ABSTRACT
Having an efficient and motivated team is a key factor for a well-run office. This article considers some well-known leadership principles, motivational theories, and communication strategies, along with personal experiences, to discuss some best practices to use in motivating individuals across small and large teams.

Understanding Employee Motivation and Applying Theory to the Workplace

Understanding Employee Motivation and Applying Theory to the Workplace

Being chosen for a leadership position is only the beginning of becoming a leader. To become more than "the boss" people follow because they are required to do so — or to become someone employees will want to follow at all — leaders must master the ability to invest in people and inspire those around them. Simultaneously, in order to succeed in a leadership role, one must build a team that consistently produces measurable results. There are multiple paths to explore along the journey to reaching the "pinnacle" of leadership (Maxwell, 1999), where your influence extends beyond the people who are in your immediate sphere. During the journey, you are not only learning how to lead people and encourage their professional development, you should also be engaging in self-reflection on your leadership and communication styles. Time may feel like a limited resource, but being more purposeful about understanding employee motivation and "crucial conversations" (Patterson, Grenny, McMillan, & Switzler, 2012) will help you lead an efficient and motivated team and ultimately make everyone more satisfied with their work.

This article is based on a presentation by the authors at the American Association of College Registrars and Admissions Officers (AACRAO) conference in April 2017. During the presentation, we explored levels and sources of leadership, promoters and deterrents to motivation, and the importance of proper communication as it pertains to development of people and teams. Points were infused with examples of challenges and triumphs throughout our careers to date, as well as best practices used to motivate individuals across small and large teams. For purposes of this paper, we have created two scenarios we believe will be relatable, reviewed the information presented in the AACRAO session, and discussed how that information can be applied in these situations.

Setting the Stage (Problem)

Imagine the following: The work has piled up and your manager is on her way to a meeting that she would rather not attend because she needs to have something completed by that afternoon. Everyone is always telling her that she has too much on her plate and she needs to delegate more, so she stops by your desk on her way out and, balancing a coffee, she says, "I need you to get Dean Murphy the census report, but you have to take out all the joint degree students, and also that student with the late drop issue is going to come by and he needs to see John in Financial Aid. I have to go to this stupid meeting now, but text me if anything happens."

You are left in confusion and not very motivated. First, the manager didn't ask you what else you had to get done, and while it may or may not have mattered to the priorities, you now feel trapped. You know what a census report is, but your manager has always run it, and even though you are a problem-solver and can manage to find the right report, identifying who the joint degree students are may be difficult. Further, if those students are one quirk in the process, are there any other special cases? You also are not entirely sure who the late drop student is, and you are almost positive that John in Financial Aid worked only a half day today. Should you send the student to someone else? You become frustrated and ask yourself, “If what we’re doing is ‘stupid,’ why do I have to be stressed out about it? What is the difference if the student sees John tomorrow? It’s completely the student’s fault he didn’t drop on time anyway. Can’t someone else run this census report? It looks like this is going to take forever!” Forget it, you’re taking lunch and will do it when you come back. And now you are an unmotivated employee, at least for the day.

Or consider a second common scenario: you have taken over as the director of an office where one of the assistant directors, Jamie, has been at the college for 15 years. You have been there a few months now and think you have identified some procedures that can be streamlined, including asking the university for some new resources to communicate with students and trying a different way of preparing block registrations. You present the ideas to your team but Jamie sits in the corner scrolling through his phone screen. A little miffed, you try to talk to him after the meeting. As people are leaving the room, you express your irritation at his constant lateness and inattention, and ask why he did not contribute to the meeting. He sighs and says, “Look, I’ve been here a long time and everyone tries to change things, but it always just makes things worse. As for the block registration, I’ve got it down to the way that works for me and, as long as it’s me doing the registration, that’s the way I’m going to do it." How can we use theories of leadership and motivation to work through these two scenarios?

