



6/3/2021

**FACULTY EXPERIENCE WITH MOTIVATING
AND INHIBITING FACTORS OF ONLINE
TEACHING: THE CASE OF TWO UNIVERSITIES
IN BAKU**

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of Master of Arts in
Education Management



Rabiya Suleymanli

ADA UNIVERSITY

BAKU, AZERBAIJAN

ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this research is to investigate the motivating and inhibiting factors that affect faculty's online teaching experience at two Baku Universities. During the special quarantine regime caused by COVID 19, all higher educational institutions in Azerbaijan transferred to online teaching. The analysis of the prior research works showed a lack of research on faculty motivation for online education and a lack of methodological approaches to measuring faculty's motivation levels. This research's main target is to identify motivating factors for faculty in online teaching. It also explored barriers to online teaching in order to understand inhibiting factors for faculty. The research work covers two Universities in Baku- University A, and University B.

During the research, semi-structured interviews and document analysis were used as qualitative research methods to explore faculty's experience regarding online teaching. Moreover, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a dean and program director to understand the university management's role in faculty motivation. Twelve faculty members from different departments, one program director, and one dean participated in the interview process. Based on the interviews, the study explores motivating (extrinsic and intrinsic) and inhibiting (extrinsic and intrinsic) factors for faculty in their online teaching experience. Main motivational factors for instructors are: overall job satisfaction, administrative and technical support, students' active participation, technological advantages, trainings. Major demotivating (inhibiting) factors for university instructors are: lack of IT skills, cheating in exams, dissatisfaction with the change of form of contact, malfunction of platforms, weak internet connection. One major result of the research is that the role of administration is important for university instructors. At the end of the

study, some limitations and recommendations for further research are pointed out. Research findings can be helpful for further research on online teaching in the Azerbaijani context.

Keywords: Online teaching, motivating factors, inhibiting factors, faculty's experience, university.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am very thankful to my supervisors Dr. Vafa Kazdal and Dr. Ulviyya Mikailova, who have been supportive of my career goals and who worked actively to provide me with important guidance and support.

I am grateful to Dr. Tamilla Mammadova and Dr. Maurus Roller whom I had the pleasure to work with during my research. Each of my Thesis Committee members provided me with extensive personal and professional guidance and taught me a great deal about scientific research. I came to learn many new things; and I am really thankful to them.

Nobody has been more important to me in the pursuit of this research than my family. I want to thank my parents; despite their busy schedule, they helped me a lot to gather all the different information, collect data and motivate me from time to time. My sister gave me ideas of how to make this research unique.

The word count: 13.300

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	5
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
The Methodology of the Review	9
Findings from Previous Studies	9
Conclusion	17
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	21
FINDINGS	25
Interviews with Dean and Program Director.	25
Interviews with Faculty.....	30
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	38
Motivation Theory; Hygiene Factors	38
Motivation Factor.....	40
Level of Motivation	41
Online Teaching Barriers and the Role of Administration.....	42
Document Review.....	45
CONCLUSION	48
REFERENCES	50
APPENDIX 1	53
APPENDIX 2	55

INTRODUCTION

Online teaching is being considered one of the forms of distant education (Major, 2015). Blotzer and Michal (2000) believe that distance education is any learning environment where physical separation occurs between teachers and students. Modern technologies, and networking systems enable learners to study materials and to take courses in an online form.

The World Health Organization (WHO) officially declared COVID-19 as a pandemic on March 11, 2020 (50 Online Education Statistics, 2020). After the official declaration, schools and universities had closed their doors and transfer to online teaching. Online teaching enables educators to reach learners anywhere and anytime (Adebo, Philip, 2018). About 70% of the students worldwide were affected by the new path to online teaching (50 Online Education Statistics, 2020). Teachers have become critical components in online education growth and success (American Council on Education, 2003). As the demand for online teaching is growing, the study of what can motivate and demotivate faculty to teach online becomes more significant.

Problem Definition

The current situation (Covid-19) is being accepted as a radical change for both universities and students. Since the trend is dramatically increasing and an unpredictable case for many countries, universities and faculty in Azerbaijan have experienced challenges in adopting the new educational environment. This unexpected radical shift from face-to-face education to online teaching creates a demand for a deep understanding of the faculty's online teaching experience.

Research Question:

The research work mainly focusses on to explore the motivational and inhibiting factors for faculty during the COVID-19 pandemic. Hence, one main research question was developed. The main aim of this study is to find reliable answer to this question:

What are the factors that motivate or inhibit faculty in their online teaching experience during the pandemic?

Laws

Yet, distance learning was strategized by the Azerbaijan Ministry of Education even before the impact of COVID 19 pandemic. Based on the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Azerbaijan on "Rules of the Organization of Formal Education," formal education can be carried out full-time and part-time. What is more, distance and free (external) forms of education have been defined (Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Azerbaijan, 2010). Even though Azerbaijani universities overwhelmingly preferred face-to-face teaching, unexpected changes in educational sectors emphasized the importance of online teaching.

According to Article 25 of the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan "On Sanitary and Epidemiological Safety" (February 28, 2020) and to the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Azerbaijan- "Rules of Consideration of the Organization, Prevention, and other Necessary Measures" - all educational institutions operating in the Republic of Azerbaijan must continue teaching and educational process in the distance form from November 2, 2020. This decision was valid until December 2020 (Asadov, 2020). Using online teaching was a necessary measure due to COVID-19. On April 20, 2021, the Ministry of Education of Azerbaijan has officially legalized distance learning in Higher Education. Universities still continue online teaching and online teaching is being taught almost for one year.

Previous Studies

Many researchers have studied the faculty's online teaching experience. Previous studies about online teaching focused on collecting quantitative data using surveys with close-ended questions (Muilenburg & Berge, 2001; Schifter 2000; Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner 2009).

Although some researchers have used mixed methods such as questionnaires and interviews (O'Quinn & Corry, 2002), more qualitative research projects are needed to understand faculty's online teaching experience in depth. Besides, the lack of research on online education in the Azerbaijani context is the main reason for conducting this research. The study on "Faculty' Experience with Motivating and Inhibiting Factors on Online Teaching" aims to gain a deeper understanding of faculty experience in two Azerbaijani Universities using exploratory research design. The name of Universities will be stayed anonymous to ensure the privacy of faculty members and management.

The thesis work contains six sections: introduction, literature review, research methodology, results, findings and discussion, and conclusion. The literature review part presents and critically analyzes the previous literature related to faculty online teaching experience. The study presents detailed information about the chosen methodology, research methods, sampling techniques, and target population in the research methodology section. Results present the primary research findings, results of semi-structured interviews and of the document review conducted during the study. The findings and discussion section critically evaluate the preliminary results and research findings, and with this reference to the literature review. The conclusion aims to summarize the study's main results and to consider them in the context of its research question and objectives.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nowadays, technology is playing an important role in the teaching and learning environment. Higher Educational institutions worldwide offer online classes for different levels of academic degrees. Many recent studies have already defined online teaching as distance education (Vaughan, Norman 2010; Kim 2014). All meetings for delivering the instruction via electronic or print communications media to learners engaged in a planned process in different places and times have been accepted as distance education (Moore, 1990). Distance education can be delivered via online courses, using television, correspondence, or videotapes (Moore, 1990). Traditional education is a face-to-face form of education. Online teaching, however, is a form of teaching that is delivered over the Internet. As we have YouTube or servers and services to up- and download any kind of data (recordings, clips, films, anything of the kind), we are not currently using videotapes. And instead of using TV, we are using up-to-date technology, namely laptops to teach via learning platforms- the internet Microsoft Teams, Blackboard, Zoom meetings etc.

Almost every sector in the world has been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Thus, online teaching emerged as a workable and safe choice for the educational area. Referring to 50 Online Education Statistics (2020), the global online teaching market has already seen massive annual global growth even before the pandemic. According to Technavio statistics (2018), the U.S. online teaching market will be expected to grow to \$6.22 US billion between 2017 and 2022.

Kim (2014) categorized distance education into three types of service delivery: traditional distance education, computer-based education, online education. Audio- and videotapes or paper-based materials though the postal services are the tools for traditional distance education. Computer-based education utilizes a hard drive or CD-ROM material. Online education also called Web-based education or Internet-based education is using the Internet to deliver the classes and

courses. If computer-based education is offered through the Internet, it is called online education (Kim,2014). Online teaching can be delivered asynchronously and synchronously. For asynchronous online instruction, instructors do not need to interact with students in real-time. So, students are not obliged to join their classes at the predefined time. So, synchronous online teaching, by contrast, is characterized by student's and instructors' real-time interaction (Martinez, 2004).

