethnicity (*n* = 42)	
White	89.4
Faculty or staff (*n* = 49)	
Faculty	98.2
Current rank (*n* = 49)	
Assistant professor	10.2
Associate professor	32.7
Professor	55.1
Other	2.0
Tenure status (*n* = 49)	
Tenured	85.7
On tenure track, not tenured	6.1
Not on tenure track	8.2
Volunteered for director position (*n* = 54)	
Yes	64.8
Union membership (*n* = 54)	
Yes	33.3
Age (*n* = 41)	
mean = 52.85	
std. dev. = 11.2	
Years at current institution (*n* = 54)	
mean = 11.23	
std. dev. = 8.4	
Years as program director (*n* = 54)	
mean = 4.98	
std. dev. = 4.1	

TABLE 2.
Program and Institution Characteristics

Program characteristics	Percentage	Institution characteristics	Percentage
Program type (*n* = 54)		**Public or private institution (*n* = 49)**	
MPA	87.0	Public	91.8
Average annual enrollment (*n* = 54)		**Carnegie classification (*n* = 49)**	
< 50	24.1	Research 1	38.8
50–99	35.2	Research 2	20.4
100–149	18.5	Research 3	14.3
150+	22.2	Master college	20.4
		Unknown	6.1
Mode of delivery (*n* = 52)		**US Census region (*n* = 48)**	
In person only	28.8	New England	2.1
In person with online coursework	63.5	Mid Atlantic	8.3
Primarily or completely online	7.7	East North Central	10.4
		West North Central	8.3
		South Atlantic	31.3
		East South Central	8.3
		West South Central	14.6
		Mountain	6.3
		Pacific	10.4

are faculty members. The typical participant is white (89.4%), male (62.5%), tenured (85.7%); holds the rank of professor (55.1%); and works at a public institution (91.8%). The average participant age is 53; these program directors have been at their respective institutions for an average of 11.2 years; and the majority of participants (63%) have served as program directors for 5 years or less.

The majority of Program Directors reported that they volunteered for their positions (64.8%). Of the directors surveyed, 87% direct MPA programs, and the remainder direct MPP or mixed MPA/MPP programs. In terms of pro-gram delivery, 63.5% of respondents' programs combine traditional in-person instruction with some online coursework. Directors from various-sized programs and different regions of the country are well represented, although programs in the South Atlantic region of the United States may be overrepresented in the sample.

As with all research of this kind, there are limitations to the findings. First, because all programs included in this study are bound by NASPAA requirements, our findings may not be reliably generalized beyond the sample population. Second, although respondents'

answers may not be biased or inaccurate, the "truth value" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 290) of this study may be bounded. However, the use of participants from multiple sites located in different geographic regions across the United States helps to offset these limitations.

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Herzberg's two-factor theory assumes that some elements of a given job are inherent in the position, perceived to be important, and serve as intrinsic motivators, while other elements are extrinsic hygiene factors that do not serve as motivators nor affect levels of satisfaction with a given job. In contrast, Vroom's expectancy theory is rooted in the perceived expectations and importance of a given act. When Herzberg's two-factor theory is combined with Vroom's expectancy theory, however, the level to which a respondent indicates that an intrinsic motivating factor is important may also indicate the level of expected success for that factor. Although many considerations may influence the decision, program directors would likely not have accepted the position had they not believed they would be able to achieve success in the most important aspects of the job. For example, respondents who indicate that promoting the program's mission (an intrinsic characteristic of the director's job) is a very important factor in their decision to accept the position expect that they would be successful in promoting the mission. If there was no expectation of success, respondents who felt that promoting the mission was important would most likely not accept the position.

The mean scores for responses to survey questions suggests the level of importance/expectation assigned to each of the 17 intrinsic and extrinsic job characteristics of a program director. A second set of survey questions asked about the extent to which the expectations for each job element had been met. Table 3 shows the mean importance/expectation scores for each of the 17 intrinsic and extrinsic job factors associated with the role of program director and the extent to which the expectations for each factor had been met.