Sources of Power and Leadership

Sociologists John R. P. French Jr. and Bertram Raven (1959) identified five bases of social power: legitimate, coercive, reward, expert, and referent. Raven (1965) later added a sixth category, informational power. That expanded model is presented here.[1]

Legitimate power is very straightforward: the employee does what the supervisor tells them to do simply because the supervisor is in charge. Reward power and coercive power both rely on external reinforcement mechanisms, at opposite poles. Reward power uses, as expected, a system of positive rewards to encourage behavior - for example, a monetary bonus or supervisor praise. Coercive power is based on fear and relies on the threat of negative consequences, such as a bad performance review or termination. The problem with each of these bases is that if the external system of motivation is removed, the positive behavior may decrease, or negative behavior may increase. Reward and coercive methods of motivation may cause work to be rushed to receive the payoff or mistakes to be hidden out of fear. Most importantly, none of these actions promote the employee’s independent development and investment in the work, something with which leaders should always be concerned. A slightly deeper source of influence is expert power, where the employee follows the supervisor because the employee recognizes the depth of knowledge the supervisor has about the work. However, this still relies on an external source and does not promote independent growth.

The final two sources of influence value intangible motivators more highly. The first is referent power, which relies on interpersonal relationships and admiration. This helps cultivate a motivation to do *well*, not simply to *do*. While it may be tempting to be satisfied with an employee who simply does what we say, promoting personal investment helps to ensure that we do not spend unnecessary time correcting, re-explaining, monitoring, rewarding, or punishing. The sixth basis of power, added a few years later, is informational power (Raven, 1965). Informational power is similar to referent power, but involves more knowledge-sharing with the employee rather than a reliance on interpersonal motivation. Raven (2008) asserts that use of this power in the workplace leads to more prolonged independent change on the part of the employee(s).

More recently, leadership author John C. Maxwell (2011) identified levels of leadership that are somewhat similar to French and Raven’s (1959) descriptions, but operate more from the perspective of the individual being influenced. The chart below captures and summarizes Maxwell’s levels of leadership (personal commentary indicated by italicized text). As you read, consider your own team members of present and past; you will likely find they fall into one of the below categories.

Table 1: *Levels of Leadership from Maxwell (1999)*

Level of Leadership	Description
Position	People follow because they have to. *These people do not have a personal stake or interest at the school or organization. They are there to pay bills; the job is ONLY a means to an end.*
Permission	People follow because they want to. *They have a vested interest in the organization, in their position. They respect you as a leader.* *Example:* *Leader: “I need a few people to work on this Saturday.”* *Employee: “I don’t like to work on Saturdays, but I will work on this Saturday because you asked me to.”*
Production	People follow because of what you have done for the organization. *They specifically want to be on your team.*
People Development	People follow because of what you have done for them personally. *They specifically want to be on your team and/or developed and mentored by you.* *Sometimes it is not organizationally practical for someone to be on the team that you supervise or manage. However, it is possible for the person to learn from you through a formal or informal mentoring relationship.*
Pinnacle	People follow because of who you are and what you represent. *This is the highest level of respect and influence, associated with those who are requested to be mentors.*

1 See Raven, 2008 for a more comprehensive summary.

French, Raven, and Maxwell, in presenting their frameworks, have all emphasized the value of fostering interpersonal relationships and sharing knowledge, championing them as the most effective leadership behaviors for encouraging independent employee motivation (French & Raven, 1959; Maxwell, 2011; Raven, 2008). Let us next review how motivational theories underscore and work in tandem with these lessons on leadership.

Employee Motivation

INTRINSIC VS. EXTRINSIC MOTIVATORS

Intrinsic motivation is essentially the desire to move toward a goal because of personal, independent reasons, and not because of some external reward you will receive. It is an investment and appreciation in a process more than a particular outcome. In contrast, extrinsic motivation is when behavior is influenced by outside forces, awards, raises, threats, etc.

