

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

6-18-1996

Effective motivation of front-line employees

Regina M. Audio

Rowan College of New Jersey

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Public Relations and Advertising Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Audio, Regina M., "Effective motivation of front-line employees" (1996). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2137.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/2137>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact graduateresearch@rowan.edu.

Effective Motivation of Front-Line Employees

by

Regina M. Audio

A Thesis Project

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
of the Master of Arts Degree in the Graduate Division
of Rowan College of New Jersey

June 18, 1996

Approved by _____
Professor

Date Approved 6-18-96

ABSTRACT

Regina M. Audio, Effective Motivation of Front-Line Employees, 1996, Anthony J. Fulciniti, MA, Rowan College of New Jersey Graduate Program in Public Relations.

Motivating front-line employees to perform at optimum levels is a challenge for managers and business owners. Non-management employees from Southern New Jersey for-profit and non-profit companies responded to a survey to offer comments as to which of six specific types of motivational phrases would best motivate them to perform optimally in common workplace situations involving: quality, teamwork, personal responsibility to organizational policy and procedure, initiative, and customer service issues. Participants considered top performers by their managers were asked to choose which phrase would best motivate them in each situation in an attempt to identify which phrases are most effective in each situation.

Results of the survey suggested that the type of motivational communication that is most effective varies slightly from situation to situation, but that peak performers are consistently those who bring a high level of personal motivation to the job and apply that standard to all

types of work-related situations. This finding implies that locating such workers and tailoring situation-appropriate messages to them might prove more effective in achieving desired results than searching for an ideal motivational means and applying it generically to all employees, because mass application would include those from whom desired results might not be possible.

MINI-ABSTRACT

Regina M. Audio, Effective Motivation of Front-Line Employees. 1995, Anthony J. Fulciniti, MA, Rowan College of New Jersey Graduate Program in Public Relations.

Motivating front-line employees to perform at optimum levels is a challenge for managers and business owners. Non-management employees considered to be peak performers by their managers from Southern New Jersey companies were asked to choose which of six motivational phrases would best motivate them to perform optimally in scenarios describing each of five workplace situations: quality, teamwork, personal responsibility to organizational policy and procedure, initiative, and customer service. Results showed that peak performers were those who brought a high level of personal motivation to their jobs and suggested that locating such employees should precede the designing of motivational efforts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To my family who began this program with me a lifetime ago, and who will be with me for the next one, and the one after that, whatever those might be...

To my friends and colleagues who listened first to the soapbox ideas that created this thesis, then its progress, and finally the next soapbox it would create with its findings, particularly BK, Carolyn, Andi and Michael for their kindness and support...

To Jack Gillespie for his assistance as early as 1992 when we first began to work on Newstrack together and discuss employee motivation...

To Tony Fulginiti, for the hours spent in conference over this thesis and for pushing me to outdo everything I've done before, including my PR plans that will live in infamy...

To the participants in my study, without whose contributions I would not be here...

To Frank who told me in 1991 that yes, someday, I would finish...

And finally to Patrick, who taught me over Thursday afternoon coffee more about motivation and results than I could have ever imagined was possible...

...For this I thank you.

DEDICATION

To the unsung heroes of the workforce -- the part-timers, the night-timers, the weekenders, the hourlies -- who keep the system running, but with voices that too often go unheard.

May we never forget what it's like.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1	
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	6
Delimitations	6
Need for the Study	7
Hypothesis	8
Procedure	10
Definitions of Terms	11
Chapter 2	
Foundation for the Study	14
Relationship of the Study to the Field	25
Chapter 3	
Research Method	28
Chapter 4	
Research Findings	31
Chapter 5	
Interpretation of Findings	51
Public Relations Implications	51
For Further Research	53
Bibliography	55
Survey Form	Appendix A
Raw Data	Appendix B

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

CEOs and small-business owners agree that they possess certain entrepreneurial qualities that have made and continue to make them successful. Quality, teamwork, personal responsibility to organizational policy and procedure, initiative, and customer service are priorities for them every day. Peak performance in each of these areas is the norm for them and the trademark that separates them from their less successful colleagues.

Those same CEOs, small-business owners, and franchise operators employ front-line, non-management employees who share in the quality, teamwork, personal responsibility to organizational policy and procedure, initiative, and customer service duties. Yet, despite the importance of their employees' commitments to peak performance in these areas, these business owners claim that one of the greatest challenges they face is motivating their employees to perform as though they, too, were entrepreneurs who cared about these issues, and not simply disinterested workers collecting a paycheck.

Such entrepreneurial performance is vital, according to one business owner with stores grossing over \$5 million annually and employing over 100 workers on the non-management front lines.

"If I could find a way to get all of the people on my front lines to feel like they owned my stores, I know I would get better performance and my customers would get better service. It's that simple. It's a question of ownership."¹

A small-business CEO with about 20 front-line employees claims that, "No one who works for me ever seems to do the job the way I do mine. I try everything with my employees, but it seems that nothing, formal or informal, seems to work. They do a good job, but not an 'owner's job.' The care and concern are always missing, no matter what."²

One upper-level bank manager with thousands of front-line employees under his jurisdiction adds, "We believe that employees who feel like they have a stake in what happens to the company are the best employees to have on board, so we offer all of our employees the chance to buy stock."³ This institution has other incentive programs in place that reward

¹ Interview by author with franchise owner with stores grossing \$5 million annually and employing more than 100 front-line, non-management employees in Southern New Jersey, November, 1994.

² Interview by author with small-business owner in Southern New Jersey; has owned service-provider businesses in auto detailing and maintenance since 1972, November, 1994.

³ Interview by author with regional manager for Southern New Jersey commercial bank, November, 1994.

"extra mile" service efforts. Why, then, do bank customers still complain about employee rudeness, long waits and employees' lack of concern for the job they're doing?

