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What Do We Know About Faculty?  
A New Way of Looking

ROBERT E. YOUNG

Faculty development puts a focus on individual faculty members, their professional and personal lives. But what do we really know about faculty members? What do we know about how they think and act? What do we know about how they learn and develop in their many roles? In this article, I want to review some of what we do and do not know and propose a way to organize our understanding of faculty members as individuals.

Let me suggest to you that we know a lot. Our own individual experience and growing collective insight provide us considerable understanding. Each issue of the POD Quarterly, each POD conference, and similar publications and meetings add to our knowledge of faculty members and ways to work with them. But this is not all we know. As in any field, we have formal inquiry inside and outside of the field to stimulate and guide us. Among faculty developers and others interested in our work, a slow but steady stream of studies of faculty and ways of influencing them has emerged (e.g., Mann, et. al., 1970; Centra, 1973; Noonan, 1971; Erickson & Erickson, 1977; Young, 1976; Lindquist, 1978; DeSena, 1979). In addition, theorizing and research outside our field bears directly on our attempt to understand faculty members. Investigations in the disciplines, other applied fields, other professional contexts, and at other levels of education all contribute useful knowledge on those things that affect faculty behavior, learning, and development.

All this information, though, presents us a special problem as faculty developers. Theory and research, and often our own experience, are for the most part obscure and inaccessible and certainly not organized in ways useful to thinking and working with faculty members. As we identify the influences on a faculty member's be-
havior, learning, or development—for example, the effect of students—how do they relate to similar observations we have made in the past? How do they relate to what others have seen, either in the course of their experience or in formal investigation? How does this particular influence relate to other kinds of influence, such as colleagues, the consequences of certain ways of responding to students, or the faculty member’s own needs or style? And, how might these influences, separately and together, affect this person or others and our work with them? The answers to these kinds of questions are not always immediately evident, at least not to me.

To make what we know about faculty members more accessible and more organized, I want to suggest a way of looking at individual faculty members, their behavior and their learning and development. We do not have a concept of the individual faculty member which allows us to easily identify and use existing theory and research and our own experience. I want to present a way of viewing whom we work with: the college faculty member. Until we develop such a view, existing knowledge will remain inaccessible, difficult to understand, and hard to apply by most faculty developers.

What the field of faculty development lacks is an integrated view of faculty behavior, learning, and development. Very early in the faculty development “movement” of the 1970s, a concept of faculty development was proposed (Bergquist and Phillips, 1975). The scientists and educators who worked in the field wanted to view faculty as multidimensional in character and see faculty behavior as having many influences. This view would help understand faculty behavior and attempts to change it. Bergquist and Phillips suggested three sets of influences: attitude, process, and structure. Change in faculty behavior would be affected by the attitudes possessed by the faculty member, the processes he employed as a teacher, and the structural environment of the organization in which he worked. In their seminal article they translated these influences into the familiar distinction among personal (faculty), instructional, and organizational development approaches to the improvement of teaching mentioned earlier.

This conceptualization, though, has an important limitation as a way of conceptualizing faculty functioning. It does not provide an integrated view of behavior, development, and learning. To know that a faculty member is person, teacher, and organization member is important, but to understand thought and behavior, either in
specific instances or in developmental sequences, requires a way of pulling these influences together. As faculty developers, we may find it useful to know that a 40-year-old faculty member may be reassessing his career. But to know exactly how that personal characteristic is going to influence behavior, in interaction with other characteristics of the person and the situation, would seem to be even more valuable. A way of conceptualizing this interaction of influences would be helpful to practitioners, since they must deal with behavior that results from this interaction. Also, such an integrated view will indicate where more research should be done, where influences are not well illuminated or interactions well understood.

I want to propose another concept of faculty behavior, which should not supplant the familiar and useful personal-instructional-organizational one, but which helps us understand the interaction of their influence. I propose this way of looking at faculty functioning for three reasons:

1. To give us a conception which allows us to better understand and influence faculty functioning.
2. To try to begin to organize the theory and research applicable to faculty development.
3. To give us a framework to begin to generalize research and theory bearing on faculty development and stimulate research inside and out.

In each area my interest is less to instruct than to stimulate. Creating ways of looking at what we do and with whom we do it, organizing existing knowledge, and suggesting where we need to know more should be useful and valued activities in our field at this time of its development.