The most salient theory around intrinsic motivation is Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory. Self-determination theory posits there are three prongs to internal motivation: autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Autonomy* means the employee feels they have a choice in what they are doing. This does not necessarily mean the employee gets to choose the task they work on (often they cannot), but we can provide some agency where possible in allowing them leeway in how the task is accomplished, engaging them in efforts outside their formal position, and reinforcing the value of their work to their chosen profession. *Relatedness* describes a feeling of connection to, and inclusion in, the social network (in this case, the employee's workplace and colleagues) or a connection to the task itself. Finally, *competence* is fulfilled when people feel reasonably sure they can succeed at a task. The presence of these factors should lead to greater performance and engagement, with employees putting more effort into tasks that fulfill these needs.

Morse (2003) examined multiple surveys that show that people in general tend to underestimate the effectiveness and preference for intrinsic motivators in others. Respondents indicated that the importance of the work and feeling valued are the most important job characteristics for themselves, but assume that other people are more driven by money and other tangible perks. This in turn affects how institutions and managers approach employee morale, often leaning on seemingly obvious things like compensation or awards, and less on properly encouraging and communicating shared values.

Patrick Lencioni (2007), an industry premier writer of books on business management and team engagement, has written about the three signs of a miserable job: anonymity, irrelevance, and immeasurability.[2] Lencioni defines these as follows:

- **Anonymity:** People cannot be fulfilled or engaged in their work if they are not known, or if they feel like their unique qualities are not appreciated by someone in a position of authority. People who see themselves as invisible, generic, or anonymous cannot love their jobs, no matter what they are doing.
- **Irrelevance:** Everyone needs to know that his or her job matters to someone...anyone. If team members do not see a connection between their work and the satisfaction of another person or group of people, their efforts will not create lasting fulfillment. As managers, directors, supervisors, deans and assistant deans, we know how most of what we do will impact or affect an individual or a group. We have to be sure our team members know the same, whether we manage 200 persons or one person.
- **Immeasurability:** Employees need to be able to gauge their progress and level of contribution. Without a way to tangibly assess success or failure, motivation eventually deteriorates as people see themselves as unable to control their own fate.

One can see the influence of self-determination theory in these observations, particularly in the latter two characteristics identified. Lencioni (2007) states when these characteristics persist in a work environment, productivity suffers not only in the individual employee, but also when the unmotivated, miserable employee knowingly or unknowingly spreads his or her mood to others. When this occurs, we start to see increased instances of unplanned paid time off and eventually turnover. Further, weariness sets in and customer service to students, peers, and faculty plummets, which impacts the culture of the department and how the team is viewed by those they serve. Lencioni (2007) noted three indicators relative to employee engagement can be viewed as direct feeders into intrinsic motivation theory, for they speak to an employee's need to feel valued, appreciated, known, and engaged. When these needs are met, employees feel more connected to the work that they perform, and they make it a personal goal to do well.

Research around millennials in the workplace suggests that members of this generation in particular value work that they feel makes a difference, and they are enthusiastic about achieving their goals. They also prefer collaborative environments to competitive ones and want their bosses to be coaches and mentors for them (Asghar, 2014; Giang, 2013). The bad news is that these employees are also more likely than older workers to leave jobs if they are not fulfilled in the workplace. This suggests these employees have the capacity to be diligent and thoughtful workers when they believe in the work they are doing, and the best approach to millennial workers is to foster intrinsic motivation through styles that are people- and value-focused: people development, pinnacle, referent power, and informational power.

This does not mean extrinsic rewards are not useful. A meta-analysis by Cerasoli, Nicklin, and Ford (2014) addressed the questions of whether intrinsic motivation could predict performance, whether there is an interaction between extrinsic and intrinsic motivations, and whether different motivators predict different types of performance measures (i.e., quantity of work and quality of work). They split extrinsic motivators into two categories: directly salient incentives (ones with clear ties to performance, such as a bonus for meeting a quota) and indirectly salient incentives (such as salary level). The researchers found that intrinsic motivation does affect performance, and

2 In 2015, Lencioni's book was republished and retitled as *The Truth About Employee Engagement*.

quality-of-work performance in particular, and that this relationship is strengthened by indirectly salient incentives but weakened by directly salient incentives. Furthermore, while extrinsic and intrinsic motivation had similarly weighted effects on performance overall, extrinsic motivation had a larger effect on quantity indicators (though intrinsic motivation was still predictive) while intrinsic motivation had a larger effect on quality indicators. In practice, this means that both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation should be considered as part of a thoughtful leadership strategy, with an emphasis on the latter if there is a greater concern for quality over quantity, as is typically the case in higher education.