Data in Table 3 indicate that promoting the program's mission (mean = 2.29) and promoting the program's core values (mean = 2.37) are the two most important factors motivating program directors to accept the role. Over half of respondents (57.7%) reported that promoting the program's mission and values, respectively, are Extremely or Very Important, while 65.9% indicated that working with these two variables fully or mostly met their expectations.

Additional job characteristics that round out the top five motivating factors are, in descending order, opportunity for professional growth (mean = 2.85), opportunity to receive course release(s) (mean = 3.17), and opportunity to increase professional status (mean = 3.19). Interestingly, the top five motivating job characteristics identified by our respondents match, with one exception, Herzberg's two-factor theory as depicted in Figure 1. The exception is that respondents reported receiving course release(s) to be a moderately important aspect of the job, with some expectation that a course release would be granted to individuals serving as program directors. Therefore, these data suggest that respondents perceive a course release to be an intrinsic motivating aspect of the job, although not all program directors actually receive a course release.

We explore respondents' satisfaction with their role as program director in several ways. First, we look at the grand mean value of the survey questions that measure the importance and expectations that respondents' assign to each of the 17 factors in Figure 1 compared to the survey questions that measure the extent to which respondents' expectations are met for each of the same 17 intrinsic and extrinsic job factors. The grand mean of 3.51 indicates a slight to moderate level of overall importance and expectation perceived for the role of program director, while the score of 2.99 indicates that at least some of respondents' expectations for the role of program director have been met. These scores suggest that the reality experienced by respondents is more positive than what they expected in terms of satisfaction with the program director role.

TABLE 3.

Levels of Importance, Expectations, and Expectations Being Met for Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Characteristics

Intrinsic and extrinsic job factors	Importance/expectations (mean)	Expectations met (mean)
The opportunity to promote the program's mission	2.29	2.23
The opportunity to promote the program's core values	2.37	2.23
The opportunity for professional growth	2.85	2.49
The opportunity to receive course release(s)	3.17	2.72
The opportunity to increase professional status	3.19	2.80
The opportunity for increased responsibility	3.25	2.55
The opportunity to receive a financial stipend	3.28	3.13
The opportunity to work more closely with other faculty in your academic unit	3.46	2.77
The opportunity for increased autonomy	3.50	2.95
The opportunity to broaden your professional network	3.58	2.86
A sufficient level of clerical/administrative support	3.62	3.34
The opportunity for increased authority	3.65	3.11
The opportunity to work more closely with central administration (president, provost, etc.)	4.11	3.45
The opportunity for greater job security	4.13	3.60
The opportunity to work more closely with department chair or direct supervisor	4.19	3.07
The opportunity to work more closely with dean	4.30	3.36
The opportunity to reduce research productivity requirements	4.74	4.22
Grand mean	3.51	2.99

Second, bivariate analyses allow us to further explore the relationship between program directors' realities—the extent to which their expectations have been met—and levels of satisfaction. We asked directors to rate their level of satisfaction with the top 5 motivating job characteristics, using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Extremely Satisfied, 5 = Extremely Dissatisfied). In general, participating program directors are mostly satisfied with their overall role

(mean = 2.19). This finding is consistent with the previous finding derived from a comparison of grand means. The bivariate analyses also provide additional insight insofar as our survey respondents indicated that they are generally satisfied with their ability to promote the program's mission and values (mean = 2.04 and 1.98, respectively), to promote student success (mean = 1.69), and to effect positive change (mean = 2.10).

We also performed bivariate analyses between the demographics of respondents and each of the 17 intrinsic and extrinsic job characteristics. We found only one significant demographic relationship among these variables: age was positively correlated to professional growth ($r = 3.13$, $p \le .046$).