The Methodology of the Review

The research studies used for this literature review, pointed out the motivating and inhibiting factors for university faculty. Four databases were used as sources to access the relevant research studies: ADA Library, Education Abstracts Full Text Wilson, Google-Scholar, JSTOR. The review focused on updated data and new research sources (years 2000-2020). Keywords included; online teaching, motivating factors, inhibiting factors, barriers, faculty, universities. Overall, thirty sources were reviewed, and four of them were discarded because of -irrelevant content. Nine studies discuss the faculty's approach to online teaching most importantly (Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner, A.: 2009; Major, 2010; Cooperman 2017, etc.). One study presents a general analysis of both student's and facultys' perspectives (Valentine, 2002). For this literature review, even though many countries had online teaching experiences too, the USA was purposefully chosen as research context and point of reference since the U.S. American educational system had a well-known online teaching experience long before the pandemic.

Findings from Previous Studies

One of the most appropriate ways of understanding the experience of faculty with the online teaching environment can be to define the motivation and inhibiting factors for instructors related to online teaching. The majority of the reviewed studies analyze the long list of

motivational factors for faculty; they have been analyzed in this literature review (see Table 1 at the end of the literature review. Motivators for instructors were divided into two main categories: intrinsic and extrinsic. Moreover, the several barriers for faculty to online teaching have been evaluated in this paper (Table 1). Barriers for faculty have been discussed under two categories: extrinsic barriers and intrinsic barriers. The terms *barriers*, *inhibiting factors*, and *demotivating factors* for online teaching were used interchangeably in this research.

Motivation Theory

Various researchers have conceptualized and defined the term "Motivation." According to More, Wegner, and Miller (2003), motivation usually energizes people to take action, and people tend to make choices as part of their goal-oriented behavior. Fuller, Valacich, and George (2008) defined motivation as an individual's direction, intensity, and persistence to achieve a particular goal. Motivation sometimes is related to personal needs, the effort of individual, organizational goals. For instance, according to Saraswathi (2011), motivation is enthusiasm to gather a high level of action toward the organizational goal, determined by the ability to satisfy a person's need.

There are different motivation theories related to the workplace of individuals. Researchers have categorized these theories into two groups: content theories and process theories. The content theory focuses on factors and needs of workers that encourage them to behave and perform well. This theory supports the idea that all employees have the same set of needs, and organizations can predict their needs to understand motivated employees' characteristics (Lynnee,2012). On the other hand, process theory emphasizes employees' behavior and performance-driven by individual needs (Lynne, 2012). A person becomes satisfied with work when his or her expectations and requirements are met in his career.

One of the well-known theories is Frederick Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory that was developed in 1959. Two hundred workers' feedback had been collected in the USA to design Two-Factor Theory. This theory was developed based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs; nevertheless, it finalizes more factors that are being used to measure an individual's motivation in the workplace. The reason why this theory was used for this research is that the intended purpose of the research is in agreement with Herzberg's theory. Identifying the motivating factors for workers will be more systematic by categorizing motivators as Herzberg's theory. Two-factor theory can be helpful for organizations to increase the job satisfaction of workers and remove hygiene stressors. Herzberg's findings revealed that factors related to employees working attitudes and performance could be categorized under two sets (Herzberg,1968). He called them Motivation & Hygiene Factors: Motivation factors (also called intrinsic factors) cause satisfaction of employees, and it includes recognition for achievement, interest in the job, responsibility for the task, advancement to higher-level study, and growth. According to Herzberg (1968), recognition for achievement means that supervisors and peers must provide recognition of employee success. An employee should have a sense of achievement for his/her job. Interest in a job means that the job should be exciting and challenging to keep the employee motivated. Responsibility for tasks indicates that an employee takes responsibility for his or her completion of work. Growth suggests that a job should provide opportunities for learning new skills.

On the other hand, Hygiene factors include company policies and administration, interpersonal relationships, quality of supervision, work conditions, and salary (Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene, 2014) (also called extrinsic factors). They are needed to prevent workers' dissatisfaction. The absence of Hygiene factors leads to dissatisfaction; at the same time, their existence does not lead to a higher level of motivation among employees. Company policy is

defined by Herzberg (1968) as equivalency, fairness in policies; company policy must be clear to every employee. Quality of supervision indicated that enough autonomy should be introduced to workers with appropriate and fair management. The relationship should be healthy, hospitable, and equitable between peers and superiors. The working environment is also essential; the workplace should be well equipped with necessary tools, and the environment should be safe and hygienic. Finally, the salary of workers should be competitive with other organizations in the same industry.

According to Herzberg (1968), if there are high hygiene and low motivation in the workplace, employees have few complaints about the job, but they are not motivated at all. The second scenario - low hygiene and low motivation - is an unfavorable one where employees are unmotivated and have many complaints. In the third scenario - low hygiene and high motivation, employees are motivated to work, but they have some complaints. The ideal situation for employees is where there are high hygiene and high motivation. In this case, they are motivated workers without complaints.

Intrinsic Motivators

SDT is a self-determination theory developed by Ryen and Deci (2020). The SDT framework helps understand the facilitators or undermining factors for intrinsic motivation and extrinsic motivation in the context of educational settings. SDT argues that intrinsic motivation allows people to do something "for their own sake," or for the sake of their internal interest and enjoyment (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Intrinsic motivators are being considered influential factors for faculty's motivation. Intrinsic motivators are when a person engages in an activity because of their own sake rather than expecting external rewards (Lee, Reeve, Xue, Xiong, 2012). Intrinsic motivators help faculty to fulfill their self-actualization needs. This motivation includes personal motivation to use innovations, overall job satisfaction, or the flexibility of location for delivering

courses (Cook, et. all, 2009; Schifter, 2000). Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner (2009) and Schifter (2000) used survey results to analyze faculty's motivational factors. According to mentioned studies, instructors are motivated to use innovations, because they believe innovations are powerful tools to make the classes more interactive. Flexible location means that faculty can deliver their online courses from their home or any place where there is required equipment and internet connection.

Five research studies have emphasized the crucial role of reaching a wider audience as motivating factor for online instructors (Parker 2003; Valentine 2002; Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner, 2009; Schifter,2000; Cooperman, 2017). They arrive at conclusion that online teaching enables instructors to reach a wider audience by increasing the high attendance of students. Faculty have a chance to teach more students with online classes. Cooperman (2017) shared online faculty experiences that provide insight for successful online teaching in his book. According to study, some faculty members also believe that online teaching removes time and places barriers for learning activities, which is the most positive aspect of online teaching. Students who are not able to attend traditional classes for different reasons (for familial reasons or because they live in a remote village) may confidently join the online sessions.

According to Parker (2003); Schifter (2000); Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner (2009); Cooperman (2017) instructors believe that online teaching creates a need to develop new ideas and challenge themselves intellectually. Online teaching requires some skills such as subject expertise, time management, empathy skills, communication skills, and time management. Instructors need to manage all process using the mentioned skills which leads to need for develop new ideas and intellectual challenge. The last-mentioned research studies also support the idea that if an instructor teaches the same course regularly, he/she can build a repository for all additional work such as

grading rubrics, discussion posts, grading the online assignment. These repository skills also lead to time-saving and reduced workload. The last-mentioned studies also used a survey as an instrument (except Cooperman, 2017) to find the motivation factors for faculty to teach online.

Cooperman's (2017) study result shows that some faculty members highly appreciate online classes because they can research any questions that students ask. They state that if students ask questions; that they feel unable to answer in a residential classroom setting, they can simply promise an answer for the following lesson. However, online classes enable instructors to respond to these questions immediately after primary research. They can easily use different platforms (Google, Wikipedia, etc.) to find answer to various questions.

Xiao's (2014) semi-structured interview results show that student-related factors may significantly influence online teachers' motivation. Students' active engagement in the learning process can increase faculty motivation. His study results show that if students are motivated enough to learn, then instructors feel more motivated to teach online. According to Cooperman's (2017) study, some instructors believe that students' active engagement depends on their experience. In order to motivate students, they can be asked explicitly to relate the materials with their real-life experiences, apply the course concepts to real-life and share personal stories.

Extrinsic Motivators

Extrinsic motivations make a person feel motivated to engage in an activity because they want to earn a reward or avoid punishment (Tranquillo, Stecker, 2016). This type of motivator can make faculty more willing to engage in online teaching, but they are not as powerful as intrinsic motivators. Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner (2009) argue that merit pay or promotions do not significantly influence faculty engagement in online teaching. Faculty tend to be motivated mostly by intrinsic factors. As a result of surveys with faculty Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner (2009);

Schifter (2000) found that tangible rewards offer attractive incentives for faculty to participate in online teaching. Tangible rewards however, seem to offer more attractive incentives, but even these are less influential than intrinsic factors and these include stipends, course releases, technology training, administrative support, and recognition for their distance education efforts.