Another problem with many of the most relied-upon extrinsic motivators is that, in nonprofit institutions, we often cannot feasibly provide higher salaries or other monetary benefits. To exclusively use extrinsic motivators also carries the risk of losing positive behavior if the extrinsic reward is removed or decreased, or if its value changes to the recipient. There is also neural evidence of an "undermining effect" – that removing extrinsic motivators decreases intrinsic motivation to a lower point than before the extrinsic motivator was introduced (Murayama, Matsumoto, Izuma, & Matsumoto, 2010). There are, however, some extrinsic motivators that do not require a higher budget and will also encourage intrinsic motivation. Recognition and credit, for instance, are extrinsic rewards, but they also help nurture relatedness and competence.

SETTING EXPECTATIONS

Another way of pushing employees to meet higher expectations is simply to set expectations higher. A notable study by Eden and Shani (1982) found people tended to strive only as high as was expected of them. Maxwell (1999) adopted this idea and urged managers to "Put a '10' on every person's head" (p. 11). To "put a 10" on a team is to expect excellence, to let them know that you expect them to do the very best they can with the time and resources at their disposal. In addition to encouraging employees to work at a higher level, Maxwell (1999) asserts that expecting the best of others helps them think more highly of themselves (combating anonymity and irrelevance, and reinforcing competence). If you set the bar high, people will rise up to meet it.

The counterpoint to this is that you cannot set your employees up to fail. In order to rise to the level of your expectations, the employee must have a clear and achievable path to get there. Well-written performance objectives or productivity goals help with this. We have found objectives and goals easier to follow when written in a S.M.A.R.T. goal format (Doran, 1981). S.M.A.R.T. goals are: Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Realistic, and Time-Based. Others over time have replaced "Assignable" with "Attainable" and "Realistic" with "Relevant," and either model works. A S.M.A.R.T. goal's purpose is to clearly state what is to be accomplished and by whom (specific/assignable). It can only be achieved if it is a quantifiable (measurable) and realistic goal (attainable), with a completion date (time-based). In the alternative model, the "Relevant" prong means meeting this goal will actually improve something.

The components of the goal can be listed in any order, as long as they are all present. For example, your objective is to provide an opportunity for growth to a team member by giving her the responsibility of leading a project to transition to a paperless office. The objective for the team member might be: *By December 31, 2017, meet with IT to discuss three options to move to a primarily paperless office over the next 18 months. Consider what other departments have already done and whether it is necessary to research vendor options.* This is a very simplistic S.M.A.R.T. goal, but you can see that it is specific in identifying key players. It is quantifiable, attainable, realistic, and it provides an initial time frame for completion. With multi-level projects such as the one above, additional goals can be written after the initial steps are completed to keep the employee and project on task. Goals can also be effective tools to train employees on new processes or tasks, to retrain employees, or to get employees back on track.

General Tips on Communication and Recognition

There is strong evidence to support interpersonal types of extrinsic motivation and the power of good communication in promoting intrinsic motivation. Therefore, it is useful here to expand on specific techniques to use in recognizing your employees and addressing workplace issues.

Recognition may seem to be obvious and trivial but many of us do not take the time to do it. Whether shown in small or large ways, the rewards of recognition in combating anonymity and reinforcing competence, as well as simply building Referent and Pinnacle Power, are well worth making this a priority. Here are some avenues of recognition we have personally used:

- **Subject Matter Experts:** Almost every office has a subject matter expert on a process, whether it be the evaluation and awarding of transfer credit, efficient transcript processing and distribution, electronic record keeping, course substitutions, or something else. Defer to that person and give him or her a chance to shine when an opportunity is presented.
- **Speak for Yourself:** Do not just give credit; allow your team members to speak for themselves. Lindsey Pollak (2014) relayed in her book, *Becoming the Boss*, that listeners often attribute partial credit for an idea to the person speaking even when that person is attributing the idea to someone else. Instead of telling meeting attendees that Jane had a great idea, ask Jane to explain her idea if she is present. Similarly, allow Jane to send the report she put together to the senior administrator herself instead of having her send it to you purely so you can pass it on.
- **Amplification:** This concept is usually invoked in discussions around women in the workplace because studies show that women are more likely to be interrupted and less likely to credit their own ideas than men (Hancock & Rubin, 2014; Haynes & Heilman, 2013; Zimmerman & West, 1975). Some of the ways we can amplify another's voice is by continuing to make eye contact with them when another person interrupts, actively stopping the interrupter if we are in a position to do so, or pointing out (tactfully) that an idea someone is claiming as their own has already been raised.
- **Tokens of Acknowledgment:** Many times, there is not money in the budget (personal or professional) to celebrate "wins" through monetary or material means. In one of Dr. Shipman's workplaces, they found a creative way to recognize achievements despite this lack of funds. The supervisors bought old 45 records from a thrift store and decorated them with construction paper and a label that described the team member's "win" (which could have been completing a major project, significantly improving a process, etc.)

by starting with "Let the record show..." It was corny but great fun, and it boosted the team's camaraderie.

Recognition of good employees, of course, is the easy part of prioritizing motivation. But how do you communicate with employees who are poorly motivated or have other performance issues? Often a collective issue may actually be a symptom of an individual issue.[3] In such cases, once a problem is observed, a leader must then target the individual(s) so that the whole team can function properly.

The first thing to understand is that, absent significant personal difficulty, employees are not usually unmotivated in general; they are unmotivated toward a particular purpose or at a particular time (Manion, 2005). In the case of Jamie in our second scenario, while it may seem he is miserable and biding his time, it would be poor leadership to accept this assumption without attempting communication to address the issue. At the heart of almost all chronic problems in our institutions, teams, and relationships lie "crucial conversations," which can be simply defined as high-stakes, emotional conversations between people with different perspectives (Patterson et al., 2012). Many times, these are conversations we avoid holding or that we are not holding well. Patterson et al. (2012) showed that those who do not properly utilize crucial conversations suffer in numerous ways, including backstabbing, gossip, undermining, passive-aggression, and more.

According to Patterson et al. (2012), the winning formula for addressing problem behavior is FACTS+PRIVACY+RESPECT. Here is what this looks like in actionable steps:

1. Clarify the facts. Clarifying the facts is the homework required for crucial conversations and it prevents the feeling of having to choose between candor and kindness.
2. Have the conversation behind closed doors and proceed with a respectful tone.
3. Convey, genuinely, your interest in the other person's thoughts and concerns.
4. Respect what the other person is saying. Avoid being dismissive, inattentive, or defensive, and do not interrupt.

An example of this type of situation may be with an employee who does not understand that they are performing poorly. The key to a successful conversation in such a scenario is to have documented evidence of the issue (you have tracked task completion or lack thereof, output, or productivity over a few weeks). It would also be beneficial to have previously shared how their expected contributions affect the team or work environment so that they have a benchmark for what you think is good performance, avoiding immeasurability. If this has not been previously communicated, include it within the conversation. Finally, do not let the conversation end vaguely. Often times, we are in a rush to end crucial conversations because they are uncomfortable, but make sure that both you and the employee are leaving the conversation with a clear understanding of the issue, how each of you feels about it, and what the next steps are. Use active communication and repeat the team member's concerns as you perceive they were stated to ensure you are on the same page.

For other types of dialogue, perhaps around motivation or misery, it may be best to simply have an unstructured conversation, something that does not feel like a confrontation. Arrange a check-in and open the lines of communication. Make sure your team knows that you will make time to listen to them, that you always want to know how you can improve the work environment for them, and that you recognize their strengths and will look for ways to utilize them.