We examined each of the top 5 job characteristics where expectations have been met (the intrinsic characteristics of mission, values, growth, and responsibility and the extrinsic characteristic of course release) against each of the dimensions of satisfaction discussed above. As shown in Table 4, each of the 4 intrinsic job characteristics are associated with at least three dimensions of satisfaction. In contrast, program directors' realities regarding the extrinsic job factor of receiving course release(s) is not significantly correlated to any dimension of satisfaction.

There is also a positive, statistically significant relationship between expectations for the variable of promoting the program mission being met and directors' ability to promote student success ($r = .502$, $p \le .01$), program values ($r = .487$, $p \le .01$) and the mission itself ($r = .427$, $p \le .01$). Directors who indicate that these same expectations were met also tend to be satisfied with their role as program director ($r = .498$, $p \le .01$). And directors' expectations of their opportunity for professional growth being met also produced a significant relationship across

TABLE 4.
Results of Bivariate Analyses

Job factors with expectations met	Satisfaction with overall role of director	Satisfaction with ability to promote student success	Satisfaction with ability to effect positive change	Satisfaction with ability to promote core values	Satisfaction with ability to promote mission
Opportunity to promote mission	.498**	.502**	.541**	.487**	.427**
Opportunity to promote values	.426**	.233	.273	.380*	.345*
Opportunity for professional growth	.342*	.342*	.315*	.363*	.297*
Opportunity to increase responsibility	.436**	.132	.388**	.361*	.330*
Receive course release(s)	.205	.043	.181	.098	.044

*$p \le .05$. **$p \le .01$.

all 5 dimensions of satisfaction, at $p \leq .05$. Interestingly, the strongest statistically significant relationship of satisfaction ($r = .541$, $p \leq .01$) is between promoting the program mission and the ability to effect positive change.

Table 5 is based on Table 3's mean scores for importance/expectations and expectations met for each of the 17 job characteristics. Data in Table 5 indicate aspects of the program director's job where the rank order of the director's reality—where expectations were met—match the rank order of expectations; where the rank of the director's reality is more positive than the rank of expectations; and where the rank order of the director's expectations is above the rank of reality. Perhaps most meaningful is the third column in this table, which suggests that there is room for improvement in managing at least 6 of the 17 job characteristics that may affect directors' motivation and job satisfaction.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on our research, there is a void in extant literature concerning the motivations of graduate program directors. This study is intended to help fill that void through application of the content and process theories discussed herein.

Regarding the content models of motivation, Taylor's notion that employees are primarily motivated by money appears to be somewhat flawed, given that the extrinsic element of receiving a stipend is ranked 7 among 17 possible motivating job factors. However, receiving a stipend is the highest ranking extrinsic job factor motivating survey respondents, which lends at least some degree of support to Taylor's theory.

Similarly, both Maslow's and Herzberg's theories of motivation (Maslow 1943; Herzberg et al. 1959) seem partially supported by these research findings. For example, 6 of the top 10

TABLE 5.

Program Directors' Expectations vs. Realities of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Job Characteristics

Expectations rank matches reality	Expectations rank lower than reality	Expectations rank higher than reality
Promote the mission	Increase responsibility	Receive course release(s)
Promote core values	Work more closely with peers	Increase professional status
Professional growth	Increase professional network	Receive a stipend
Increase autonomy	Increase authority	Clerical/admin support
Lower research demands	Work more closely with chair	Increase job security
	Work more closely with dean	Work more closely with central admin

motivating factors reported by survey respondents (increase professional growth, professional status, responsibility, working more closely with peers, autonomy, professional network) are considered higher-order needs according to Maslow's theory of motivation. And consistent with Herzberg's two-factor theory, all 5 of the identified intrinsic job factors (promote the mission, promote the core values, increase professional growth, increase professional status, and increase responsibility) are among the top 6 motivators reported by survey respondents. Although respondents reported that receiving course release(s), an extrinsic job element, was a key motivator, we found no statistically significant relationship between this variable and job satisfaction.