The study conducted by Cooperman points out that there are other extrinsic motivational factors mentioned by teachers (Cooperman,2017). One group of faculty members believe that there is no need to commute or dress up for online teaching. The instructor does not need to wait for the next session to collect the grading assignments; instead, assignments can be graded as they come in (digital assignments). Furthermore, online teaching's technical advantages motivate instructors - they can easily present YouTube videos or TEDx talks to students.

Intrinsic Barriers

Some instructors believe that the increasing demand for technology may decrease faculty's motivation for online teaching. Thus, faculty may fear that computers could replace them (Muilenburg & Berge, 2001). With the rapid growth of technologies, faculty and other university members may have some perception that technology can do everything, even take over the roles of instructors. Muilenburg and Berge's (2001) factor-analytic analyses points out that that this concern can be perceived as a barrier by faculty to use modern technologies as a teaching tool. Furthermore, some faculty members feel that the instructor is expected to always be available and instantly reply to emails from students and the administration.

Another technology-related issue has been mentioned by Schifter (2000). His survey results indicate that faculty's weak technological background can be a barrier and prevent them from engaging in online teaching. Lack of ability to use modern technologies can demotivate faculty easily. Another barrier for faculty is that organizations are resistant to change - faculty can

show resistance to the online teaching environment because of the lack or absence of a strategic plan for online teaching or the absence of key players (policymakers, supervisors, etc.) in the organization (Muilenburg & Berge, 2001). Without a predefined strategic plan, instructors will face the challenge of adopting the new teaching environment by themselves. Additionally, if there is no online teaching plan, it means key players have not been involved in the process. This may lead to a lack of support for faculty.

Extrinsic Barriers

The majority of studies agree on the negative influence of the lack of administrative and technical support, and a lack of training for faculty (Schifter 2000; O'Quinn & Corry, 2002; Muilenburg & Berge, 2001). Without sufficient training programs and other support, faculty may not achieve advancement to deliver online teaching. As we mentioned before, not all faculty members are good at using technologies. Even some of the instructors are novices; they have fewer experiences than experienced ones. This group of instructors needs additional help in order to improve their skills.

Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner's (2009) study shows that some other inhibiting factors harm instructors' motivations, for instance, concern about faculty workload and lack of grants for materials. Faculty need to develop new plans and schedules for delivering online teaching, leading to an increasing workload that may demotivate them for online teaching. Some faculty members may require additional materials to provide online courses. If the university does not fund those materials, faculty usually feel demotivated to teach online. Similar to previous study, Cooperman's (2017) study results also point out that increased workload is one of the interviewees' main concerns for online teaching. Enrollment of more students in online classes (teaching more students in contrast to teaching in a typical residential setting) plays a barrier role for online faculty.

Teaching a more significant number of students is more challenging because instructors may have to explain the topic more than once, respond to questions of a larger number of students, and they are additionally faced with the task to engage this larger number actively. Referring to the responses by instructors, the deadline for grading assignments is typically less than one week. Some faculty members stated that sometimes students post assignments inappropriately, leading to an increased workload for instructors.

Conclusion

Herzberg's (1969) Two-Factors theory and other scholarly works (Schifter 2000; O'Quinn & Corry, 2002; Muilenburg & Berge, 2001, etc.) determined a long list of both motivating factors and barriers for faculty to teach online. The majority of the collected data from the reviewed literature was gathered through quantitative methods - via surveys. These studies do not provide us with descriptive information about faculty's experience with online teaching. Only a few studies (Cooperman, 2017; Xiao, 2014) used semi-structured interviews as an instrument. Moreover, it is necessary to explore the management's perspective (deans or program directors), too, to see to what extent their perceptions match with the perceptions of teachers. What kind of barriers and motivating factors related to online teaching do they see for faculty? How do they support faculty in the context of online teaching? What is the main difference between faculty's and management's perception? Will Universities support and motivate faculty for online teaching? These are highly interesting questions because the majority of the motivating and inhibiting factors are being affected by university management's decisions and policies.

Table 1: Motivators and barriers for online faculty.

<i>Motivators</i>	<i>Xiao</i>	<i>Parker</i>	<i>Valentine</i>	<i>Cook</i>	<i>Schifter</i>	<i>Cooperman</i>
Students' motivation to learn a subject	+					
Overall job satisfaction				+	+	
Reduced teaching load		+			+	
Flexible location		+			+	+
Sense of achievement	+					
Self- satisfaction		+				
Teacher' self-efficacy in teaching	+					
Ability to use new technology		+				+
Opportunity to improve teachers' teaching				+	+	+
Appreciation of tutors' Teaching	+					
Intellectual challenge		+		+	+	
Wider audience		+	+	+	+	+
Opportunity to develop new ideas		+		+	+	+
Technical and administrative support from institutions (dean, administration)				+	+	
Reflection and professional development	+				+	
Released time		+			+	+
Easy Grading						+
Responsibility		+				
Payment, reward, Stipends		+		+	+	

<i>Barriers</i>	<i>Valentine</i>	<i>Cook</i>	<i>Schifter</i>	<i>O'Quinn</i>	<i>Mulenburg</i>	<i>Cooperman</i>
Organizational resistance to change					+	
Concern about the quality of course	+		+	+	+	
Students 'problems with technology				+		
Lack of technical support staff	+	+	+	+	+	
Lack of administrative support			+	+	+	
Lack of trainings	+	+	+	+	+	
Lack of personal technological expertise	+		+		+	
Concern with testing, assessment.					+	+
Lack of recognition or reward	+			+		
Problems with technological equipment	+				+	
Lack of monetary support		+	+	+		
More number of students						+
Concerns about workload		+	+	+	+	+
Lack of grants for material/ Expenses			+	+	+	

Perception that computers may replace with teachers					+	
A sense of a loss of control over the teaching and learning process				+		
Lack of salary increase			+	+		

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The design of this research project is exploratory. The research's primary goal is to explore faculty experiences with online teaching by identifying the motivating factors and inhibiting factors for them. The first step in the data collection procedure was to collect the primary source of research data. The interview was the main data collection method for this research. The data collection procedure had been carried out directly by the author of this study. Furthermore, universities have been asked to share their documents or strategies (lesson plans, strategic plans) about online teaching during the interview process. These documents were used by as a secondary source of data.

Two universities in Baku have been selected as hosting organizations. In this study, they will be called University A and University B because the author promised anonymity to these institutions. University A is a newly established university with modern technologies, an e-library, and modern tools for online teaching. University A is well-known for its diverse environment with students, faculty, and staff from more than forty countries worldwide. This university engages in the delivery of undergraduate and graduate degree programs, student exchange programs, and English proficiency programs. University B is also a public university with a traditional library, and a large number of faculty, staff, and students. University B offers undergraduate, graduate, and doctorate programs, as well as exchange programs and additional qualifications for students. The target populations are five faculty members from each university and two deans of those faculty members. Universities were chosen based on the non-probability sampling method - a convenience sampling technique taking into consideration the researcher's easy access to these universities. Yet, instructors and one of the deans have been chosen on a purposive basis due to the appropriateness of the representatives to the researcher's needs. Purposeful sampling can provide “useful”

information about a given phenomenon (Creswell, 2012). The purpose here is to invite faculty members who have similar backgrounds. For interviews, it is essential to have participants that have common knowledge and comparable experiences.

Interviews

The first data collection method was one-on-one interviews with faculty members and one dean (from University B) and one program director (from University A) of these faculty members. These interviews provided an in-depth understanding of the research problem as well as qualitative data from two different sources (faculty and managers). One-on-one interviews enable a researcher to ask sensitive questions, and it is helpful for interviewees to ask questions or provide comments. A high response rate is typical for this type of interview because it is scheduled in advance, and participants usually feel obliged to answer questions. The interviews were conducted to collect data on how dean and program director manage and regulate online teaching and understand faculty preparedness for this process. The type of interview was semi-structured; based on the answers of the responder's, the interviewer asked follow-up questions to collect more specific data. The intended time for these interviews was 30-40 minutes. The interview protocol consisted of 9 questions. The interview process was recorded in audio format after getting the permission of interviewees. Thematic content analysis has been used to analyze the interview data. The researcher piloted interviews. Piloting the interviews is a critical step to test the questions and to have some practice in interviewing. Harding (2013) mentioned that piloting interviews helps adjust the interview guide before conducting the preliminary study. One faculty member was selected to participate in the piloting process. As a final step, the researcher made some changes in the interview questions. The collection and analysis of the interview data lasted for four weeks. One interview was conducted in Azerbaijani and one in English. The research questions were asked to

understand the administration perspective on online teaching and the support provided by the university.