Putting Theory into Action

Let us revisit the scenarios we posed at the beginning of this article. We can now see a few ways to improve how the manager in the first scenario approached the situation. Avoiding calling the meeting "stupid" and taking some time to carefully explain the work would have better reinforced the value of the work being done. A proper training, even if not explicitly connecting the work to the whole of the institution, would offer more opportunity for the employee to see how the work connects, and also uses Informational Power to inspire the employee to be more independent and motivated toward future work projects. Additionally, the manager could exercise interpersonal understanding by recognizing and respecting the employee's time. Even if the task needs to be done right away, something simple like, "I know you've been working hard on X project, but this census report has come up and is a rush issue. The Dean would like to have it by 3:00 p.m., so could you switch gears and take care of it while I attend this meeting? I'll explain it to you and you can also text me with any questions." If sometimes this feels like too much, keep in mind: the cost of not spending the time to communicate properly is likely to be higher than the cost of being five minutes late to your meeting.

After this, the manager should either allow the employee to send the Dean the report directly (if the manager does not need to check it) or credit the employee's part in the work, particularly if it was something important to the Dean. There is some sense that offering recognition too much starts to make it meaningless, so sometimes managers may want to stick with recognizing people for specific contributions. In this case, fulfilling a last-minute request might be very valuable, even if the task itself was routine. Giving specific credit recognizes not only the employee's skill but also the time they spent on the task.

Consider now the employee questioning, "Can't someone else do this?" While recognition need not be concurrent with every completed task, managers should foster a pattern of pointing out and rewarding employee strengths. If the employee seems really invested in decorating the office for the holidays, the manager should take note; it will make the employee feel less anonymous, and the manager has recognized an additional skill set that can be used to contribute to the department. Later, the manager can explain how planning a new student event takes the same type of skill of balancing elements and being creative, and that

3 We would be remiss if we did not mention that managers should do some self-reflection or "360° feedback" to ensure they are not the toxin in the pool. But for purposes of this article, we will focus on managing other individuals.

is why the manager is asking for this particular employee's help. The employee will feel like the task is accomplishable because they have already done something like it, feel like their skills are relevant, and feel recognized for previous contributions.

The second scenario with Jamie is a bit tougher. When we discussed addressing poor performance in our talk at AACRAO, one audience member asked how to communicate with employees who do not think they are performing poorly. This is never an easy situation and will depend a lot on the particular dynamics of the workplace and whether the manager can objectively back up what they are saying. The second scenario we have posed depicts an employee performing poorly, in part because they are unmotivated, and in part because of a difference in working style.

In this scenario, we would first recommend not expressing irritation with Jamie while others are still present, and instead addressing his behavior and your differences in a private conversation. Depending on your style, you may want to do it closer to the time in which the meeting occurred, so that the conversation is connected to the behavior, or you may wish to wait if you think you would not be able to speak professionally and objectively immediately, or if you think Jamie might become overly defensive. At whatever time you choose, sit down purposefully and focus on the conversation (e.g., don't check your email at the same time).

Next, pay attention to what Jamie said; he thinks the changes are making things worse. Rather than treat this as a flippant, grumpy remark, ask what changes he thinks have been misguided or what it is he thinks would make things better. This line of questioning gives him the opportunity for input in future change, which creates personal buy-in. Jamie may be feeling a bit of *anonymity* and *irrelevance*. It seems as though managers have come in before and disregarded his years of institutional knowledge. Holding on to his methods may be how he "rebels," for lack of a better word.

In conducting the actual conversation, you should have an opening statement that is not too hard or too soft, and that establishes mutual purpose. For example: "Jamie, I'd like to talk about something that's getting in the way of my working with you. It's a tough issue to bring up, but I think it'll help us be better teammates if I do. Is that okay?" Continue by repeating Jamie's concerns to make sure you understand them correctly. Establish clearly what issue you are addressing in the conversation: "Jamie, you have previously expressed that you feel that changes are making things worse. You have also said that you feel you perform the block registration process well, and do not see a need for change. Can you tell me more about why you feel that way so I can understand your perspective?"