_A Model of Faculty Behavior, Learning, and Development_

Recently the study of teaching and teacher development has focused on the teacher in quite different ways than in the past.¹

¹ Much of the new work in the study of teaching teachers has been done at the pre-college level. Much of the thinking in this article has been stimulated by this work; some of the research reported later focuses on teachers and teaching in elementary and secondary schools. Important differences exist between these levels and post-secondary education. But, much is directly applicable (in both directions) or heuristic to our thinking about the teachers and teaching we serve. Useful sources include *Harvard Education Review*, *School Review*, *Teachers College Record*, *Journal of Teacher Education*, and the publications of the American Educational Research Association.
Traditionally we have studied the characteristics of teachers and tried to relate them to student outcomes (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974) and then have tried to find ways to select or develop for these characteristics. Now a new paradigm has emerged. Through the encouragement and work of Lee Shulman and his colleagues at Michigan State University and others, the teacher has begun to be conceptualized as a behaving, learning, thinking, and developing individual. Teaching and student learning are affected by not only teacher characteristics, but also the situation in which the teacher finds himself and the way he processes the information he gets from both. These factors and the way they interact can hinder or facilitate behavior, learning, and development of a faculty member as teacher, researcher, public servant, as well as citizen and family member.

What I want to suggest is that we begin to benefit from this new paradigm, putting our focus on the individual faculty member and taking a close look at the things which influence what he does.

It is useful to look at faculty behavior, learning, or development in terms of episodes. Episodes can be of various dimensions of length and complexity. An episode might be momentary, as descriptive of a single classroom interaction with students. Behavior in a faculty meeting would be an example of a larger episode. An instructional development project, and all the behaving and learning necessary, is an even more extended episode. Finally, the period of a career crisis, in which important development takes place, can be conceived as an episode, as a way of understanding and working with a faculty member.

Though we could describe episodes endlessly, they have one common characteristic: they are formed around a purpose. The classroom episode, for example, might have the purpose of helping students understand a difficult concept. The teacher's characteristics, the situation (including student characteristics), and the thinking and behaving processes employed will all affect the accomplishment of that purpose. The individual's purposes in the faculty meeting, in the instructional development project, and in the career crisis will catalyze the effects of personal and extra-personal factors on thought and action in the episode.

The model described here and represented in Figure 1 has been adapted from a similar conception by Lee J. Cronbach (Cronbach, 1977). Cronbach was trying to explain student behavior, learning, and development. It made immediate sense to apply it to a similar organism: the college faculty member.
As I have been suggesting, action in any episode will be influenced by three general sets of factors: (1) characteristics of the person, (2) the situation, and (3) processes of thinking and behaving (Figure 1). In the instructional development project, the specific needs of the person (for example, for affiliation or achievement), the resources available, and the way he interprets the difficulty of the task will all affect, along with other things, how he behaves and learns during its course. Another influence, and probably the most important, is the interaction of these separate factors. As already suggested, it is how the various influences on a faculty member work together that we need to know about. For to understand and/or be in a position to affect faculty members, we need to know how personal characteristics interact among themselves and with the situation, in the context of thought and action.

As an example of this interaction, the individual characteristic labeled need for achievement (Atkinson, 1964) works together with other characteristics, the nature of the task being pursued (a feature of the situation), and the outcome of performance (a process variable). To be activated by this need, the individual must consider himself responsible for the outcome (success or failure), the task must be one in which success is relatively certain (although with some degree of risk), and there must be explicit knowledge of results. Thus, a faculty member with a high need for achievement may find his motivation enhanced after failure and decreased after success. This same person may not be stimulated to approach tasks, such as new teaching techniques or research, if success is too uncertain. Also, when an activity does not have clear standards for success, as teaching and instructional improvement often do not, it may not be chosen for much time and effort by an individual with a high need for achievement. Hopefully, this kind of knowledge, particularly the way in which factors interact, will be helpful as we try to understand faculty members and intervene with them.

*The Model as a Way of Organizing Theory and Research for Faculty Development*

In addition to being useful in understanding faculty and planning interventions, the model pictured in Figure 1 also may be an effective way to organize and utilize theory and research applicable to faculty development. A framework can assist us to break apart research which deals with many factors, such as the growing body
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Figure 1. A model of faculty behavior, learning, and development.
of work by The Wright Institute (1977) and integrate investigations in diverse areas such as those on personal needs (e.g., Maslow, 1954), organizational features (e.g., Herzberg, 1959), and reward (e.g., Zimmerman, 1965). In this section I will begin to organize the theory and research that underlie faculty development. In each area there exists knowledge from the more general social and behavioral sciences, the specific study of higher education institutions and faculty, the literature of lower schooling, and work directly on faculty development activities and programs. I do this review, in part, to show how it can be done, and, in part, to get on with the job. A next step is to continue the job, and I invite others to join me.

Conditions of Faculty Behavior
The specific conditions that affect faculty behavior are many in number. But with a view that some of these will be characteristic of the person and some characteristics of the situation, we can begin to identify them and understand how they (separately and together) affect learning, development, and behavior.