The second step was to individually interview University A and B faculty members. Five instructors (a total of 10 participants) from each university were chosen. The main purpose here was to collect qualitative data through interactive and directed discussions. The individual interview with faculty lasted approximately 30 minutes for each participant. The type of interview was semi-structured. The interviewees included instructors who were asked to share their views on the motivating and inhibiting factors for online teaching. Faculty members represented different subjects such as writing and literacy, speaking and listening, methodology, pedagogy, linguistic, etc. The interview protocol consisted of 10 questions. After determining the interview questions, they were reviewed and feedback was included into the interviews. Considering the pandemic, interviews (with management and faculty) were conducted through online platforms (Blackboard Collaborate and Zoom). Analyses of the interview transcripts with faculty were done through thematic content analysis. The intended time for data collection and the analysis of data was four weeks—all interviews with faculty were conducted in English. The research questions were designed to explore the faculty motivation and barriers to teaching online. Furthermore, their prognosis about the future of online education was asked for.

Document Review

The third step was the review of documents provided by both universities. During the interview process, the researcher asked the deans to share some documents for review. The intended documents for analysis were strategic plans for online teaching, policies of universities, or any document that was closely related to online teaching. Overall, three documents (one syllabus from University B, two documents from University A) were collected by the researcher,

and one document (online exam regulations and rules and regulations for online teaching) was chosen for document review. The rest two documents (syllabus, and academic plan) did not provide meaningful results to the main purpose of this research work. University B management did not provide any other written document related to online teaching except the syllabus because there was no any related document. For that reason, only one document was selected. Document analysis provides the background and context for online teaching and verification of findings from the interview results. Thematic analysis has been done by the researcher for document review. This type of analysis requires recognizing patterns within the data, with the help of emerging themes that become categories for analysis (Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006). The main purpose here was to understand how various factors affect faculty motivation in the online teaching process.

Ethical Consideration

Some ethical considerations needed to be taken into account for this research. First of all, participants have been treated with respect and anonymously. Secondly, they provided informed consent about the purpose of this study, the benefits of this research, and the methods that have been used. Interviewees were not named for assuring the confidentiality and anonymity of the participants. The researcher got the permission of participants to record the interview.

FINDINGS

To answer the research question of this research work, the researcher conducted a semi-structured interview with the universities' management (a dean and a program director of faculty) and faculty members (instructors). Instructors age range are between 24-45. They have taught face-to-face classes before the pandemic. Both Universities (University A and University B) are currently engaged in online teaching under the Cabinet of Ministers' decision (Organization of the Activities of Educational Institutions operating in the Republic of Azerbaijan During the Special Quarantine Regime), and this due to the COVID 19 pandemic. This part of the research analyzes the semi-structured interviews with university management and faculty by examining each theme separately. Interview questions can be found in the Appendix part.

Interviews with Dean and Program Director.

University A program director mentioned that as a University, they have been teaching online since January 2020. Before transitioning to online teaching because of the pandemic, they had already used the Blackboard platform for three years. In this period (transition to Blackboard), they introduced many Blackboard system policies. Furthermore, the University itself designed the particular policies regarding creating the web pages for online courses. The program director believes that, since January 2020, the University has also developed some policies institutionally, and these policies have been introduced to faculty. According to a dean of University B, since the special quarantine regime starts, University faculty teaches online classes. However, long before the pandemic, they had some strategic plans about distance education. University B had been using the Zoom platform as a starting point. However, after the Ministry of Education's decision, the Microsoft Teams platform was introduced to University B in April, and they are currently using this platform to deliver online teaching. Furthermore, the Ministry of Education sent

recommendation letters, and organizes monitoring to support online education for the University. He stated that Quality Assurance Agency in Education has been monitoring the online teaching process for one year.

Additional Support by University

According to the interviews' answers, both Universities do not provide any tangible rewards or salary increases, or financial incentives for instructors to support them to teach online. According to University A's program director, the University provides lots of training for faculty members to collaboratively share their experiences. The primary support comes from the collaboration and discussion of issues related to online teaching. The dean from University B stated that they had organized various training sessions organized by the IT department, and the rector of the University. University B provided internet packages to the students who live in rural areas in order to support them financially. Furthermore, some social events, round table discussions were organized by the University for the instruction of students and teachers.

University A's program director stated that she is directly involved in the monitoring process as program director. They collaborate with the student-record service regularly to make sure that online classes started on time and everything goes well. "Instructors regulate the online teaching, and they tend to self-develop their online courses. As a program director, I did not take classes deliberately, so I worked outside the system and did many pieces of research to guide the faculty in online teaching". She claims that apart from the regular sessions, they organize "share shops". They have a particular online folder where management adds all videos and materials related to online teaching, and faculty have easy access to them. The dean of University B stated that when the University started to teach online, he had difficulties managing the process because there was no system. "But now, I have access to all classes, so I can easily join any online lessons

and monitor the process." He claims again that training sessions and discussions organized for faculty by university management are helpful for both faculty and them (deans) to understand the whole process and make necessary interventions.

Faculty's Motivation to Teach Online

Both interviewees believe that the motivation level of instructors is high enough now. However, in the beginning, instructors were slightly overwhelmed and scared because of the unexpected transition to the online environment. The Dean of University B stated that some faculty members had concerns about delivering online classes from their homes at the beginning. Instructors with kids had difficulties providing the online courses from home. Furthermore, some inexperienced instructors were worried that others would examine their pedagogical knowledge. The dean considers that as a university, they have been assured the faculty that learning new skills for online teaching and adopting this new environment would help instructors improve themselves. "Now, the motivation level of faculty is high enough. They have already adopted the new teaching environment and try to do their best." According to University A's program director, the faculty's motivation level has grown day by day. They are trying to explore the system's new features, and students' progress is also an essential factor to evaluate the faculty motivation. Furthermore, faculty motivation has been influenced by teaching from home because there is no necessity to come to the University. They can spend more time with their families and kids.

Technological Background of the Faculty

The program director of University A stated that some faculty members only have minimal technological background, but they are trying to improve themselves. "Probably because of their higher intellectual abilities, they can easily learn the technology-related issues. I am observing that one training will be enough for faculty to show them how to use online teaching platform or how

to share the content". University B's dean also mentioned that approximately half of the instructor's technological knowledge was not satisfactory at the beginning of the new path to the online classes. However, because of the training sessions and IT support, they have improved themselves. "I would say that now 90% of faculty members have a background good enough for the use of technology. 10% of them are trying to improve themselves, at least they can join the classes and share the content".

Experience Sharing

University A's Quality Assurance Agency in Education management states that they organize share shops more than twice a semester, and all faculty members have a chance to share their experiences. The program director usually observes the online classes. She believes that there should be a particular rubric for the observation that is developed for online teaching. Online teaching is entirely different from the traditional way of education, and it has specific etiquettes, requirements. "Sometimes instructors are not clear about the expectations. Therefore, there should be special frameworks developed for online teaching in the". Mostly, instructors of University A are the senior ones; they are experienced instructors. The program director thinks that they do not need much guidance when it comes to methodology, but there should be mainly developed guidance and framework for online teaching.

The dean of University B also mentioned because of the democratic environment; each faculty member has a chance to share any concerns about online teaching with deans. "Concerns are mainly related to students' cheating or inactive participation." The dean observes the classes to ensure the quality of education and to monitor instructors' actual experiences.

Barriers for Online Teaching

University A's program director believes that one of the most inhibiting factors for faculty is the teaching load. As the course at University A is non-degree, they have more teaching hours, and sometimes faculty have difficulties teaching many hours in front of the computer. She considers that the second inhibiting factor for faculty is that they are far from the natural classroom environment, and they cannot get in touch with students. She assumes the third barrier for faculty will be the examination of students. Online teaching enables students to cheat and violate academic honesty easily, which creates a challenge for instructors to monitor all the processes.

The dean of University B also mentioned that the cheating factor is a natural barrier to online teaching. Besides this factor, students cannot attend the classes or have no computer to join the ranks or complete the online assignments because of low internet connection in rural areas. Another barrier mentioned by the dean is little or no technical knowledge of faculty. He assumes that a faculty member who has the little technological background to teach online can have difficulties teaching online.

Quality of Online Teaching

University A's program director states that the quality of education is the highest priority for the University. They have a regular guidance system (share shops, observations) for their faculty, and they organize regular meetings with students and ask for their opinion about the quality of teaching.

The quality of education (offline and online) is tested by students, instructors, and program testing committees. This committee conducts achievement and final exams. If the number of students who failed the program is not more than 10%, it is considered normal for the program. There is a department that is operating in University B, called Quality Assurance. According to the

answer of the dean from this University, this department regularly conducts and monitors students' surveys to ensure quality of online education.