Experts agree that several valid reasons explain why incentives fail and employees don't perform. Alfie Kohn, author of several management books, including Punished by Rewards: The Trouble With Gold Stars, Incentive Plans, A's, Praise and Other Bribes, presents one of the most controversial views on incentives and performance. In his lectures to corporations, Kohn suggests that pay and performance be kept as far apart as possible when trying to motivate people. Says Kohn, "The more we get people thinking about the reward they're going to get, the less interest they come to have in whatever they had to do to get the reward."⁴ Rather than use pay to reward employees, Kohn advises employers to "pay people well and fairly; then do everything possible to help them forget about money."⁵

Kohn also suggests that companies approach motivation the way psychologists do, dividing motivation into two types -- intrinsic and extrinsic, and then examining their employees and the efforts used to motivate them accordingly.⁶ This will help companies determine which employees will

⁴"Why Incentives Fail: A CFO Interview With Alfie Kohn." CFO, Sept., 1994, 15.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶Ibid.

respond to which motivators, according to Kohn, and will then help them determine which types of motivators to use. Employees will give employers the quality results they want if they are appropriately motivated. But, the fanciest motivation methods that address the wrong employee needs will fall short.⁷

Following Kohn's lead of identifying worker types and "hot buttons," the Gallup Management Consulting Group identified four personality types which were endorsed by an article in Sales and Marketing Management, and cited in a study released by Northwestern University's Integrated Marketing Communications Department. Identifying workers as one of those types, the achiever, the competitor, the ego-driven worker, and the service-oriented worker, might help companies motivate workers in a way that best suits them.⁸ Since each employee is different, a considerable effort must be made to communicate with each employee in a way that best motivates him or her in every situation.

Traditional means of rewarding employees are also changing, reports national business-psychology and management writer, Robert McGarvey, as are the employees the programs reward. "Programs that foster unhealthy internal competition pit employees against one another. Employee-of-the-month

⁷Ibid.

⁸Eisman, Regina. "Incentives: There's More to Measure." Incentive Magazine, Feb. 1995, 11.

programs create the situation where there will be only one winner but many losers."⁹ McGarvey instead describes a group reward system that fosters cooperation and contributes to healthier relationships between workers. McGarvey also suggests that employers give employees the power to reward each other for jobs well done instead of making rewards a top-down-only process.¹⁰

One CEO from a successful San Francisco tool and die company asserts simply that people make the difference, saying that "without good employees, even the best business plan will only be marginally effective."¹¹ That same theory can be applied to motivational methods: Without good employees to respond to them, they can be only marginally effective at best.

Which of these approaches is correct? Is the best method to scrap money and incentives all together and aim at a higher level of need? Or would it be more appropriate to go back to some basics, return to the carrot and stick or maybe resurrect the iron hand and threat of unemployment? The answer isn't simple, but it lies in the need for basic communication between bosses and employees. Paying top dollar for fancy programs that do not respond to employee needs is a

⁹McGarvey, Robert. "Risky Rewards." Entrepreneur, Nov. 1994, 76.

¹⁰Ibid., 77.

¹¹Melohn, Tom. "Winning Strategies." Incentive Magazine, Oct. 1994, 47.

waste if the programs are ineffective, and threats are useless if all they result in is turnover. Finding out what kinds of techniques work in which situations and then making those techniques part of something more formal might be a good way to get the desired performance results, say those employers in the trenches.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Owners and managers want employees to perform as though they themselves were part-owners of the company, yet they face the problem of being able to motivate front-line workers to do so. Traditional means of motivation are changing and existing motivational means are proving ineffective with the front-line, non-management employees who are supposed to be motivated by them. Little data exist from the perspective of the front-line employee, yet answers to how to motivate this group of workers rest with them, and are rooted in their needs and styles. This study provides data from this necessary, yet missing, perspective.

DELIMITATIONS

This study focused on non-management employees and the types of phrases that could motivate them to perform optimally in situations involving quality, teamwork, personal responsibility to organizational policy and procedure, initiative, and customer service. Employees were studied at

both profit and non-profit organizations. All respondents were currently employed. The study did not restrict employee age, sex, educational background or years with the company. All of these factors were noted as demographics, however.

Management-level employees and business owners were not asked to participate in the surveys, but were asked via individual interviews to provide background information used to formulate the survey, including areas of major concern, areas they often evaluated during performance reviews, and phrases used to motivate employees in each situation. Management-level employees were then asked to distribute the surveys to employees considered to be the best performers on their staff.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Because the problems caused by poor front-line performance will not go away and will continue to cost companies in terms of lost customers, as well as frustrate owners and managers, the question of how to motivate the front-line worker to perform optimally must be answered. Because means of motivation change as employees change, employers must discover new and appropriate ways to motivate for desired results.

Because not much data exist from the perspective of the front-line worker, despite an available pool of such workers, going directly to the front lines for these answers provides

business owners with a perspective missing from most of their existing motivational efforts.

A study involving the best front-line employees' direct responses to certain motivational phrases used during typical situations, and answers to which type of phrase would motivate them to perform as owners of the company, can help the people they work for and others in similar organizations to provide all workers with both the environment and support needed to get desired "owner-like" performance. This study will offer owners and managers suggestions from employees for communicating with them that can be integrated with existing motivational efforts and everyday communications to enhance the results of all communications and particularly motivational communications efforts.

HYPOTHESIS

The type of worker hired dictates what will motivate that worker, and what motivates that type of worker in a given situation determines how that worker will perform. Therefore, if employers are to motivate front-line, non-management employees to perform as though they were owners of the company, they must first shift their focus away from deciding which motivational efforts to use and concentrate on determining which types of employees they have hired or will hire and must motivate. Then, employers must tailor their

motivational programs to respond to their employees' individual styles and needs, going back to the basic communications and then designing programs structured around those communications.

ASSUMPTIONS

It will be assumed for the purpose of this study that all employers expect their employees to perform as though they were owners of the company, displaying entrepreneurial tendencies in the areas of quality, teamwork, personal responsibility to organizational policy and procedure, initiative, and customer service. It will also be assumed that certain similarities exist in all situations regardless of industry, and it will be assumed that the respondents will be able to apply their own industry-specifics to the generalized scenario offered.

It will also be assumed that the opinions of chosen employees, while not representative of the entire population, would be somewhat similar to those of their colleagues and other employees like them working in other organizations. Finally it will be assumed that the findings of the study will be applicable in some ways to other industries not represented in the study but employing similar types of employees working under the same conditions.

PROCEDURE

The author gained a background on the issue of employee incentives and motivation by performing literature searches and interviewing business owners and managers in the Southern New Jersey area.

Through this preliminary research, the author identified that people were going to provide the best data for the new study and that existing research could provide the foundation for an instrument to be used to conduct the original research.

Interviews with managers and owners showed that five areas were of major concern to them and that generally six types of motivation commonly occurred. Both of these findings were used to prepare the survey which was checked for clarity with the managers whose comments had provided the information that led to its formation.

A survey was chosen to serve as the research tool because it allowed the researcher to pose the questions without interviewer bias and gather the results in an anonymous fashion. The organizations chosen to participate in the study included a variety of industries and were chosen by the author because they employed a cross-section of the pool of front-line employees.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Achiever -- One of four worker personality types identified by the Gallup Management Consulting Group in which a person is driven to perform by his or her personal goals and the desire to achieve.