Characteristics of the Person (Figure 1)
Psychologists often distinguish between trait and state characteristics of the person. These aspects of personal characteristics are often difficult to separate in theory and research, as well as in the practice of recognizing and trying to affect them. For example, anxiety can be either a trait or state characteristic depending on its persistence as an aspect of an individual’s personality (Spielberger, 1972). But the distinction is important because the likelihood of modifying more deeply set trait features would be less than with situation-oriented state characteristics. And we would go about it differently.

Five categories of trait characteristics seem relevant to faculty behavior: needs, concepts, styles, purposes and goals, and abilities. There may be others. For each category, I want to define its para-
meters and mention at least one significant body of theory and/or research.

Needs. Henry Murray's (1938) work on human needs is commendable to faculty development practitioners and researchers because it serves as a basis for much of the work of Nevitt Sanford and his colleagues at the Wright Institute. Sanford's methods and insights about faculty behavior have had a significant influence on many in our field.

Murray developed an extensive taxonomy of needs. It included needs for abasement, achievement, affiliation, autonomy, counteraction, defendance, deference, dominance, exhibition, harmavoidance, infavoidance (to avoid humiliation), nurturance, order, play, rejection, sentience, sex, succorance, and understanding. These needs serve, according to Murray, as the well-springs of thought and behavior (as they interact with the press of the surrounding environment). Individuals—faculty members in our case—can be characterized as having some degree of each one of these needs. Some will facilitate and others may hinder faculty behavior, learning, and development.

The need for achievement, in particular, has been extensively researched (Atkinson, 1964; McClelland, 1953; Weiner, 1972, 1974), some results of which were cited earlier. In addition to Murray's ideas, the work of Maslow (1954), Ardrey (1966), and Shultz (1959) on needs should be mentioned. Although research on the specific needs of college faculty members is limited, the extensive interviewing of professors by the Wright Institute group provides valuable information for faculty developers (see the Wright Institute, 1976).

Concepts. Concepts are those ideas we use to guide our behavior. In working with college faculty members we are most interested in the concepts they carry around in their heads about their job, the institution, themselves, and all the important aspects of each.

The creation of concepts seems to be an important adaptive process for human beings (Bruner, Goodnow, and Austin, 1956; Freud, 1920; Simon, 1957). Since we can deal with only a limited amount of information at any one time (Simon, 1969), we develop representations of reality. We can call these concepts. Our concept of a particular student is only a model of who that student really is. We neither have the time, nor the capacity to deal with all the in-
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formation we could get about him. Hence, we think of him as “lazy” or “bright” or, maybe “bright but lazy.” We use these concepts then to interpret and evaluate new information about this student.

Although an essential and functional human characteristic, the concepts we develop can lead to systematic distortions of perception and limit our capacity to use new information. If as a faculty member, our concept of the institution is that it is not interested in teaching, we may misinterpret and misuse efforts by the school to offer assistance to professors in the area of teaching.

Concepts have been studied in a variety of different ways: as perceptions of self and others (Hieder, 1958; Hunt, 1973), attributions (Jones, et. al., 1972; Weiner, 1972), beliefs (Rist, 1972; Rokeach, 1973), and expectations (Brophy and Good, 1974; Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968). A most general and heuristic way of thinking about concepts is the work by Argyris and Schon (1974). They suggest that “theories of action” influence learning and human interaction. Their formulation may be especially useful to faculty developers because they have developed it explicitly to illuminate the thought and behavior of professionals, such as college teachers.

The concepts which college faculty members have about the important aspects of their life and work have been studied by The Wright Institute (Bloom, et. al., 1973; Brown and Skukraft, 1971; Freedman & Sanford, 1973; Eckert, 1973; Ladd and Lipsett, 1976; and Wilson, Gaff, et. al., 1975). These sources, plus the unpublished work of Jack Noonan at Virginia Commonwealth University, are good places to start to understand this important personal characteristic.

Concepts do not exist in isolation. They are related to other concepts (Hieder, 1958; Hunt, 1971). Brophy and Good (1974) suggest that beliefs about certain methods, e.g., whether to work with students in groups or individually, are related to other beliefs about the nature of learning, teaching, and the social and physical environment. This notion puts theory and research in this area in touch with the growing investigation of cognitive structure (Ausubel, 1963; Gardner, 1972; Piaget, 1970). And it suggests that an understanding of the faculty thinking and behavior will require a recognition of the separate concepts and their relationships to other concepts. In trying to influence faculty thinking, we may be able to identify which are the important ones to “attack.”
**Goals and Purposes.** Purpose has a special place as a personal characteristic. Recall that a basic premise of our model is that behavior is purposive; the organism responds when it has a purpose(s) to accomplish. Purpose guides thought and behavior and, in effect, sets the standard for judging our performance. For example, a faculty member whose purpose or goal is to publish his first article may not attend too closely to announcements of teaching workshops, and he will probably choose to spend his time (from all his alternatives) in his office rather than in a lounge conversation about university governance. Cronbach (1977) discusses further the role of goals in thought and behavior.