Future Plans Regarding to Online Teaching

Both University representatives believe that a hybrid type of education - partially online and partially on campus - will remain. They support the idea that by using the advantages of online teaching, some courses and trainings will be offered in the online form. University B's dean considers that they have to work on improving the strategies and plans for online teaching. The program director stated that they had purchased the monitoring system to help faculty organize students' examinations. But this system is more appropriate for on-campus exams. They are currently working to improve the system for online exams, too. This system is expected to enable faculty to decrease the percentage of cheating possibilities of students and automatically grade the students' exam papers.

Interviews with Faculty

University A faculty members say they have been teaching online courses for one year. Even before the pandemic, the faculty members have been using the Blackboard tool for receiving student's assignments, and they were able to share content and, announcements. From the very beginning of their teaching journey, they all experienced using this platform. They usually share their online teaching experience with colleagues, including the program director, during one of the share shops. However, one of the faculty members mentioned that she does not explicitly share her own experience with the rest of the faculty members or the program director in these share shops. The reason behind it is instructor's character, she does not like to share the experience at all.

University B faculty members said that they had joined different online webinars. However, it was the first time they engaged in online teaching (during the COVID-19 pandemic).

Some of the faculty members keep in touch with deans and share experience, and some of them do not directly share their experience with deans - they discuss it with head teachers of their departments.

Motivators for Faculty

Many of the faculty members from University A love teaching, which also motivates them to teach online. Furthermore, most believe that online teaching is more convenient because there is no need to spend time on commuting. During online classes, they use different online tools to encourage students' active participation and involvement. Using technological advantages of online teaching motivates them. Students-related factors – their active engagement in the online lessons – are one of the motivating factors for this faculty. Some members believe that online teaching is more significant to reach a wider audience (a greater number of students), and it is one more motivating factor for them. However, it is not a motivating factor for two members because the number of students in face-to-face classes and online classes is almost the same. For both university faculty, flexible location teaching from home - another motivating factor. University B faculty also believe that the technological advantages of online education motivate instructors considerably. "We had few rooms which are technologically well-equipped at the campus. Online classes enable us to share any content, present materials easily, and that makes the lessons more interactive". Students' active participation, love for teaching, reaching the wider audience are some of the mentioned motivational factors for University B faculty. Some members believe that online education allows instructors to improve themselves in using technology and implementing best practices.

Technological Background of Faculty

The majority of faculty members (University A) feel pretty comfortable teaching online, and they usually have "plan B" if they face some technological issues. Faculty have taken some training for learning the advancement of Blackboard and other tools that may help online teaching. They were also certificated after the training sessions. The formal training for Blackboard was introduced to faculty by the University. Faculty believe that they have interactive and exciting online classes because they can use online teaching's technological advantages very well. University B faculty members mentioned that they had some difficulties at the beginning of their online teaching experiences. Some faculty members were overwhelmed and stressed at the beginning. They had concerns about using Microsoft Teams, grading students' online exams, and preparing online quizzes. However, day by day, both faculty and students got used to online classes. Instructors can approach IT support and training that the University offers.

Policies and Plans of Universities

According to interviewees' answers from University A, Blackboard usage is one of the University's successful strategies. They believe that this platform is one of the best ones to deliver online classes. Furthermore, the University is technologically well-equipped, and the digital library of the University is beneficial for instructors and students. Some faculty members mentioned that, unfortunately, nothing has changed about instructors' teaching hours, which creates some challenges for them. They believe online teaching hours should be less than face-to-face teaching hours. As faculty, they need specific policies about the teaching hours in online classes. Some instructors claim that policies are mainly related to student participation and, exam regulations in online courses. One more strategy of University A is Help Desk support. Instructors can efficiently address and email to them if they have any problem.

Furthermore, the program director sends them valuable videos and links for webinars about how to use the platform's new features. University B also offers training and IT support for instructors, and this is highly appreciated by faculty. What is more, according to some interviewees' answers, experienced teachers share essential features of online teaching with them.

No faculty members from University A have received any tangible rewards for their online teaching efforts. Some instructors have received the certificates for Blackboard usage, but it was before the pandemic, and the certifications were not directly related to online teaching. Almost none of the faculty members expect any awards for teaching online. One instructor said, "My only expectation is high student satisfaction with my online lessons. Seeing all the students involved and feeling their presence and progress is rewarding for me". Like University A, no faculty members of University B have received any tangible rewards. Faculty just received some certificates from online teaching webinars or training. They are not in expectation of any tangible rewards. "When students actively participate in a class or just praise one is a reward for us."

Barriers for Online Teaching

One of the University A's faculty members mentioned that sometimes students' feedback at the end of the course could demotivate them. As an instructor, they are doing their best, but it can be a barrier for some of them when the course feedback is negative. Teaching load is another inhibiting factor. Sometimes just one student is missing the class, and the instructor has to prepare the test for him or her, and it is a time-consuming process. Technical issues are another factor for both University faculty that can be barriers to online teaching. Not all students live in Baku, and some of them do not have access to the internet, and as an instructor, one has to prepare additional assignments for them. Some instructors (from both Universities) said that they had to cancel lessons a few times because the electricity was out and they had to reschedule them. They also

mentioned that they sometimes lost their motivation at the beginning of online teaching experiences because the new teaching environment seemed quite challenging. Another inhibiting factor for both university faculty is the possibility of cheating by students. Some teachers stated that online teaching increases cheating as instructors cannot fully monitor them whether they follow academic honesty.

Instructors spend time to double-check the exam papers or assignments, and this is sometimes a stressful process. Time management is sometimes a barrier for online teaching of faculty members. University A faculty believe that preparing the pre-recorded sessions for students takes time if they want to do it professionally. Some instructors consider that instructor's daily life will be influenced by online teaching as they are teaching from their home. "Sometimes my work interferes with my daily routine, or my daily routine interferes with my work." Furthermore, unlike the traditional classrooms, it is hard to monitor group work. The instructor cannot see all students on the screen even if all students open their cameras - some university instructors find this stressful. University B faculty mentioned that instructors with kids at home had many difficulties (as kindergartens are also closed) that influenced the quality of teaching. They believe the Ministry of Education should introduce some policies or plans for these groups of instructors. One faculty member from University B believes that sitting long hours in front of the computer may affect instructors' health (eye-sight, headache problems). She believes online teaching leads to a passive lifestyle for faculty and students.

Pedagogical Changes

A group of faculty members from University A and B finds online teaching much more beneficial than face-to-face teaching because of some tools that make teaching more accessible and entertaining. They think the transition to online education was relatively easy for them because,

before online teaching, they had always tried to integrate technology into their lessons. They had also attended some online courses, and having some prior understanding and experience helped them embrace the challenges. One instructor (university A) mentioned that they need to train the students to be self-learners by encouraging them to take more responsibility for their learning because of online teaching requirements. Students can use pre-recorded lessons if they miss the class, which is also one of the advantages of online education. Some faculty members believe that instructors have invested their time and energy to learn new skills online, which is why they will not give up online teaching. Students also get used to online education as this process has already lasted for more than one year. Some faculty members of University B believe that students also should improve themselves to advance in using the online teaching tools, and they should be well aware of online teaching etiquettes.

Dealing with the Challenges of Online Teaching

One faculty member of University A stated that she tries to find a solution if there is a problem. Googling it is often enough, and she does not think she needs any additional help. Another faculty member considers that by understanding students, the instructor can overcome the challenges. She mentioned that not every student could buy internet packages as it is an off-campus environment, so instructors should become flexible in these issues. Faculty of University A and B believe that seminars and conferences are always suitable for instructors since instructors need to learn new skills every day because of online teaching requirements. University B faculty consider that internet providers should be improved to increase the quality of teaching. Furthermore, online teaching platforms are sometimes overloaded, and that should be solved.

Motivation Level

One University- A, faculty member considers that when students resist turning on the camera or participating actively, their motivation level becomes low. Students' cheating during the exam also decreases their motivation. Faculty are skeptical about the effectiveness and objectivity of online exams. They feel really motivated when they see students' progress or when the new methods or tools, they are using help them achieve the lesson aims. When students actively participate in the classes, their motivation level becomes highest. One faculty member mentioned that when she has enough time to prepare the class materials and grade students' work, she becomes more motivated. University B faculty members believe that students' active participation is one of the best motivating factors for them.

Furthermore, some of them mentioned that they could use exciting tools for making online quizzes and prepare interactive presentations that make students more motivated. Their motivation level is low when students join the class but participate only passively. "Sometimes students join the class, but they pretend they attend" or, "Sometimes students answer the questions simultaneously, and it leads to confusion" - this is demotivating for instructors.