Competitor -- One of four worker personality types identified by the Gallup Management Consulting Group in which a person is driven to perform by his or her desire to be the best or top performer.

Ego-driven -- One of four worker personality types identified by the Gallup Management Consulting Group in which a person is driven to perform by the promise of public recognition or reward.

Entrepreneur -- a business owner; for this study this term will also refer to the worker who takes personal ownership in the company he or she works for by performing with the care and dedication of an owner.

Extrinsic motivation -- outside motivational factors, such as rewards, bonuses or incentives, that attempt to produce a desired behavior.

Extrinsically motivated -- those employees who are driven to do a superior job by extrinsic, or outside, motivational forces.

Front-line, non-management employees -- the employees who will be studied; those working in front-line roles without management responsibilities or training, receiving hourly wages, usually without traditional benefits packages.

Intrinsic motivation -- the motivational force within an employee that comes from doing a job that is liked and liking the job that needs to be done.

Intrinsically motivated -- those employees who are driven to do a superior job by intrinsic forces, or those coming from inside them.

Management employees -- those who supervise the front-line, non-management employees being studied.

Motivational methods or programs -- any policy, program, plan or method, formal or informal, that companies use to entice workers to perform.

Service-oriented -- One of four worker personality types identified by the Gallup Management Consulting Group in which

a person is driven to perform by his or her desire to serve others.

CHAPTER 2

To provide a foundation for the study, a comprehensive review of the literature was performed. Topics researched included motivation, employee motivation, employee rewards, employee recognition, psychological motivational factors, and general employee relations, communications and human resources categories. The searches were conducted on electronic databases, including the business abstracts, psychological abstracts, theses and dissertation abstracts, and social sciences indexes available at Rowan College of New Jersey, Camden County Library, and Cherry Hill Library, all of New Jersey. The literature search also included a review of the indexes of current business magazines, management publications and newspaper articles.

The literature review revealed that a considerable amount of material exists on the topic of motivation and employee incentives in books, periodicals and trade journals. For the purpose of this study, which deals with the needs and concerns of the front-line employee in 1996, and given that needs of employees change with the changing times, any material with a publication date older than five years was

not considered for inclusion in this study.

The literature review also revealed that a considerable amount of material exists which deals specifically with hiring and with employee recognition. No information was available, however, that specifically combined the hiring practice and the communications used in motivational efforts. Likewise, very little information existed from the perspective of the front-line employee, regardless of topic, and no similar studies were found to have been performed on a similar audience of front-line workers.

The literature search showed that experts' ideas surrounding motivation and the use of incentives are divided and subdivided between those who believe motivation should be monetary and those who believe that it should be non-monetary and consist largely of recognition and awards. Within that division, experts differ as to whether they believe that individuals should be rewarded as individuals or whether it's more beneficial to reward people as part of a team. Smaller debates rage as to which types of monetary or non-monetary incentives are most effective and discussions ensue relating to how often an incentive should be used and who should initiate the process.

Alfie Kohn, management consultant and author, offers one of the more contemporary -- and controversial -- views on employee rewards and motivation in the Small Business Forum article, "Do Employee Rewards and Recognition Programs Work?"

In that piece, Kohn suggests that rewards are successful only in producing temporary compliance with rules. Therefore, says Kohn, businesses cannot use a reward system to get them the desired results of quality, service and dedication.¹²

Why? Because rewards, maintains Kohn, do not create an enduring commitment to any value or action, but merely change what employees do -- temporarily. People who expect to receive a reward for completing a task, or for doing it well, do not perform as well as those who do not expect to receive anything. Kohn further asserts that "not one controlled study [to his knowledge] has ever demonstrated that a long-term improvement in the quality of performance ever occurs as a result of rewards."¹³

In continuing his discussion of rewards, Kohn asserts that rewards can actually punish workers by setting them up as winners or losers. He also contends that rewards thwart creativity since workers are less likely to take risks or explore possibilities if they fear the loss of a reward. Rewards, then, says Kohn, encourage people to seek easy tasks and take little interest in what is actually being done as they focus more on what they will get when the task is completed. Kohn also maintains that rewards can damage workplace relationships, saying that "very few things are as

¹²Kohn, Alfie. "Rewards Produce Temporary Compliance." Small Business Forum, Winter 1994/1995, 67.

¹³Ibid.

dangerous to an organization as a collection of incentive-driven individuals trying to reassure and curry favor with the incentive dispenser."¹⁴ Even if this incentive dispenser is a peer, as Robert McGarvey suggests as an alternative to the traditional management-down style of rewards, the danger still exists.

To provide a foundation for his opinions, Kohn refers to Edward Deci's studies in the early 1970's, which showed that the more employees thought about a reward the less they thought about their task, a condition that seems to still be true today.¹⁵ In an interview with CFO Magazine, Kohn reiterates this finding by saying that "the more people focus on a reward the less they focus on what they have to do to get the reward." He then says that to be effective the emphasis on motivation must move away from "simply motivating people to perform" to "determining what motivates people to perform."¹⁶

To further clarify his position, Kohn introduces the psychological concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation into the workplace motivational arena, noting that if employees are best motivated by extrinsic factors, such as money and other outside inducements, then there is little else that will motivate them. Likewise, if the reward is the

¹⁴Ibid., 68.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶"Why Incentives Fail." CFO Magazine, Sept. 1994, 15.

only reason the employee is performing, then intrinsic factors, such as personal commitments to quality and concern for the job will never be the driving factor in their performance. In a final statement Kohn says that "manipulating behavior by offering reinforcements can never bring quality to the workplace."¹⁷

The theories put forth by Kohn are relevant to this study on front-line employee motivation because finding out what makes employees perform as though they owned the company is one goal of this particular study. Knowledge and understanding of Kohn's concepts of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation become important in the study for interpreting the data and determining what best motivates which type of worker in which type of situation, and then later, when using this information, to recommend which types of workers to place in which types of positions.

Peter Scholtes offers an opinion similar to Kohn's. His contention is that "the greatest management conceit is that we can motivate people. Motivation is inside people -- or it isn't -- and the only thing that motivational efforts can do is demotivate."¹⁸ For example, Scholtes points to commonly used merit and reward systems that create winners, losers and cynics. According to Scholtes, many employees feel that the

¹⁷Kohn, Small Business Forum, 69.