Little research has been done on this characteristic since John Dewey (1938) essentially put "purpose" back into American education. This may be because purpose or goals can be considered simply a cognitive representation of the interaction of needs and concepts. The recent work of R. M. W. Travers (1979) on the nature of children's interests may be useful in understanding how purposes and goals are formed and how they influence behavior, learning, and development. Considering the purposes and goals of college faculty members, there has been some descriptive research (Eckert, 1973; Ladd and Lipsett, 1976; Light, 1974; Livesey, 1975; Martin, 1969; Wilson, Gaff, *et al.*, 1975). The purposes of college faculty members are diverse; but a most interesting finding is that the primary interests and goals lie outside the domain of salary, benefits, and reduced obligations (Axelrod, 1973; Freedman, 1973; Freedman, *et al.*, 1976; Sanford, 1971).

**Abilities.** Another trait category has to do with the knowledge and skill a faculty member possesses. These abilities affect behavior, learning, and development in the same way as other characteristics. The theory and research in this area seems simultaneously voluminous and sparse. All the investigation into intelligence (Resnick, 1975), cognitive development (Rohwer, *et al.*, 1974), the effect of previous knowledge and skill (Gagne, 1973) on learning and development would apply here. With little direct research in this area, suffice it to say now that the knowledge and skill that a faculty person possesses can both facilitate and hinder his future learning and development.

**Styles.** Style may best be considered as the exhibition of the interaction of all the personal characteristics described in this section.
The teaching process allows for the satisfaction of a variety of needs, the expression of certain concepts and attitudes, the pursuit of specific purposes, and the exhibition of abilities. Thus, teaching styles may reflect the special collection of these characteristics in individual instructors. Style may also be influenced by situation, such as the course being taught. But it should be considered a personal trait characteristic, because it seems to have an enduring nature in influencing the behavior of the individual.

Styles of teaching have been discussed extensively in the past few years, and theory and research on the subject are as accessible as any to faculty developers (Adelson, 1961; Axelrod, 1973; Bergquist and Phillips, 1975; Mann, et al., 1970; and Wilson, Gaff, et al., 1975). Of all these descriptions of teaching, Axelrod's may be of most interest because it seems most complex and most suggestive of style as interaction of needs, beliefs, and situational factors.

That does it for trait characteristics; now I want to suggest five categories of state characteristics: stage of development, defense mechanisms, arousal, mental set, and health. Again, state factors are those characteristics of the person that exist at certain times, for certain tasks, under certain circumstances.

Stage of development. An individual behaves differently at different stages of his development. In part this has to do with the different situations he finds himself in as he moves through his life. Psychologists and other observers of human development have identified predictable sequences of development along which the individual holds quite different personal characteristics. These characteristics, in turn, affect behavior, learning, and development. Theories and research on stages of ego development, particularly in the adult years, have been read widely by faculty developers and used in their work with faculty. The ideas of Erikson (1950, 1959), Loevinger (1966, 1969), Levinson (1973, 1978), and the popular account by Sheehy (1977) have gotten the most attention. Of these Levinson's seems most applicable, particularly since Hodgkinson (1974) has tried to apply Levinson's ideas to the development of college faculty members and administrators. The Wright Institute group (see Ralph, 1973) has also developed insights into stages of faculty development based on extensive interviews with hundreds of faculty members. This is a particularly useful body of theory and research because it considers not only stage of developmental char-
acteristics but also the academic culture in which this development takes place and influences behavior, learning, and subsequent development.

*Defense Mechanisms.* Other ego psychologists have described situation-based defense strategies (A. Freud, 1946). These defense mechanisms include: *regression* (adopting more primitive forms of thought and action), *repression* (dismissal from consciousness of disturbing memories and impulses toward action), *projection* (unacceptable impulses, thoughts, or actions are attributed to another person), *denial* (failure to recognize or admit the occurrence of a specific action), and *rationalization* (reintegration of actions to make them more compatible with self-image). The list is longer. The defense used depends on the type and quantity of stress present. Defense mechanisms are an important set of state characteristics because they characterize the way a person will behave in a particular situation. They also serve as an aspect of style, the trait characteristic described in the previous section (Witkin, *et al.*, 1962; The Wright Institute, 1976).