Depending on how the conversation proceeds, you may find that Jamie's method of processing block registration is more sensible than you initially considered, and collaborate together on a solution. Or, you may discover Jamie has often been told about system changes without any explanation or conversation that welcomes his input, so he does not feel autonomous and has not had leaders whom he felt rose above the Position level of leadership. Perhaps you would also find out Jamie is being defensive because he is concerned he will not understand a new system as well or complete his work as quickly. In this case, you should offer reassurance and recognition of Jamie's other good work, and ensure you are using informational power to strengthen his feelings of competence. Whatever the underlying issue is, you should show a genuine interest in understanding Jamie's concerns and finding out what will better motivate him. How you choose to move forward should ideally be the result of a joint process of brainstorming, so that Jamie feels invested in the process.

In addressing other specific performance issues, some approaches might be, "Jamie, you consistently show up late to meetings and then are unengaged during the meetings. What's going on?" or "I've noticed that you are hesitant to handle additional responsibilities in meetings, though you have the skills and knowledge to do so. It puts extra work on the team. Are you aware this is a pattern?" At the end of these conversations, make sure that you each leave with a clear understanding of new and higher expectations. Documentation is key.

A Note on Hiring

Workplace leadership and motivation is easier, of course, when you have spent time on good hiring. Hiring team members who are a good fit for your team and institution factors into solid team development. When hiring new team members, Dr. Shipman has found great benefit with the use of behavior-based interview questions. Such questions are aimed at learning about one's past behaviors in specific work situations, with the goal of gaining insight into how one might behave in the future. The questions can also be useful in determining team and organizational fit.[4] Some examples of behavior-based interview questions are below.

1. Describe the job you held in the past that was the most gratifying or the most frustrating.
2. How do you think you can help my department be more productive?
3. Tell me how you would handle multiple projects.
4. Describe a situation in which you have applied your skills to solve a problem.
5. Tell me about your ability to meet aggressive deadlines.
6. How do you go about making important decisions?
7. How do you maintain composure when in the hot seat?
8. Tell me about a time that you made a critical decision without supervision.
9. What do you like to do when you are not at work?
10. What are some of your 3-5 year goals?

It is important to pay attention to the candidate during all aspects of the interview and listen to your instinct, if it is trustworthy. Of the multiple team members Dr. Shipman has hired or interviewed, only one was a spectacular failure, and that bad decision resulted in a multi-year, multi-team, multi-process problem. This was before the days of using behavior-based interview questions. Of course, such questions cannot be considered a fail-safe, but they do lend to the possibility of better hiring.

4 For a discussion of the "right seat on the bus" principle of getting the right people into the right role, see Collins (2001).

Conclusion

A workplace may be able to function at a base level through bureaucratic authority, non-purposeful management, and a staff that constantly needs to be given instructions and pushes to perform. However, research on leadership and motivation indicates it is generally preferable to spend time cultivating a staff that will see the value in their independent initiative and will be happy to work for you. A good delegation and training process is one that is neither rushed nor imbued with the manager's own stress, frustration, and impatience; and, one that appreciates and respects the employee. Leaders must take a sincere and genuine interest in improving interpersonal interactions and addressing motivations in order to increase employee satisfaction and fulfillment.

Do not be afraid to be yourself in this process. We borrow here another maxim from Maxwell (1999): "Share yourself." People like to interact with *real* people, and thus appreciate leaders who share their victories as well as their challenges and struggles...the good and the bad of their journeys. Few people have reached a mountaintop without bruises. Fewer people still are willing to follow and respect those who are too prideful to admit it. If it comes across consistently that you love what you do and know that your purpose is greater than your position, employees will admire and potentially share your motivating attitude.

Find ways to begin focusing now on employee engagement and motivation. You will soon have a team who feels engaged and motivated towards excellence and innovation, and employees who respect their leader and have a full understanding of how their work impacts others. It is never too late to let an employee know how their work makes a difference to the team or organization. It not only confirms for them that their work is important, but that *they* are important. We all want to matter to someone. The workplace is no exception to that truth.

References

Asghar, R. (2014, January 13). What millennials want in the workplace (and why you should start giving it to them). *Forbes*. Retrieved from https://www.forbes.com/sites/robasghar/ 2014/01/13/what-millennials-want-in-the-workplace-and-why-you-should-start-giving-it-to-them/

Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *140*(4), 980-1008.

Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great: Why some companies make the leap... and others don't.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior.* New York: Plenum Publishing Co.

Doran, G. T. (1981). There's a S.M.A.R.T. way to write management's goals and objectives. *Management Review*, *70*(11), 35–36.

Eden, D., & Shani, A. B. (1982). Pygmalion goes to boot camp: Expectancy, leadership, and trainee performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*(2), 194–199.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. H. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), S*tudies in Social Power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research.

Giang, V. (2013, September 9). Here are the strengths and weaknesses of millennials, Gen X, and Boomers. *Business Insider.* Retrieved from http://www.businessinsider.com/how-millennials-gen-x-and-boomers-shape-the-workplace-2013-9

Hancock, A. B., & Rubin, B. A. (2014). Influence of communication partner's gender on language. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 34*(1), 46-64.

Haynes, M. C., & Heilman, M. E. (2013). It had to be you (not me)!: Women's attributional rationalization of their contribution to successful joint work outcomes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39*(7), 956-969.

Lencioni, P. (2007). *The three signs of a miserable job: A fable for managers and their employees.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Manion, J. (2005). *From management to leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Maxwell, J. C. (1999). *The 21 indispensable qualities of a leader.* Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.

Maxwell, J. C. (2011). *The 5 levels of leadership: Proven steps to maximize your potential*. New York, NY: Center Street

Morse, G. (2003). Why we misread motives. *Harvard Business Review, 81*(1), 18-19.

Murayama, K., Matsumoto, M., Izuma, K., & Matsumoto, K. (2010). Neural basis of the undermining effect of monetary reward on intrinsic motivation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 107*(49), 20911-20916.

Patterson, K., Grenny, J., McMillan, R., & Switzler, A. (2012). *Crucial conversations: Tools for talking when stakes are high* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Pollak, L. (2014). *Becoming the boss: New rules for the next generation of leaders.* New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Raven, B. H. (1965). Social influence and power. In I.D. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds.), *Current Studies in Social Psychology* (pp. 371–382). New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Raven, B. H. (2008). The bases of power and the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 8*(1), 1-22.

Zimmerman, D. H., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions, and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne and N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and Sex: Difference and Dominance* (pp. 108-129). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

THERESA GALLO is the Director of Academic Services at Drexel University Kline School of Law. She has spent most of her working life in higher education and, through her years of movement from being a work-study student to her current Director's position, she has learned that it takes a concerted effort and a lot of reflection to be a motivational and respected leader, who is comfortable both with herself and the staff that she leads.

DR. CONNIE R. SHIPMAN has served as registrar at Campbell Law School since June 2014. As registrar, she oversees, manages, and coordinates all student records, registration, grade reporting, and transcripts. Prior to Campbell Law, she served in a variety of roles within higher education administration, including as a visiting professor and supervisor of registrar services, wherein she managed teams across two locations. She has also taught in the public school setting and served within non-profit management, to include roles as program director for the Bertie County Partnership for Children and a consultant to the Washington County Child Advocacy Council. While in non-profit management, she worked collaboratively to raise more than $325,000 in grants related to educational opportunities.

Throughout the years and in particular during her time in higher education, Dr. Shipman has appreciated the knowledge, skills, and abilities gained as a result of opportunities given to build out teams to handle various responsibilities. Because teams were diverse in age, levels of experience, and communication styles, she learned quickly to be flexible, embrace change, and that a focus on people was as important as a focus on tasks and processes. She truly believes that collaboration is key to a successful and productive work environment.

Dr. Shipman holds a B.S. in Child Life Studies and a Master of Public Administration from East Carolina University, as well as a Doctorate in Educational Leadership, with a focus in Higher Education Administration, from Argosy University. Outside of work, her volunteer passion lies in advocacy against child abuse and neglect. She also serves on the board of the National Network of Law School Officers. In her spare time, she likes to blog, spend time with loved ones, read fictional crime thrillers, travel, and write poetry.