¹⁸Scholtes, Peter R. "Reward and Incentive Programs are Ineffective -- Even Harmful." Small Business Forum, Winter 1994/1995, 71.

one day of recognition is merely lip service since it is not consistent with the treatment they receive on a daily basis. Similarly, if one employee wins and many employees lose in employee-of-the-month type endeavors, then those who do not win also lose their desire to try. Scholtes' solution to the problem is for managers to: resist the urge to bribe employees; remove demotivators; and focus on improving the motivational process. Lastly, Scholtes says that if managers want quality and customer service to be the end results of their motivational efforts, for instance, then they must focus on hiring employees who see quality and customer service as the focus of their job and move the emphasis away from the reward.¹⁹

Robert McGarvey's opinion that employee of the month programs do more harm than good are also in line with Kohn's and Scholtes' assertions. McGarvey contends that breeding unhealthy internal competition through contests is not advisable.²⁰ McGarvey also asserts that while team rewards might help eliminate the unhealthy aspect of the competition, they are not a sure-fire solution because contests soon become heavily entangled with rules. Limiting the number of winners or the number of times a person can win, for instance, changes a reward into a game where there is no relationship between performance and winning, and therefore

¹⁹Ibid., 73.

²⁰McGarvey, 77.

renders the contest useless as a motivator.²¹

Bob Nelson contradicts both Kohn and Scholtes when he asserts that "incentive programs can work" in his article by the same title from Small Business Forum's Winter 1994/1995 edition. Nelson, Vice President for a San Diego-based management training and consulting firm, contends that Kohn's theories are laced with myth and fiction. Nelson's first disagreement with Kohn is over Kohn's statement that extrinsic motivation is bad for quality. Nelson's first argument with Scholtes comes from the fact that Nelson believes that motivation is possible, and also desirable.²²

Says Nelson, "Intrinsic motivation is best. But few jobs are intrinsically motivating, so extrinsic motivation is sometimes the only way to motivate." This is particularly true of front-line positions. Nelson then contends that managers must work with employees to meet their individual needs, an idea that relates to this study because it supports what the study is suggesting that managers do.²³ These ideas can be seen as related to Kohn in one way, however. Kohn recommends that businesses pay workers a fair wage as a way of moving them away from thinking about money and extrinsic forces. Nelson's recommendations are similar in that he is asking managers to meet employees on their level, which on

²¹Ibid.

²²Nelson, Small Business Forum, Winter 1994/1995, 71-72.

²³Ibid., 70

the front line may indeed begin with the perceived adequacy and fairness of the wage.

Nelson again contradicts Kohn when he says that rewards do not punish, and that competition and controlling behavior are not bad. Nelson says instead that if employees are a part of creating the reward system, then they will feel less manipulated by it. He also notes that while excessive competition can create problems, some competition is healthy if it can be used to boost creativity and help people strive to achieve, particularly if workers are such types as to respond to these techniques. These ideas become important to the study because they again reinforce the idea that management must know what types of workers it is dealing with before putting motivational tactics into effect. Examining the effectiveness of everyday communication techniques is one way to achieve this.²⁴

Frank C. Hudetz, a chairman and CEO for an Illinois-based business, says that self-esteem and self-actualization are the highest order of incentives and should be at the base of every effort. He says on one hand, like Kohn does, that short-term incentives, such as cash, coupons and vacations are short-term rewards and therefore make short-lived incentives because they respond to lower level, more basic needs. Hudetz contends that to get quality results and long-

²⁴Ibid.

term commitment to their jobs, companies should aim to satisfy employees on higher levels, such as their self-esteem and self-actualization needs. Hudetz' theories assume that all employees are ready to have their needs met at these levels, something that would be applicable if every employee felt that the more basic needs were being met.²⁵

A study conducted by two integrated marketing students at Northwestern University significantly contributed to the development of this thesis because it proposes that the type of worker should be matched to the type of motivation. The study, titled, "Development of a Long-Term Measurement Instrument to Evaluate Incentive Programs," by Jolene Eckert and Cathy Hartman, suggested that incentive programs be evaluated in terms of the kinds of workers on hand to "use them." The study also stated that this was feasible because many companies had this information on hand. Four sales worker types were identified that could be applied to other industries as well. Those were: the achiever, the competitor, the ego-driven and the customer-driven. According to the study, all of these types of workers have different "hot buttons" that motivate them. The key, said the researchers, was to identify what types of workers existed in each position and then tailor-make each motivational effort to

²⁵Hudetz, Frank C. "Self Actualization and Self Esteem are the Highest Order of Incentives." Small Business Forum, Winter 1994/1995, 71.

respond to those workers' needs.²⁶

The Incentive Magazine article, "Hiring the Eagles," also suggested that it is the kind of worker who makes the difference in the quality of work performed, not the type of reward offered to that worker. Says author Tom Melohn, "without good people even the best [sales] plans will be marginal." The same can hold true for motivational efforts. The secret is not in the effort, it's in the people who will be responding to it. Melohn says that managers must reexamine the hiring process and get more detailed information about the people they will be hiring. Then, like other experts have suggested, once this information has been gathered during hiring, management can put it to work when designing the motivational means and gain a better chance of getting the desired results.²⁷

Virginia M. Gibson, writing in Management Review, says that employee compensation is linked to the organization's success since employer-employee relationships are changing. Companies want high-quality work, loyalty, commitment, and service. Employees want much more subjective things, including having their compensation linked to their contribution. They also want challenging work, opportunities for training, and flexibility in their schedules. Linking this to the Hudetz' findings and Kohn's notion of the

²⁶Eisman, 11.

²⁷Melohn, 50.

importance of adequate pay, it is only when employees are able to move up the hierarchy of needs -- beyond safety and security -- that they are able to respond to incentives offered at higher levels.

In a roundtable discussion six executives from companies around the United States discussed how they are beginning to change their compensation practices to make them more closely related to employees' contributions. These changes came about as a result of employees' changing ideas about work and the workplace. Writing in Incentive Magazine, Judy Quinn also suggests that organizations reengineer the way that rewards and recognition are handled the same way and at the same time they consider other changes in their organization. Reengineering guru James Champy, in the book, Reengineering the Corporation, devotes an entire section to this notion claiming that the "traditional means of motivation are changing as are the employees that managers must motivate."²⁸

Malia Boyd takes on the issue of incentives from the financial perspective and says that motivation can be done and often quite inexpensively. This agrees with the shared opinion of some of the other experts which says that sometimes it is the inexpensive type of reward that makes the most impression, such as the praise mentioned by Manager's Legal Bulletin writers or the trust and confidence touted by

²⁸Quinn, Judy. "Mr. Fix-It." Incentive Magazine, Feb. 1995, 18

Robert Rogers. Other non-financial rewards seem to work, too, although assertions by Kohn about adequate pay would seem to override the effectiveness of such rewards. In short, an employee who cannot make ends meet on a particular wage simply will not be motivated to work harder to earn a certificate, but that same employee might be persuaded to work harder if the reward helped to meet his individual needs, even if those needs are extrinsic and monetary given his position on the hierarchy of needs.