*Arousal.* The central nervous system is, at any time, in a particular state of arousal. The nature of arousal and consequent alertness will be determined by other personal characteristics (knowledge, goals, beliefs, attitudes, and needs) and situational factors. Arousal theory (Duffy, 1950) suggests that the optimum level of stimulation for learning and effective action varies across time. This happens because we adjust to any constant sensory output; when the environment *stays too constant* or *changes too fast*, our receptors will shut off and not take in the information available. (Ever wonder why you get bored?) This may help us understand why faculty members (as well as students) do not remain alert in our work with them or over longer episodes of their lives. Their situation may be too constant (or too fluid) at this important sensory level.

*Mental set.* Mental or psychological set refers to the way in which an individual is prepared to receive new stimuli, whether that be a lecture from a teacher, a fast ball from a pitcher, or a kiss from one’s companion. Mental set has much to do with traits such as concepts, attitudes, and purposes and states such as arousal. It, like style, may be amalgam characteristic.

*Health.* We all know that physical health has some effect on behavior, ability to learn, and prospects for development. Protein-calorie intake seems to affect neuromotor responses and capacity to
benefit from intellectual stimulation and novel stimuli (Hurley, 1969 and Levitsky, 1971 in Ball, 1977). No research, though, comes to mind which relates health to the behavior of persons such as college professors.

**Characteristics of the Situation** (Figure 1)

The second major class of conditions that affect faculty behavior have to do with the situation in which the person—that collection of trait and state characteristics—finds himself. Two major approaches to theory and research have developed to explain the influence of situation.

The *interaction* approach, taken by social psychologists, is similar to the study of state characteristics of individuals. But the reference point is the situation or environment rather than the person. The most influential “interactionist” has been Kurt Lewin. Lewin suggested that the environment plays an important role in behavior, but that the same environment will have different effects on different individuals. Personal factors cause the differences. The social psychologists will argue that changing behavior is best done by changing the environment, but knowing how the person views the environment must first be known. Lewin’s research program was extensive (Lewin, 1946, 1948). And his ideas have spawned other bodies of theory and research, including the work by Heider (1958) on personal perception and interpersonal relationships and Festinger (1957) on motivation. Most familiar to faculty developers is the work of Sikes, *et al.* (1974).

The second major approach, I will call the *situational elements* approach. It acknowledges the importance of interaction but focuses its attention on the elements of the situation itself. The specific elements I want to discuss include: the physical environment; the social environment which itself includes other persons, groups, organizations, and social systems; and the tasks that occasion behavior, learning, and development. The point here is that the characteristics of these elements of the situation influence behavior, learning, and development.

**Physical Environments.** Physical environment affects behavior; there’s no doubt about that (Hall, 1966; Sommer, 1969). Faculty members’ classrooms, laboratories, the buildings they work in, and the very appearance and layout of their campus may have some influence on the way they think and act. Size, shape, color, lighting,
although possibly not significant factors, may have something to do with enthusiasm, effectiveness, and satisfaction for many college faculty members.

Structural changes in the classroom will affect teacher behavior, which in turn affects student behavior and learning (Brophy and Good, 1974; Rist, 1973). Something as simple as different seating arrangements can result in different behavior, probably as conditioned by other personal and situational characteristics (Adams and Biddle, 1970).

Other Persons. Other human beings and our relationships with them affect behavior. For college faculty members, these relationships would be with students, faculty, peers, administrators, faculty members, and friends. Considerable literature exists to help us understand these relationships and how they affect behavior. First, the general body of theory and research on interpersonal relationships will be applicable here (Dashiell, 1935; Newcomb, 1961; Schmuck and Schmuck, 1975).

More specifically, we know that teachers are affected by students (Brophy and Good, 1974; Hunt, 1971). Students of different characteristics do lead teachers to behave in different ways. Extensive studies by Wilson, Gaff, et. al. (1975) and Bloom, Ralph, and Freedman (1973) can be especially helpful to faculty developers in understanding the effects of students on faculty members’ behavior.

An individual’s peers serve as another source of influence in the social environment. The most intriguing general theory and research in this area is on modeling (Bandura, 1969). Human beings seem to be influenced by the example of others with whom they identify. The effect which a peer will have on behavior, learning, and development of a faculty member will be determined by the faculty member’s perception of the peer’s abilities, his self-concept and aspirations, and his social relationship with the peer.

Administrators, in individual relationships with faculty members, provide another influence. The scholarship in this area appears to be growing (Shtogren, 1978). The studies of most interest here will be those which describe characteristics of chairmen, deans, and others as managers. McGregor (1960), for example, suggests that managers’ implicit theories about how and why humans behave in work settings affect their relationships with employees, which, in turn, can affect the employees’ behavior, learning, and development.
Finally, *family* and *friends* affect how a faculty member will behave in a particular instance and develop over a longer period of time. No studies that refer to college faculty members could be found. But, the general sociological and psychological literature on family relations is growing and can be useful.