Prognosis on the Future of Online Teaching

All faculty members of University A support the idea that universities should offer online teaching in Azerbaijan. Not every student has chances to attend on-campus classes for different reasons. They think online education overcomes these barriers. They believe that students should be taught how to behave in the online learning environment to make online teaching more effective. Some members, however, consider that hybrid learning will be more effective for our county because in-class instruction also has some advantages. For them, blended learning offers various incentives for both instructors and students. University B faculty members also support the idea

that universities should offer blended learning. Online teaching enables some students (disabled ones or those who cannot attend on-campus classes for different reasons) to join courses quickly. Faculty members from both universities believe that we should improve the online teaching system by formulating relevant policies and by further developing the online teaching environment.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

According to Herzberg's Two Factor Motivation theory, intrinsic (motivators) and extrinsic (hygiene) factors were defined as factors that drive the individuals toward action (Herzberg, 1964). Motivators were defined as job-satisfiers by some researchers. For example, according to Castillo and Cano (2014), the motivators are 'job satisfiers' that lead to a worker's psychological growth. The hygiene factors as job satisfiers, on the other hand, prevent individuals' dissatisfaction in the work environment. In this part of the research, we will discuss significant of research findings and their relation to the results of the literature previously reviewed. Moreover, the collected data will be critically analyzed against Herzberg's two-factor motivation theory.

Motivation Theory; Hygiene Factors

Herzberg (1968) claimed that an organization would not proceed with employees' motivating factors without the hygiene factors. As the transition to online teaching was unexpected for our country, universities were not able to provide hygiene factors for workers. As we know, hygiene factors were to include working conditions, company policies and administration, interpersonal relationships, quality of supervision, and salary. If we refer to interview protocols, we can easily determine some differences between the two universities' approaches to hygiene factors. University A is well equipped with technology and tools that will be helpful for online teaching. The working conditions of employees were good enough even before the pandemic. Some rooms are equipped with projectors, computers, and necessary tools for making the class more interactive. Furthermore, faculty had already used the online teaching platform "Blackboard" long before the pandemic. Even though the faculty of University A did not have online teaching

experience before the pandemic, they had the skills to use technology. They were aware of the necessary elements for online teaching.

The working conditions at University B, however, are different. The faculty mentioned that when they taught face-to-face classes, it was challenging for them to find classrooms with well-equipped technology. There are few classrooms on campus with projectors and computers. That created a challenge for instructors when they wanted to make their classes more interactive. That is why most faculty members prefer online teaching because they can easily share PPTs or videos. Cooperman (2017) believes that using the advantages of technology is a motivating factor for faculty. Both University faculty find it interesting to engage in online teaching because they can implement the technology's benefits in their classes. Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner, 2009; Schifter, 2000 emphasized the importance of flexible online teaching in their research work. Faculty think that teaching from home is more convenient because there is no need to waste time on commuting. What is more, they can spend more time with their families. Table 2 reflects a group of motivators for faculty.

Table 2. Group of Motivators for Faculty.

Group of Factors	Type of Factors
Extrinsic	Training by university, administrative support, IT support Using different platforms to prepare quizzes, exams etc.
Intrinsic	Strong Collaboration Teaching from home Using the advantages of technology for interactive lesson,
Student-related factors	Students' active participation, Students' motivation

Company policies and administration and the quality of supervision are also hygiene factors, according to the theory. Both universities were using online platforms, and they started to introduce some policies for these platforms. University A has prepared internal policies (online teaching regulations) to improve online classes. Each University offers training for instructors and IT support to help them in online teaching. But faculty members believe that they need more supervision from the administration. When it comes to interpersonal relationships as a hygiene factor, University A faculty have healthier and more equitable relationships than University B faculty. University A faculty members emphasized the importance of collaboration, sharing experiences especially during the pandemic. Both university administration and faculty of this university mentioned that they have regular meetings for experience sharing. University B faculty, however, take a more individual approach. They also share their experiences, but there are no regular meetings among the administration and faculty.

Hygiene factors are the extrinsic factors according to the theory. If we refer to the literature, Tranquillo, Stecker, (2016) mentioned that extrinsic motivators are not as powerful as intrinsic ones. Referring to interviews, even though there are no salary increases for both university faculty members for their online teaching, almost all members support the idea that salary as the extrinsic factor is not one of the primary motivating factors. To sum up, absence of salary increases does not affect the level of motivation negatively.

Motivation Factor

According to Lee, Reeve, Xue, Xiong, (2012) intrinsic motivators help instructors to engage in activity because of their own sake. Faculty members of University A and B mentioned that strong collaboration, teaching from home, and using the advantages of technology for

interactive lesson motivate them intrinsically. These types of motivators enable instructors to engage in teaching activity without expecting any reward.

Recognition for achievement, interest in the job, responsibility for the task, advancement to higher-level tasks, and growth motivate employees to grow psychologically. (Castillo & Cano,2014). I would say that these intrinsic factors are the main motivation for the faculty from both universities. Instructors have a sense of achievement; they want to improve themselves on technology use and implement the new methodologies that will be best for online teaching. University A and B faculty and administration think that online teaching is interesting as well as challenging for them. Both faculty members are responsible for their online teaching- they want to improve themselves. Online teaching forces instructors to learn new skills and choose the best methodology for their classes. The interview results are in agreement with Parker (2003); Schifter (2000); Cook, Ley, Crawford, & Warner (2009); Cooperman (2017) and their findings reveal that online teaching helps faculty to develop new ideas and intellectually challenge themselves.

Level of Motivation

The level of motivation for faculty will fall into three categories considering the answers of respondents: high and medium and low.

High Level: Almost half of the faculty members expressed a high level of motivation in their jobs. These are usually the intrinsically motivated instructors. Using the advantages of the technologies, love for the profession, good working condition, flexibility, administrative support, collaboration, and sharing, desire to learn new skills are some of the significant motivators for them. They want to continue online teaching because they hope there will be great opportunities for both faculty members (University A and B) and students in the future. They mentioned that

they could overcome online education challenges (problems with equipment, cheating issues, etc.). This group believes that online teaching motivation enables them to learn new skills and implement new methodologies.

Moderate Level: Approximately half of the faculty members from both universities have a moderate level of motivation to teach online. They reflected the simultaneous existence of both motivating and demotivating factors for online teaching. Motivation for this group of respondents is students' active engagement, using the advantages of technology, administrative and IT support, and flexibility. They also mentioned that some online teaching barriers, such as students' cheating during exams, students' passive participation, or problems with equipment, could sometimes be demotivating for them. The faculty believes that online teaching policies and plans should be introduced to improve online teaching.

Low Level: Just one of the faculty members' motivation level is low (University B). She mentioned that face-to-face education is the best option for her. She believes students in the country are psychologically not ready for online teaching_- they are cheating in online exams and tend to break academic honesty rules. In her opinion, instructors can easily monitor the students' group works in face-to-face education. Even though this group of faculty member prefer face-to-face education, she also believes that faculty can deliver online courses for people who cannot attend regular classes in the future.

Online Teaching Barriers and the Role of Administration

Table 3 reflects the group of factors that are considered as barriers for instructors accompanying the process of online teaching. Wingo (2017) believes that educational organizations should implement strategic plans for online programs by understanding faculty

perception of online education. The author also mentioned that if there is too much workload for instructors, or a lack of technical support for faculty, this will be a barrier for faculty to teach online. University B faculty members mentioned that their workload has increased during the pandemic. They have to prepare the online assignments and exams for students; they have to prepare some online teaching materials, which takes time. The increasing workload is a barrier for University B faculty members. Further problems are weak internet connection, the emotional stress caused by malfunction of equipment, dissatisfaction caused by the change in the form of contact, concerns about students' test results, lack of IT skills (for an initial period), lack of abilities to prepare online quizzes, tests, and challenges with online grading. Table 3 represents some of the barriers to online teaching that the faculty members mentioned.

Table 3. Inhibiting factors for University A and B faculty.

Group of factors	Type of factors
Extrinsic- Technical	Weak internet connection
Intrinsic- Psychological	Emotional stress caused by malfunction of equipment Dissatisfaction caused by change in the form of contact Concerns about students' test results
Intrinsic- Methodical	Lack of IT skills (for initial period) Lack of abilities to prepare online quizzes, tests Challenges with online grading Difficulties to monitor online class
Intrinsic-Ethical	Students inactive participation Mistrust the honesty of students

A year of experience for faculty made them more professional in online teaching; they try to improve themselves by acquiring new skills. However, it does not mean that universities should

not implement the relevant policies to increase faculty's motivation. Bunk (2015) recommended academic leaders increase the sense of excitement of faculty about online teaching; universities should implement relevant policies and practices. University A enforces online exam regulations that may be considered as incentives for faculty. Although faculty still have concerns about the possibility of cheating by students, some other policies can be implemented by the university to boost faculty motivation. University B has no written online exam rules for students, and cheating is also the faculty's main concern. Furthermore, there is no policy specifically for online teaching regarding faculty workload, responsibilities, and rights.