Relationship of the study to the field

While the study is unique in its content and its participants, its origin can be traced to the literature. Kohn suggested that motivation be characterized as intrinsic or extrinsic, and that organizations evaluate their workers in a similar way and determine whether their motivational efforts are responding appropriately to these workers' styles. This study takes that notion one step further and characterizes the communication used in more specific terms. Then this study links the employees' chosen responses to a specific type of worker so that a profile might be created.

Additional support for this study came from the article in the February 1995 issue of Incentive Magazine that suggested a link between the type of worker hired and the type of incentive that is effective. The 1995 study suggested that companies use information gathered from psychological

tests administered during the hiring process to help them form incentive programs that respond to employees' needs and "hot buttons." This study does just that by using general scenarios in each of five key areas and asking employees to tell which phrase would be most effective in each situation.

Concepts cited in the same 1995 Northwestern University study noted four sales worker types that had been identified by the Gallup Management Consulting Group: the achiever, the competitor, the ego-driven worker, and the service-oriented worker. The authors asserted that different incentives would be necessary to motivate these different types of workers to perform optimally. The article suggested that it was not so important to design the perfect incentive program, but to identify what employees would consider the perfect incentive, and then deliver that tailor-made method to each employee. This information will become helpful when interpreting the data and creating a hiring profile. This study will break new ground because it focuses entirely on the needs and ideas of front-line, non-management employees, and uses phrases and situations common to all industries that are specific enough for basic understanding.

The existing research, while voluminous and varied, lacks significant data gleaned from the perspective of the front-line employee. The existing research, however, does provide the support necessary for the new study, as is evidenced by the way that this new study has made new use of

what had been already researched and by the way that existing research will be used to interpret data and enhance the recommendations.

CHAPTER 3

The data needed for the study were divided into two areas: demographics and effective motivational responses in given situations.

A survey was compiled asking respondents to provide demographics about themselves and their present job, and also to tell which of six phrases would be most effective in motivating them to do an "owner-like" job in each of five different areas of their job responsibility. Employers and managers and performance reviews provided the basis for the five areas and six phrases which were then created by the researcher. The five areas and six phrases were not identified as such on the survey but were created to be distinct, clearly recognizable and easily classified.

Random employer-selected employees provided the remainder of the data necessary for the study and were chosen in the following manner: The employees were chosen randomly by managers from the pool of eligible employees considered to be the best performers at each workplace. Surveys were distributed in person and collected in person by the

researcher immediately upon completion. To be considered eligible, employees must have been:

- presently working on the front line in a non-management position for an organization in Southern New Jersey and
- must never have been in a management role in their present or a similar organization.

In the surveys, respondents were asked to:

- Provide basic demographic information concerning their present position, length at present position, age, highest grade level of education completed, what level of interaction their job required with the public and with co-workers, and how often their job required them to work independently; and
- Tell which of six phrases created by the researcher after interviewing managers and owners would best motivate them to perform in each of five different situations deemed by managers and owners to be the most important areas of non-management employees' jobs (quality, teamwork, personal responsibility to organizational policy and procedure, initiative, and customer service).

Surveys were distributed during the month of March 1996 to participants.

The data from the study were analyzed by the author using comparisons and matrices. Data were analyzed individually in a straight reporting of the findings. Then data were compared according to the demographics of sex and

type of organization worked for. Cross-comparisons were reported by question type (scenario) and response type (motivator). Row and column percents were provided for all relevant data along with frequencies.

CHAPTER 4

Some 109 completed surveys contained the results of the study. Demographics for the survey showed that 40 of the respondents were male and 69 were female; 78 worked in the for-profit setting and 31 in the non-profit setting. The ages of the respondents ranged from 17 years to 51 years with most respondents having an average age of 21. Respondents' educational levels also varied, with the majority of respondents having attended high school and some college, with some also having graduated from college.

In response to Question 1, which described a quality scenario and offered six types of motivational phrases and asked which phrase would best motivate them to perform, respondents answered in the following way: 22% said that perceived job responsibility would motivate them, 8.3% said that team pressure would motivate them, 3.7% said that the prospect of praise would motivate them, 2.7% said that a non-monetary reward would motivate them, 63.3% said that it was their personal standard that would motivate them, and none of the respondents said that a threat would motivate them to

perform.

TABLE 1 -- Question 1: Quality Scenario

Question 1 -- The company you work for has built a reputation for doing quality work at all levels. This means a 24-hour turnaround and a 100% accuracy rating on all orders processed and shipped. What motivates you to maintain these standards?

Response	Frequency N= 109	Row percent/ Column percent
A -- Threat: The fact that anyone who does not maintain these standards will be disciplined and later fired.	0	0/0
B -- Perceived Job Responsibility: It is a condition of the job that all workers maintain these quality standards.	24	17.2/22
C -- Team Pressure: My team gets a group reward for maintaining quality standards and they are depending on me to do my part.	9	15/8.3
D -- Praise: I will be told that I do a quality job by my peers, boss and customers.	4	13/3.7
E -- Non-monetary Reward: I will receive a monthly award (certificate) for every perfect performance.	3	12.5/2.7

F -- Personal Standard: It is my personal standard to perform this way; I would do so even if the company did not require it of me.	69	25.7/63.3
--	----	-----------

In response to Question 2, which described a teamwork scenario and offered six types of motivational phrase and asked which type of phrase would motivate them to participate in the team's activity, respondents answered in the following way: 1.8% said that a threat would motivate them, 16.5% said that perceived job responsibility would motivate them, 26.6% said that team pressure would motivate them, 2.7% said that the prospect of praise would motivate them, 3.7% said that a non-monetary reward would motivate them, and 48.6% said that it was their personal standard that would motivate them to participate.

TABLE 2 -- Question 2: Teamwork Scenario

Question 2 -- A special project needs to be completed by 4:00 p.m. and at 3:00 p.m. several parts of the project are still undone. You normally leave at 4:00 p.m., but if you stay and help, the project will get done. What motivates you to stay until things are done?