*Groups.* Groups develop *norms*, and norms have an impact on behavior. This notion is central to the literature of sociology and social psychology. The theory and research in these disciplines serve as the guide to understanding how groups and their norms affect behavior and the variety of other personal and social factors that influence these effects (Hartup, 1970; Schmuck and Schmuck, 1975; Whyte, 1943).

The literature focused on higher education and faculty members is quite large in this area. The studies by Burton Clark (1962) and Nevitt Sanford and his colleagues of faculty culture are exemplary. A professor is drawn to particular groups because of his interests (purposes and goals) and needs. And, faculty groups with differing orientations will have different influences on an individual member’s behavior, learning, and development.

In studies of specific practical interest, Sikes, *et. al.* (1974) worked with teams of faculty members to create the norms, values, and perspectives necessary to foster change on a campus. And, Young (1976) found that peer group support had a significant impact on a faculty member’s willingness to participate in instructional improvement activities.

*Organizations.* Formal organizations such as colleges and universities have formal and informal *structures* and *procedures* which influence the behavior of persons who work in them. Much of what we know about groups and how norms affect behavior will help us understand the influence of organizations. But, the special role of organizational factors is to affect how one does work in a particular setting. The literature on organizations is vast and growing, especially that which deals with higher education (Argyris, 1962; Balderston, 1975; Baldrige, 1971; Katz and Kahn, 1967). With organizations in mind, the ideas of Herzberg (1959) and other on *sources of work satisfaction and dissatisfaction* are very useful in understanding faculty behavior and as a basis for influencing it. Aebi (1972) tested Herzberg’s theory with college professors and administrators. He found it generally applicable, with work itself the
greatest satisfier and working conditions the greatest source of dissat­
satisfaction. Similar studies have been done in a variety of types of
institutions: general (Ballyeat, 1968; Wilson, Gaff, et. al., 1975), com­
community colleges (Cohen, 1974; Gloster, 1975), and private
liberal arts colleges (Morris, 1972). Also, theory and research in
organizational development applies here. Suffice it to say for this
review that this has become an active area of application, theorizing,
and research (Bennis, 1966, 1969; Blake and Mouton, 1964; Boyer
al., 1958; Miles, 1964; Sarason, 1972; Sikes, 1974).

Finally, organization does not have to be treated only at the
institutional level. Consider that our classrooms can have different
organizational patterns, which provide frameworks for interaction
and affects faculty and student behavior (Brophy and Good, 1974;

Social System. Social systems larger than organizations influence
how power and information are distributed among individuals. And,
this distribution has a lot to do with how rewards are perceived and
parceled out. The systems of most interest to faculty members are
their disciplines, the profession (Feuer, 1963; Light, 1974; Livesey,
1975), American higher education (Jencks and Riesmann, 1968;
Newmann, 1971), and the larger society (Hofstadter, 1963).

Task. In addition to these elements of the situation and their in­
teraction, the other major situational factor is the task(s) that occa­
sions behavior, learning, and development. The task will be some
form of teaching, scholarship, or service. Professional development
activities are also among the tasks that faculty members face.

The literature in this area will be diffuse. Descriptions of the
various elements of teaching (goals, methods, evaluation proce­
dures) and their influence on the teacher’s behavior will be relevant
here, and the same with scholarly activities and other tasks that
faculty members face. Most of these studies will probably be in the
form of evaluations of teaching approaches, research programs, and
service projects, where the effect on the faculty member is ex­
amined. Also, professional development activities—considered as
tasks—have generated a growing literature (e.g., Brown and Har­
ger, 1976; Case, 1976; O’Banion, 1974).

The influence of task as a situation condition will most likely be
very complex. We have already seen that its effect—whether some­
one will even attempt it—depends on the interaction of its difficulty
and the nature of the person's need for achievement. In addition, as Lewin suggests, the task will be responded to as "perceived" by the person, which has something to do with personal characteristics and information processing capabilities. Thus, the task we ask a faculty member to perform may not be the same task he pursues.

Processes of Faculty Behavior (Figure 1)

The behavior, learning, and development of college faculty members—the focus of our programs and research—are influenced not only by trait and state characteristics of the person and the situation in which the person finds himself, but also by cognitive and behavioral processes as well. Processes can be separated into three sets of activity that takes place during an episode of behavior: thinking (involving perception, interpretation, and planning of responses), behavior (the "provisional try") and responding to the consequences of behavior (observing and judging consequences). These processes can be thought to occur sequentially in any behavior episode. As a result of the sequence, learning takes place, and over a series of episodes development occurs.

Thinking. When a person finds himself in a certain situation with a need to satisfy, his sensing mechanisms begin to receive information. Almost immediately, he begins to use existing personal characteristics such as purposes, concepts, and knowledge to filter this information, deciding which to use and which to discard. But this sensing process, which we call perception has important characteristics itself.