We explore the extrinsic job factors relevant to participating program directors by applying the process theories represented by Mayo, Vroom, and Schein. Mayo's (2003) finding that the desire to satisfy one's social needs in the workplace is as a key motivator seems at least partially contradicted by our research findings. That is, the 3 extrinsic job factors of having the opportunity to work more closely with their institution's central administration, a direct supervisor, and the dean each appear in the lower half of the reported rankings of importance/expectations for the 17 intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. Respondents ranked only the extrinsic job element of having the opportunity to work more closely with peers in the top 10 motivating job factors.

With regard to the complex models of motivation, applying the logic of Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory allows us to identify the level of expectation and importance assigned by respondents to each of the 17 intrinsic and extrinsic job characteristics relevant to program directors. Schein's (1985) theory of organizational culture promotes our understanding of influences extrinsic to the job itself, such as compensation and relationships with superiors and peers, that may affect program directors' levels of motivation.

Combining Herzberg's two-factor theory with Vroom's expectancy theory provides analytic benefit by accounting for the personal preferences of our respondents, an identified weakness of Herzberg's model (see House & Wigdor, 1967). Moreover, combining these two models may allow for more reliable estimates of job satisfaction than either model alone.

In a more practical sense, over half of our survey respondents reported that promoting the mission and promoting core values of their respective programs are the two most important aspects of the program director's job and that their expectations regarding these variables were mostly or fully met. These are significant findings given that NASPAA accreditation is based on a program pursuing achievement of its mission and core values.

In addition, our findings may assist with efforts to increase the motivation and performance of program directors by paying close attention to those elements of the director position reported to fall short of expectations. Additional opportunities for program directors to increase their professional status by working more closely with their institution's central administration, having adequate clerical/administrative support, enjoying increased job security, receiving a stipend, and having the possibility of course releases may generate increased motivation and productivity.

Finally, the activity of promoting the program mission is significantly correlated to each of the five measures of job satisfaction. Interestingly, the strongest statistically significant relationship of satisfaction ($r = .541$, $p \leq .01$) is between the elements of promoting the program mission and having the ability to effect positive change. This finding reinforces the importance of the program mission as an intrinsic aspect of the program director's job, the satisfaction derived from the job, and NASPAA's accreditation process.

In conclusion, our data indicate that program directors participating in our study are mostly

satisfied with their role and the intrinsic rewards they receive. However, we recommend that future research delve more deeply into understanding the motivations and levels of satisfaction of MPP and MPA program directors. A better understanding of these factors would surely aid in choosing the right people for the job, not only in terms of recruiting, but also through retaining talented individuals who are highly motivated to carry out their program's mission, embody their program's core values, promote student success, and effect positive change.

NOTES

1 Maslow (1970) later concluded that less than 1% of the US adult population becomes fully self-actualized, because American society rewards motivation primarily based on belonging, esteem, and other social needs, thereby reducing a person's motivation to realize his or her own unique potential.

REFERENCES

Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York, NY: Wiley.

House, R., & Wigdor, L. (1967). Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: A review of the evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology, 20*(4), 369–90.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review, 50*(4), 370–396.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Mayo, E. (2003). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Ott, J. (1989). *The organizational culture perspective*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Roethlisberger, F., & Dickson, W. (1939). *Management and the worker*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rowley, J. (1996). Motivation and academic staff in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education, 4*(3), 11–16.

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Stewart, M. (2006, June). The management myth. *Atlantic Monthly*. Retrieved from www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2006/06/the-management-myth/304883.

Taylor, F. (1947). *Scientific management*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Jerri Killian is an associate professor and chair of the Department of Urban Affairs and Geography at Wright State University. Her research interests include administrative reform, public management, and ethical leadership.

Mary Wenning is an associate professor and MPA program director at Wright State University. Her research interests include housing policy, food insecurity, and pedagogical innovation.