Response	Frequency N= 109	Row percent/ Column percent
A -- Threat: The knowledge that anyone who doesn't pitch in at crunch times doesn't get to share in the sales leads the projects generate.	2	8.3/1.8
B -- Perceived Job Responsibility: It is part of the job that everyone help during times when the office is busiest.	18	12.9/16.5
C -- Team Pressure: Everybody else is doing their part and they need my help so we can be successful.	29	48.3/26.6
D -- Praise: I will be commended for going the extra mile.	3	10/2.7
E -- Non-monetary Reward: I might get some sort of reward for going the extra mile.	4	16.6/3.7
F -- Personal Standard: It is my personal standard to stay involved with projects until they are done no matter what.	53	19.7/48.6

In response to Question 3, which described a personal responsibility to policy/procedure scenario and offered six types of motivational phrase and asked which type of phrase would motivate them to follow the policy, respondents answered in the following way: 14.7% said a threat would motivate them, 24.8% said that perceived job responsibility would motivate them, less than 1% said that team pressure would motivate them, 1.8% said that the prospect of praise would motivate them, less than 1% said that a non-monetary reward would motivate them, and 56.9% said that it was their personal standard that would motivate them to perform.

TABLE 3 -- Question 3: Personal Responsibility to Policy/
Procedure Scenario

Question 3 -- Your organization's staff meetings are always held after hours and sometimes on your day off, yet everyone is expected to attend the meetings. What makes you attend these meetings regardless of the day and time scheduled?

Response	Frequency N= 109	Row percent/ column percent
A -- Threat: The knowledge that meetings are mandatory and those who don't attend will get put on warning.	16	66.6/14.7
B -- Perceived Job Responsibility: It is a job requirement that staff stay updated through monthly meetings.	27	19.4/24.8
C -- Team Pressure: The shift (team) gets rated on attendance and they are depending on me to do my part.	1	1.6/.9
D -- Praise: Those who attend meetings always get praised at the end of the meeting.	2	5.6/1.8
E -- Non-monetary Reward: All those in attendance at meetings get a certificate for attendance and perfect attendance is rewarded at the end of the year.	1	4.1/.9

F -- Personal Standard: I feel personally responsible to stay updated on industry/ company information.	62	23.1/56.9
--	----	-----------

In response to Question 4, which described an initiative scenario and offered six types of motivational phrase and asked which type of phrase would motivate them to perform at top level, respondents answered in the following way: 2.7% said a threat would motivate them, 31.2% said that perceived job responsibility would motivate them, 17.4% said that team pressure would motivate them, 5.5% said that the prospect of praise would motivate them, 43.1% said that it was their personal standard that would motivate them to perform, and none said that a non-monetary reward would motivate them.

TABLE 4 -- Question 4: Initiative

Question 4 -- Certain jobs always need to be done every day in your workplace though they are not assigned to any one particular person as part of his/her job duties. What makes you decide to do the jobs when you see that they aren't being done? (Example of a job -- washing out the coffee pot or taking the mail to the mail room.)

Response	Frequency N= 109	Row percent/ Column percent
A -- Threat: If nobody does the job voluntarily we will all be put on a rigid schedule for the tasks.	3	12.5/2.7
B -- Perceived Job Responsibility: It is part of the job that I sometimes must do extra duties to make the office a better place to work.	34	24.4/31.2
C -- Team Pressure: Everybody else is doing their part and I must do mine.	19	31.6/17.4
D -- Praise: People praise/thank me for doing these jobs voluntarily.	6	20/5.5
E -- Non-monetary Reward: I may be the next recipient of the employee-of-the-month award if I continue to do the little things.	0	0/0
F -- Personal Standard: It is my personal standard to see that things that need to be done are done.	47	17.5/43.1

In response to Question 5, which described a customer service scenario and offered six types of motivational phrase and asked which type of phrase would best motivate them to perform at top level, respondents answered in the following way: 2.7% said that a threat would motivate them, 33% said that perceived job responsibility would motivate them, 1.8% said that team pressure would motivate them, 13.8% said that the prospect of praise would motivate them, 14.7% said that a non-monetary reward would motivate them, 34% said that it was their personal standard that would motivate them to perform.

TABLE 5 -- Question 5: Customer Service

Question 5 -- A customer at the store where you work has been shorted an item in their order [sic]. They call from home to tell you of the error but they can't come back to get the missing item. What makes you decide to drop it off at their house on your way home?

Response	Frequency N= 109	Row percent/ Column percent
A -- Threat: It was my fault and I could get put on warning for the mistake.	3	12.5/2.7
B -- Perceived Job Responsibility: It's my job to make sure that customers are happy.	24	25.8/36
C -- Team Pressure: Our shift will get a bad rating for my mistake and the whole team will suffer.	2	3.3/1.8
D -- Praise: I will be praised/thanked by my boss and/or the customer.	15	50/13.8
E -- Non-monetary Reward: Next time I ask for a day off/special favor, I might get special consideration for my dedication.	16	66.6/14.7
F -- Personal Standard: It is my personal standard to perform this way on the job.	37	13.8/34

Respondents were also asked to tell how much they interacted on their present job with the public and with co-workers and how often their jobs required that they work independently, using the ratings often, sometimes, seldom, and never for each. The responses were:

Interact with the public -- 71.5% often, 22% sometimes, 5.5% seldom, less than one percent never;

Interact with co-workers -- 77.1% often, 20.2% sometimes, 2.7% seldom, no percent never;

Work independently -- 74% often, 19.3% sometimes, 5.5% seldom, and no percent never.

In reviewing the responses, the total number of each type of response is shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6 -- Total Response Types

Response Type	Total Responses N = 545	Column Percent of Total 545
A -- Threat	24	4.4
B -- Perceived Job Responsibility	139	25.5
C -- Team Pressure	60	11
D -- Praise	30	5.5
E -- Non \$\$ Reward	24	4.4
F -- Personal Standard	268	49.1

This table shows how often each answer was chosen collectively out of a total 545 possible responses (109 questionnaires with five questions each).

As evidenced by the above Table, personal standard was by far the most popular chosen answer when looked at overall. Almost half of the answers given, regardless of scenario, received a personal standard response. For a further breakdown of how the individual questions matched up with each scenario, see Table 7.

TABLE 7 -- Which scenario ranked highest with each type of motivator.

Response/ Motivator	Row Percent	Focus of scenario (Question number)
A (Threat)	66.6%	Policy/Procedure (3)
B (Job Resp)	25.8%	Customer Service (5)
C (Team pressure)	48.3%	Teamwork (2)
D (Praise)	50%	Customer Service (5)
E (Non \$\$ Reward)	66%	Customer Service (5)
F (Pers. Standard)	25.7%	Quality (1)

This table shows which scenario was the most popular application of each motivator. The focus of each scenario is also provided.