Perception involves an active ordering of sensory information. The human organism looks for the simplest pattern that will summarize the principle features (cues) in the situation. Though it's hardly ever the case that all of our students are inattentive, our perception might read the situation as "they sure look bored today." Structuring can be error prone (Bartlett, 1932); patterns used may neglect important details (e.g., "I only looked at those students in the back row."), may distort relations (e.g., "It's 100 degrees in this room."), or may freeze interpretation (e.g., "There's no reason to go on, they're too bored."). Accurate perception is a matter of attending to the chief sections, dominant elements, the important forces at work in the situation. In other words, it's a matter of "reading the right cues."

The cues we do read will depend on personal and task character-
istics. Our purposes and goals will determine what we perceive and how close we attend. And, perception is affected by the nature of the stimulus itself. Knowing about the nature of perception we may use it or alter it so as to increase the probability that certain information—certain features of the physical and social environment and task—are received and attended to by faculty with whom we work.

Once information is received it must be analyzed and used to direct behavior. The basic processes at this point include assessing the situation, identifying possible responses, and choosing the best alternative to try out (although the best one may be to do nothing). This is called interpretation. Personal characteristics actively affect behavior at this stage of the thinking process.

In assessing the situation, the limitations of the human organism to process information are again confronted (Simon, 1969). With this limited capacity, it is necessary to use some information and not others. If we believe that students are lazy, then our job of assessing each person on this characteristic is reduced. We just assume it and behave accordingly. Another way we limit the information available is by using relatively few of the cues available. Physicians making diagnoses often come to decisions after inspecting one or two pieces of information (Shulman and Elstein, 1973).

Interpretation determines what needs to be done in the episode. Next the individual must identify possible responses. Here is where knowledge and skill and style affect behavior. The person searches his memory for applicable knowledge and skills and style-oriented responses, and if the search is successful, he has the basis for responding. Considerable theory and research exists on memory processes. Storage and retrieval from memory are the principle issues, and the outcome of behavior episodes is often determined by how successfully information was stored and/or retrieved (Ausubel, 1963; Lindsay and Norman, 1972; Norman and Rumelhart, 1975). A faculty member who knows about a number of models of teaching or a variety of research designs, and who can retrieve them from memory (or the appropriate references), is in a position to respond when the situation, as he has perceived and assessed it, demands a particular teaching or research approach.

Possible responses can come from a source other than one’s own memory, a source extremely important to faculty developers. That
source is direct instruction or training. Thus, a campus workshop, individual consultation, reading, or observing another faculty member can be thought of as simply a matter of gaining potential responses for future use. The research in micro-teaching (Allen and Ryan, 1969) and the theories and investigations into observational learning (Bandura, 1969), the research on learning from text (McConkie, 1977), and the work of Gagne and others on direct instruction will be relevant here.

Finally, once responses appropriate to the situation have been identified either from memory or the “outside,” the best alternative must be chosen. The consequences that would likely follow each possible response are considered, and that one which seems to produce the most favorable consequence is chosen. Some theorists suggest that in situations individuals actually try to visualize responses and consequences as a way of deciding which one to use.

Once interpretation has taken place, chosen responses are integrated into a plan for behavior. The idea of “plans” as a way of conceptualizing this intersection of thought and action was suggested by Miller, Galanter, and Pribram (1960) and the subsequent work on human judgment and decision making (see Shulman and Elstein, 1973). Recently, the planning activities of instructors both inside and outside of class has begun to receive systematic study. Yinger (1977) has studied how teachers turn information about students, materials, their own needs, and other sources into behavior plans. Yinger’s research focuses on public school teaching, but his findings raise interesting questions for those who work with college teachers. How do they actually plan and what does that mean for how we might assist them?

**Behavior.** The processes of behavior involve turning plans into action. If the individual so decides, the results of perception and interpretation must be turned into motor responses; the brain must send appropriate signals to the muscles to perform the desired movements. I want to say little more than that about this category of processes. I assume for the purpose of this paper that once plans are formed, behavior in the form of motor responses is relatively automatic.

**Responding to Consequences.** Each of our actions result in some form of consequence. Our task is to observe that consequence and judge it as to whether it matches the goal or need for which we be-
gan the behavior episode. Through this process of observing and judging, we gain knowledge of the effects and sufficiency of the response just tried; and this knowledge is stored for use when we find ourselves in the same situation again. In other words, we have learned something.

We can observe the consequences of our behavior in at least three ways: through direct perception, by observing the effects of the behavior, or by the comments of others. The same mechanisms of perception and attention are involved as earlier in the episode. In judging consequences we use our whole range of personal characteristics, especially needs, concepts, and purposes to determine if the results of our actions have been satisfactory.