The conducted research shows that for both universities, faculty motivating factors in online teaching outweighed the demotivating ones. Even though instructors mentioned some barriers to online teaching, they are motivated enough to overcome those barriers. Universities also try to formulate some policies for making the quality of online teaching better. Both groups- (university administration and faculty) support the idea that blended teaching will be the better option for the future of education.

Limitations of Theory

When it comes to the two-factor motivation theory, I would say that a clear distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic factors for faculty is almost impossible. Herzberg's two-factor theory has some limitations:

1. The absence of an objective way to measure employee satisfaction level is an obstacle for the Two-factor theory. An employee in an organization may find his job acceptable despite the fact that he may dislike parts of the job. For instance, the instructor may love teaching despite the fact that she has concerns on low salary.

2. There is some dynamics in the faculty's perception on extrinsic and intrinsic factors: Some faculty members may perceive policy and administration as hygiene factors, while others can believe that good policy is a motivation factor. Or, to take another example, good working conditions (hygiene factor for Herzberg's theory) will be an intrinsic motivator for some faculty members.

3. This theory does not define the motivation factors specifically for educational institution employees (for instance, student-related factors were not mentioned in this theory). A group of engineers were the target population for Herzberg's theory.

Document Review

After the interview with university management and administration, the researcher concluded that student-related factors are essential for faculty's in their online teaching experience. Documents and plans are mainly related to students, and for this part of the research, researcher's primary focus is to review one of these documents.

"Online Exam Regulations" are the document that was developed by University A on November 30, 2020. The document is not intended to replace the exam regulations and rules for students, but the primary intention is to provide the regulations for making online exams run smoothly. The document might have a positive impact on teacher motivation by preventing cheating and creating environment of trust. Failure to follow the regulations is considered a violation of the Honor Code for students.

The document identifies different online exams for students: on-campus or outside-campus; synchronous or asynchronous; proctored or non-proctored; computer-based or paper-based; written or oral. As one of the main concerns of faculty is the cheating factor, the document provides some regulations for students to follow academic honesty during the online exams. All

students must have internet access, a computer, camera in place, and students should be familiar with the procedures before the exam time. There are some other requirements for students to eliminate the cheating factor: no one else can enter the software system during the exam, to take the exam in place of the student. Moreover, students should be ready to show a 360-degree view of the room if required and open the microphone during exam time. Students are expected to be prepared to submit a screenshot of the computer during the exam.

Some regulations have been mentioned for paper-based exams. The papers students will use for the exam should be empty, and the student's name should be written on each page. After finishing with their writing, students are required to show the pages to the camera for confirmation and verification. Students should use a relevant application to convert the papers into PDF files and submit it 15 minutes before the end of the exam. In addition to the PDF file, students may be required to submit the Word document, too. Faculty have chances to conduct oral examinations of students, but the oral exam should be the same level of difficulty as written exams. According to the document, the oral exam process will be done via a live and face-to-face on-screen communication with the course instructor, and it should be recorded. Faculty may include exam rules and regulations in addition to mentioned.

The document will be helpful to regulate the exam procedures for students. There are clear rules and regulations for synchronous exams. According to Harmon, Lambrinos, and Buffolino (2010), some higher technology options may prevent cheating on online exams including video capturing a 360° view around the online test-taker, monitoring off-site assessments via microphone systems, or engaging biometrics, such as fingerprint scans, optic-retinal tests, facial recognition, and keystroke pattern analysis. Video capturing a 360° is one of the options that was included in the document.

Furthermore, as some faculty members are suspicious about online exam results' reliability, the university administration can decide on on-campus online exams. The document emphasizes the role of faculty by allowing them to add additional rules and regulations for online exams. So, faculty members can choose the best option for examining students' knowledge and skills. They can add additional rules and regulations for the online exam process. Faculty should be able to benefit from this regulation and improve the examination process by decreasing the possibility and level of cheating by students. Overall, the document is well designed and all rules and regulations were clearly stated. Online Exam Regulation document might positively impact instructors' motivation by decreasing the possibility of student's cheating on online exams.

CONCLUSION

This study is timely and essential in the field of online education. As the demand for online teaching is growing day by day, the research on this topic will help understand online teaching perceptions in our country. The study investigates the experiences of faculty with motivating and inhibiting factors of online teaching. The research work's main target was to answer what motivates online faculty and to identify the barriers to faculty motivation for teaching online courses. The results of this study will be helpful for the development of online courses that universities offer.

By conducting semi-structured interviews, this study attempted to give a voice to faculty that are teaching online – and they both expressed the negative and positive aspects of online teaching. Furthermore, semi-structured interviews that were conducted for university administration helped to understand their perspectives, too. The document review in this research aimed to understand the policies and regulations that universities offer for supporting faculty. Fostering the environment for open discussions with teachers and the administration is one of the best ways to improve online teaching. Faculty motivation is an essential factor for universities and the community because only highly motivated faculty can work productively and benefit the education. That is why universities and educational institutions need to adopt policies and plans to improve faculty's online teaching opportunities.

Limitations

Documents: Only one document related to students' online exam regulations has been analyzed for this research work. The researcher could not find any relevant strategic document or plan for online faculty that can be informative to analyze.

Difficulties with online interviews: There were some difficulties in conducting online interviews, such as connection problems, technological issues. These mentioned problems did not influence the interview results.

The scope of the research: Only two Universities in Baku were participating educational entities for this research because of the current situation (COVID-19 pandemic). Scope of the investigation will be wider in order to deeply explore the motivational factors.

Recommendation for Further Research.

Researchers can address the limitations of this research to build upon its the findings. For the next 1 or 2 years, there will be more documents related to online education that can be analyzed to understand the policies and plans for online teaching more deeply. Furthermore, once the special quarantine regime is over, it will be possible to conduct face-to-face interviews with the target population. This will positively influence the results because face-to-face interviews enable the researcher to follow the interviewees' gestures, body language and make the discussion more interesting. In addition to that, the students' points of view on this topic should be investigated, too, considering that many of the student-related factors have been mentioned by teachers. Further researchers can also extend the scope of their studies to other regions in Azerbaijan.

REFERENCES

- A. Asadov (2020, October 29) "On additional measures to organize the activities of educational institutions operating in the territory of the Republic of Azerbaijan during the special quarantine regime "(2020, October 29). Retrieved December 19, 2020, from <http://www.e-qanun.gov.az/framework/46233>
- Adebo, Philip. (2018). ONLINE TEACHING AND LEARNING. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science and Software Engineering*. 8. 73. 10.23956/ijarcsse.v8i2.549.
- American Council on Education. (2003). *An Agenda for excellence: Creating flexibility in tenure-track faculty careers*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education Office of Women in Higher Education.
- Blotzer, Michael J. 2000. "Distance Learning." *Occupational Hazards* 62(3):53–55.
- Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Azerbaijan (2010, August 06) "Rules of the organization of formal education" Retrieved December 19, 2020, from <http://eqanun.az/framework/20071>
- Bunk, J., Li, R., Smidt, E., Bidetti, C., Malize, B., (2015). *Understanding Faculty Attitudes about Distance Education: The Importance of Excitement and Fear*. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1079611>
- Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Azerbaijan (2010, August 06) "Rules of the organization of formal education" Retrieved December 19, 2020, from <http://eqanun.az/framework/20071>
- Castillo, J.X., and J. Cano. 2004. Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education* 45, no. 3: 65–74
- Cooperman, L. (2017). *The art of teaching online: How to start and how to succeed as an online instructor*. ProQuest Ebook Central <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ada.idm.oclc.org>
- Fereday, J. & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating rigor using thematic analysis: A hybrid approach of inductive and deductive coding and theme development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 80–92. Retrieved 12 January 2009, from http://www.ualberta.ca/~iiqm/backissues/5_1/pdf/fereday.pdf.
- Fuller MA, Valacich JS, & George JF (2008). *Information Systems Project Management: A Process and Team Approach*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall

- Gannon-Cook, R., Ley, K., Crawford, C., & Warner, A. (2009). Motivators and Inhibitors for University Faculty in Distance and e-learning. *Br. J. Educ. Technol.*, 40, 149-163.
- Harding, J. (2013). *Qualitative data analysis: From start to finish*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Harmon, O., Lambrinos, J., & Buffolino, J. (2010). Is the Cheating Risk Always Higher in Online Instruction Compared to Face-to-Face Instruction. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Economics, University Connecticut, Storrs, CT
- Herzberg, F. (1968). "One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees?". *Harvard Business Review*. 46 (1): 53–62. OCLC 219963337.
- "Herzberg's Motivators and Hygiene Factors". Mindtools.com. Retrieved December 2, 2014. <https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/herzberg-motivators-hygiene-factors.html>
- Kim, Y. (2004). Online Education Tools. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 28(2), 275-280. Retrieved March 22, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3381065>
- Major, C. H. (2015). *Teaching online: a guide to theory, research, and practice* (Ser. Tech.edu: a Hopkins series on education and technology). Johns HopMkins University Press.
- Martinez, R. (2004). Online education: Designing for the future in appraiser education *Appraisal Journal*, 72(3), 266-273.
- Moore, M.G. (1990). Background and overview of contemporary American distance education. *Contemporary Issues in American Distance Education*, New York : Pergamon.
- More, H. W., Wegner, F. W. & Miller, L. S. (2003). *Effective Police Supervision*, Cincinnati, Anderson Publishing Co
- Muilenburg, L., & Berge, Z. (2001). Barriers to distance education: a factor-analytic study. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 15(2), 7–22.
- O'Quinn, L. & Corry, M. (2002). Factors that deter faculty from participating in distance education. Retrieved on October 17, 2003 from <https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/winter54/Quinn54.html>
- Parker, A. (2003). Motivation and incentives for distance faculty. Retrieved on October 26, 2003 from www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall63/parker63.html
- S. Saraswathi (2011): A Study on Factors that Motivate IT and Non-IT Sector Employees: A Comparison. *International Journal of Research in Computer Application and Management*, Vol. 1 (2), pp. 72-77

- Schifter, C.C. (2000). Faculty participation in asynchronous learning networks: A case study of motivating and inhibiting factors. Retrieved on October 16, 2003 from: www.aln.org/publications/jaln/v4n1/pdf/v4n1_schifter.pdf
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 54–67.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, Edward. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. 61. 101860. 10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340508212>
- Technavio. (2018). E-learning Market in the US 2018-2022. https://www.technavio.com/report/e-learning-market-in-the-us-analysis-share-2018?pk_vid=2a69e1dd3fbc7b381591262233ffe154
- Tranquillo J, Stecker M. (2016) Using intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in continuing professional education. *Surg Neurol Int.* 2016;7(Suppl 7): S197-9. doi:10.4103/2152-7806.179231
- Vaughan, Dr Norman D. (2010). "Blended Learning". In Cleveland-Innes, MF; Garrison, DR (eds.). *An Introduction to Distance Education: Understanding Teaching and Learning in a New Era*. Taylor & Francis. p. 165. ISBN 978-0-415-99598-6. Retrieved 23 January 2011.
- Valentine, D. (2002). Distance learning: Promises, problems and possibilities. Retrieved on October 17, 2003 from <https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdla/fall53/valentine53.html>
- Whatmore, Lynne (2012). *Raising Performance through Motivation Part One: Content Theories*. Michael Heath Consulting.
- Wingo, N., Ivankova, N., & Moss, J., (2017). Faculty perceptions about teaching online: exploring the literature using the technology acceptance model as an organizing framework. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1140242>
- Xiao, J. (2014). What do distance language tutors say about teacher motivation? *Open Learning*, 29(2), 145–159.
- 50 Online Education Statistics: 2020 Data on Higher Learning & Corporate Training. (2020, June 30). Retrieved December 19, 2020, from <https://www.guide2research.com/research/online-education-statistics>

APPENDIX 1

Informed Consent Form

Date:

Name of Participant (not mandatory):

Position of participant:

Years of working experience:

Study Name: Faculty Experience with Motivating and Inhibiting Factors on Online Teaching: The Case of Two Universities in Baku.

Researcher: *Rabiya Suleymanli*. rsuleymanli11047@ada.edu.a

Purpose of the Research: to explore the faculty's experience with online-teaching by identifying the motivating and inhibiting factors.

Participants' responsibilities: The participants will be invited to participate in a semi-structured interview, which will last approximately 20 minutes, and answer the questions given by the researcher. Besides, the participants will be asked to share any document related to online teaching (lesson plan, policies, etc.) to find out the factors contributing to this research.

Research Benefits: The researcher believes that if faculty experience with online teaching will be explored deeply, the universities, the Ministry of Education, policymakers may look for new ways to support the faculty.

Withdrawal from the Study: Participants have a right to stop their participation in the study at any time, for any reason. If you decide to stop participation, or not answer a specific question, it will not impact your relationship with the researcher or with ADA University, and all information will be destroyed.

Thank you!

Confidentiality: The researcher will record the interviews with your consent only. Your identity will be protected, and all responses will be kept anonymous. Research data will only be accessible by the researcher.

Questions About the Research. If you have questions about the research, please feel free to contact Rabiya Suleymanli by e-mail (rsuleymanli11047@ada.edu.az) / Dr. Vafa Kazdal (vkazdal@ada.edu.az)

Legal Rights and Signatures:

I, _____ (*Your Name*) consent to participate in Faculty Experience with Motivating and Inhibiting Factors on Online Teaching: The Case of Two Universities in Baku conducted by Rabiya Suleymanli I have understood the purpose of this project and want to participate. By signing below, I indicate my consent.

Signature _____ **Date** _____

 Participant

Signature _____ **Date** _____

Principal Investigator

_____ (*Your Name*), agrees to allow audio recording in which I appear to be used in teaching, scientific presentations and/or publications with the understanding that I will not be identified by name. I am aware that I may withdraw this consent at any time without penalty.

APPENDIX 2

Interview Transcript for Faculty

Please tell me a little more about your experience with online teaching? Have you ever shared your experience with deans or program directors?

- Almost a year, I have been teaching online. But as we are using the Blackboard, submission of student's assignments previously was made through the Blackboard. I have never taught online. We had constant discussions, collaborations with the program director and program members. It is like an ongoing process, and it is all about collaboration and sharing, and learning from each-others.

2. As a faculty member, what motivates you to do your best to teach online?

-I love teaching, and it does not matter for me in which format I am teaching. Online teaching is a new challenge for me. It is a kind of novelty that motivates us. Learning new skills, doing some research motivates me as an instructor. The flexibility of location is also another motivating factor for me.

3. Do you think that you have enough technical background to engage in online teaching?

-I think it is never enough. But I would say that I manage it, and my classes are interactive. Students enjoy my lessons.

4. What policies or plans does your university implement for supporting you to teach online?

-We had IT Help Desk Support. They help us a lot. We address the mail to them if we need help.

We receive many videos from the administration about online teaching, new features of Blackboard. We joined some webinars too.

5. Have you ever received any rewards for your online teaching efforts? If yes, does it motivate you?

- No tangible reward. But I have received the reward for Blackboard usage, and my course page was chosen as exemplary, but it was before the pandemic.

6. Have you ever met any challenges that inhibit you to teach online? Tell me about some barriers to teach online?

-We had many challenges, but thanks to our department, we can overcome them. The main barriers is that we are very skeptical about every student because of cheating issues. Sometimes we have to check the exam papers many times. It is sometimes hard to encourage them to turn on the camera, and managing the group work is another challenge. These issues are stressful for me, and they do not demotivate me.

7. What pedagogical changes do you observe on the horizon of education (shift from face-to-face teaching to online teaching)? Have you ever experienced some difficulties adopting the new teaching environment?

- I think the majority of instructors like online teaching because of some advantages. Instructors invested their time and energy to learn new online education skills, and probably they will not give up this type of teaching. There will be a blended type of teaching. I believe as University we can offer some online courses.

8. How do you deal with the challenges of online teaching? Do you think that you need any additional support?

- I try to Organize the breakout rooms on Blackboard in a more effective way, making the process goes smoothly. Building a good relationship with students to create a more natural class environment will be helpful for instructors. We can improve ourselves on how to make the classes more interactive.

9. Describe the online teaching situation where your motivation level is highest and where your motivation level is lowest.

- My motivation is highest when my students are motivated enough to learn new things.

Cheating possibility, when I am not able to control their motivation, my motivation level becomes lowest. In face-to-face classes, we can easily monitor group work and other processes.

10. Please tell me your prognosis about the future of online teaching after face-to-face education is restored.

-As I mentioned before, we can have blended teaching-partially online and partially offline. Why should we give entirely up online teaching if it has advantages? I am not sure about transferring fully online teaching, but blended is the best option, I think.