These data indicate that threats do motivate more in policy/procedure situations more than any other type of motivator, that team pressure is more effective in teamwork situations, and that personal standard is most important in quality situations. Perceived job responsibility, praise and non-monetary rewards received their highest response rates in reference to the customer service situation, showing that customer service is an area where multiple factors can motivate. The one scenario that did not have a specific

motivator appear as most commonly chosen was the scenario concerning initiative.

When cross-tabulated by gender, the data showed the following:

Table 8 -- Motivation Response Types by Gender

	Resp. Type A	Resp. Type B	Resp Type C	Resp Type D	Resp Type E	Resp Type F
Male	6 25% 3%	55 39.5% 27.5%	26 43.3% 13%	12 40% 6%	8 33.3% 4%	93 34.7% 46.5%
Female	18 75% 5.2%	84 60.4% 24.3%	34 56.6% 9.8%	18 60% 5.2%	16 66.7% 4.6%	175 65.3% 50.7%

Legend

Frequency (N = 200 male; 345 female)

Column Percent

Row Percent

This table shows the breakdown of responses by gender. Men were less likely than women to respond to teamwork motivators or threats.

TABLE 9 Response Type A -- Threat

	Ques. 1 Quality	Ques. 2 Teamwork	Ques. 3 Policy/ Proced.	Ques. 4 Initia- tive	Ques. 5 Cust. Service
Male	0	2 1.8% 1%	3 2.7% 1.5%	0	1 .9% .5%
Female	0	0	13 11.9% 3.7%	3 2.75% .9%	2 1.8% .6%

Legend

Frequency (N = 24)

Column Percent

Row Percent

Men were rarely motivated by threats in any situation.

TABLE 10 Response Type B -- Perceived Job Responsibility

	Ques. 1 Quality	Ques. 2 Teamwork	Ques. 3 Policy/ Proced.	Ques. 4 Initia- tive	Ques. 5 Cust. Service
Male	9 8.2% 4.5%	9 8.2% 4.5%	8 7.3% 4%	12 11% 6%	17 15.6% 8.5%
Female	15 13.7% 4.3%	9 8.2% 2.6%	19 17.4% 5.5%	22 20.1% 6.4%	19 17.4% 5.5%

Legend

Frequency (N = 139)

Column Percent

Row Percent

Men and women fared similarly in this response category.

TABLE 11 Response Type C -- Team Pressure

	Ques. 1 Quality	Ques. 2 Teamwork	Ques. 3 Policy/ Proced.	Ques. 4 Initia- tive	Ques. 5 Cust. Service
Male	5 4.5% 2.5%	6 5.5% 3%	1 .9% .5%	12 11% 6%	2 1.8% 1%
Female	4 3.6% 1.2%	23 21.1% 6.6%	0	7 6.4% 2%	0

Legend

Frequency (N = 60)

Column Percent

Row Percent

Team pressure was significantly higher among women than among men.

TABLE 12 Response Type D -- Praise

	Ques. 1 Quality	Ques. 2 Teamwork	Ques. 3 Policy/ Proced.	Ques. 4 Initia- tive	Ques. 5 Cust. Service
Male	1 .9% .5%	2 1.8% 1%	2 1.8% 1%	6 5.5% 3%	1 .9% .5%
Female	3 2.7% .9%	1 .9% .3%	0	0	14 12.8% 4.1%

Legend

Frequency (N = 30)

Column Percent

Row Percent

Men were considerably more responsive to praise than women,

particularly in the initiative scenario.

TABLE 13 Response Type E -- Non monetary reward

	Ques. 1 Quality	Ques. 2 Teamwork	Ques. 3 Policy/ Proced.	Ques. 4 Initia- tive	Ques. 5 Cust. Service
Male	1 .9% .5%	1 .9% .5%	1 .9% .5%	0	5 4.6% 2.5%
Female	2 1.8% .6%	3 2.7% .9%	0	0	11 10.1% 3.2%

Legend

Frequency (N = 24)

Column Percent

Row Percent

TABLE 14 Response Type F -- Personal Standard

	Ques. 1 Quality	Ques. 2 Teamwork	Ques. 3 Policy/ Proced.	Ques. 4 Initia- tive	Ques. 5 Cust. Service
Male	24 22% 12%	20 18.3% 10%	23 22.9% 12.5%	10 9.2% 5%	15 13.8% 7.5%
Female	45 41.3% 13%	33 30.1% 9.6%	38 34.9% 11%	37 34% 10.7%	15 13.8% 7.5%

Legend

Frequency (N = 268)

Column Percent

Row Percent

This gender breakdown showed that personal standard was

a key motivator among men and women rather consistently. The findings revealed that proportionally women were more likely to choose a threat motivator than men were (Table IX) and women were also more likely to be motivated in certain situations by team pressure (Table XI). Similarly, women were also more likely to choose a non-monetary reward in situations where men were proportionally more likely to choose a perceived job responsibility response as motivator (Tables X and XIV).

A cross-tabulation by organization type, profit vs. non-profit, did not show any significant trends; nor did a cross-tabulation by total number of years worked. Consistently the most common answer for each question type was personal standard, as indicated in Table 15.

Table 15 -- Most popular response type for each question.

Question number & Focus of question	Most commonly chosen response (Row percent)	Focus of response
1 -- Quality	F -- 63.3%	Personal Standard
2 -- Teamwork	F -- 48.6%	Personal Standard
3 -- Policy/Proced.	F -- 56.9%	Personal Standard
4 -- Initiative	F -- 43.1%	Personal Standard
5 -- Customer Svc.	F -- 34%	Personal Standard

This table shows which motivator type was most chosen for each question, regardless of the question's focus.

This information shows that for each question personal standard was the most common motivator.

CHAPTER 5

The study revealed that across the board, personal standards are the greatest motivating force among those front-line employees studied. This major finding presents a challenge to managers and owners as it implies that while external motivators, such as threats and non-monetary rewards are somewhat effective in some settings, no one effort can be as effective in motivating employees to go above and beyond as an employee's own will and determination.

Public Relations Implications

This finding has important implications for all industries employing front-line workers, which would translate to just about every industry in the American system: Hiring practices once reserved for upper-level employees must be adjusted to include those on the front line. Psychological tests and personality questionnaires, such as those in the text, New Personality Self-Portrait: Why You Think, Work, Love and Act the Way You Do by John M. Oldham, M.D., and Lois B. Morris (Bantam, 1995), to determine which types of workers are being hired are not a wasted

effort on the front line. They are, in fact, assets, as they may help managers identify potential organizational stars -- and problems -- early on, before a lot of time and money are invested. The finding suggests that it is the people who make the difference and therefore the shift must be made toward finding people capable of giving the desired results rather than trying to get impossible results from employees who are simply unable to perform.