Feedback and its use has been extensively studied (Bilodeau and Bilodeau, 1961; Bandura, 1969; Glaser, 1971; Hammond and Summers, 1972; Kagan, 1967; Skinner, 1968). Feedback to teachers has also been investigated (Allen and Ryan, 1969; Fuller and Manning, 1973; Good and Brophy, 1974). In the study of college teachers, Chickering (1969) found that presenting faculty with survey feedback from studies of student development served as a catalyst for change. And, Centra (1973) used student ratings for the same effect. Upon observing the consequences of their teaching (student ratings) and judging them against their goals (to achieve a certain standard of effectiveness), teachers for whom the discrepancy was large exited that particular episode dissatisfied and with the vow to "try again."

In these sections on Conditions and Processes, I have tried to point out important aspects of each. In addition, I have tried to suggest and portray the interactive nature of the factors which affect faculty members. My purpose has been to show how a way of thinking about faculty behavior, learning, and development can help us organize theory and resources potentially useful to us.

This brings me to the final section of this presentation. Further research and theorizing need to be done. The question is what research? And in what areas? Theory building also needs focus if it is going to be useful to practitioners and suggestive to researchers. As I have already proposed, the model of faculty behavior, learning, and development advanced in this paper can serve as a framework for identifying interesting and important issues to investigate.
The Model as a Way of Stimulating Further Research and Theorizing

As we try to use the model (Figure 1) in our work with faculty, I hope we will very quickly discover things we would like to know about conditions and processes and their separate and interactive effects on faculty functioning. In this section I want to identify just a few of the areas in which this might happen. Again, I make no attempt to be exhaustive at this point, just illustrative.

Research on Conditions

Personal Characteristics. One overriding question needs further investigation: "How do personal characteristics affect professional practice?" The review of the previous section begins to provide an answer. But we need more study focused directly on college faculty members. As an example, other needs on Murray's list might be explored. The special environment ("press") of the academic world make a couple of his categories especially interesting to pursue: need for affiliation and need for dominance. Also, investigation into the stages of growth of groups of faculty other than white males would be helpful. The development of women and minority members of our faculty should indicate significant different patterns since as a state characteristic, its nature will depend importantly on the nature of the situation in which this development takes place.

Situation. The major question here reverses the equation pursued in the area of personal characteristics: How does the situation affect the personal characteristics, thought, and behavior of faculty members? Here we are interested in factors affecting one's professional duties and personal life. The growing interest in faculty "vitality" (Kirschling, 1978) anticipates the need to consolidate what we know about the effects of social and physical environment and tasks on faculty behavior, learning, and development and to pursue new understanding.

The physical aspects of the situation may be a propitious place to focus our attention: they may be the easiest and most straightforward to alter. It's often easier to get new furniture for an entire building than it is to get one new junior faculty position. The burgeoning work of the environmental psychologists (Sommer, 1969 and others), and the ideas of interior designers and architects, will be suggestive to theory and research in this area. Also, the tasks
which faculty members face deserve more study. Especially interest-
ing will be some understanding of how teaching, research, ser-
vice, and professional development activities are “perceived” as
tasks to be accomplished. And, how do personal characteristics, in
addition to need for achievement, affect this perception? And, which
tasks are most effective in influencing behavior, learning, and de-
velopment in particular ways?

Research on Processes

I would like to suggest two specific areas of research with re-
spect to cognitive and behavioral processes. First, the issue of per-
ception seems important. What cues do faculty members (as indi-
viduals and a group) read when they interact with their various
environments—e.g., students in classrooms, colleagues as faculty
members, administrators in person or image, faculty developers por-
trayed in a brochure. And, how can we influence the cues to which
faculty attend? The work by Slovic (1971), Brophy and Good
(1974), and May and Lumsdaine (1958) will help us get started in
pursuing these questions. The other process area of some need for
research and conceptualization is that of planning. What infor-
mation and strategies do faculty members use as they plan their teach-
ing, research, and campus and off-campus activities. The work by
Yinger (1978) can get us started. Information in this area could
significantly assist us as we decide how to suggest to teachers that
they do their planning and decide which classroom skills need most
attention.

Overall any study which focuses directly on faculty in a way that
illuminates the effect of conditions and processes and their inter-
action will be valuable. Formal and informal investigations will be
useful. A particularly fertile source of new information could be the
evaluations of faculty development programs and activities. If we
will turn part of our attention to the fundamental conditions of
faculty behavior, learning, and development, as they influence and
are influenced by other conditions and processes, we can generate
significant and useful insights into not only our programs but the
functioning of our faculty as well. And, with the kind of framework
I have tried to propose in this paper, those insights can be shared
and benefit a progressively more knowledgeable and effective facul-
ty development field.
WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT FACULTY
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