Further analysis of the data showed that some situations could call for special types of motivation, such as in situations where teamwork was required or commitment to organizational policies and procedures was required. This finding places another challenge before management: Tailor-make motivational strategies to fit not only the properly hired employee but also the situation. This will require careful planning by managers who must be acutely aware of their employees' hot buttons and how those hot buttons intermix with required duties and daily work situations. This careful planning will also require a targeted rifle-like approach to motivation from many managers still accustomed to using more generic, shotgun tactics to motivate several employees at once. This finding calls for a change in the way motivation is approached and ultimately implemented. At first the work might seem like a great deal of fuss and research, but the findings of this study suggest that the work will pay off. Front-line employee files should

not simply contain the job application and copies of Social Security cards needed for the personnel department, but also carefully detailed observations of how that employee responds to certain situations and personal testimonies of what is important to that employee, gathered from manager interviews. The personnel file should become a personal file as well.

Recommendations for further study

This study sets the stage for further studies in the area of motivational communication. One area that should be investigated is the psychological classification of employee types. A study which cross-references employee types with the responses to motivational phrases could prove invaluable to managers trying to learn to say the right thing at the right time to the right employee.

Additional research should investigate the particular job duties and responsibilities hinted at by questions 10-12 of this survey which asked for interaction levels and independent work requirements. A closer look at the possible link between years on the job and/or education levels might also indicate a valuable trend, especially as more and more people are reduced to holding front-line positions for which they are overqualified as a result of downsizing or the shortage of professional jobs. Such studies might lead to others that could elevate the status of the front line and

ultimately improve the quality of work done at that level.

Lastly, additional research should look at what types of motivators are most effective with those who come to the position with the high personal standard. It can be assumed that these workers will motivate themselves, but it is also necessary for managers to know what "little things" they can do to supplement this self-motivation. The study could focus on which types of specific benefits or responsibilities such employees value and lead to recommendations on how to keep such employees on board once managers have found them. Retention of good workers would be a natural follow-up to this study which calls for the location of such workers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Eisman, Regina. "Incentives: There's More to Measure." Incentive Magazine, Feb. 1995, 11.
- Hudetz, Frank C. "Self Actualization and Self Esteem are the Highest Order of Incentives." Small Business Forum, Winter 1994/1995, 71.
- Kohn, Alfie. "Rewards Produce Temporary Compliance." Small Business Forum, Winter 1994/1995, 67.
- McGarvey, Robert. "Risky Rewards." Entrepreneur, Nov. 1994, 76.
- Melohn, Tom. "Winning Strategies." Incentive Magazine, Oct. 1994, 47.
- Nelson, Bob. "Incentive Programs Can Work." Small Business Forum, Winter 1994/1995, 71-72.
- Quinn, Judy. "Mr. Fix-It." Incentive Magazine, Feb. 1995, 18.
- Scholtes, Peter R. "Reward and Incentive Programs are Ineffective -- Even Harmful." Small Business Forum, Winter 1994/1995, 71.
- "Why Incentives Fail: A CFO Interview With Alfie Kohn." CFO, Sept., 1994, 15.
- Author interview with franchise owner with stores grossing \$5 million annually and employing more than 100 front-line, non-management employees in Southern New Jersey, November, 1994.
- Author interview with small-business owner in Southern New Jersey; has owned service-provider businesses in auto detailing and maintenance since 1972, November, 1994.
- Author interview with regional manager for Southern New Jersey commercial bank, November, 1994.
- Author interviews with managers of front-line employees in banking, fast-food, restaurant management, non-profit, and educational institutions, November 1994-January, 1996.

Appendix A -- Survey Form

Survey # _____

Read each scenario and choose one answer for each.

(Assume in each situation that your pay is satisfactory and will not be affected by your performance.)

1. The company you work for has built a reputation for doing quality work at all levels. This means a 24-hour turnaround and a 100% accuracy rating on all orders processed and shipped. What motivates you to maintain these standards? *Please choose one:*

- _____ a. The fact that anyone who does not maintain these standards will be disciplined and fired after the second offense.
- _____ b. It is a condition of the job that all workers maintain these quality standards.
- _____ c. My team gets a group reward for maintaining quality standards and they are depending on me to do my part.
- _____ d. I will be told that I do a quality job by my peers, boss and customers.
- _____ e. I will receive a monthly award (certificate) for every perfect performance.
- _____ f. It is my personal standard to perform this way; I would do so even if the company did not require it of me.

2. A special project needs to be completed by 4:00 PM and at 3:00 PM several parts of the project are still undone. You normally leave at 4:00 PM, but if you stay to help, the project will get done. What motivates you to stay until things are done? *Please choose one:*

- _____ a. The knowledge that anyone who doesn't pitch in at crunch times doesn't get to share in the sales leads the projects generate.
- _____ b. It is part of the job that everyone help during times when the office is the busiest.
- _____ c. Everybody else is doing their part and they need my help so we can be successful.
- _____ d. I will be commended for going the extra mile.
- _____ e. I might get some sort of reward for going the extra mile.
- _____ f. It is my personal standard to stay involved with projects until they are done no matter what.

3. Your organization's staff meetings are always held after hours and sometimes on your day off, yet everyone is expected to attend the meetings. What makes you attend these meetings regardless of the day and time scheduled? *Please choose one:*

- _____ a. The knowledge that meetings are mandatory and those who don't attend will get put on warning.
- _____ b. It is a job requirement that staff stay updated through monthly meetings.
- _____ c. The shift (team) gets rated on attendance and they are depending on me to do my part.
- _____ d. Those who attend the meetings always get praised at the end of the meeting.
- _____ e. All those in attendance at meetings get a certificate for attendance and perfect attendance is rewarded at the end of the year.
- _____ f. I feel personally responsible to stay updated on industry/company information.

4. Certain jobs always need to be done every day in your workplace even though they are not assigned to any one particular person as part of his/her job duties. What makes you decide to do the jobs when you see that they aren't done? (Example of a job might be washing out the coffee pot or taking the mail to the mail room).

- ____ a. If nobody does the job voluntarily we will all be put on a rigid schedule for the tasks.
- ____ b. It is part of the job that I sometimes must do extra duties to make the office a better place to work.
- ____ c. Everybody else is doing their part and I must do mine.
- ____ d. People praise/thank me for doing these jobs voluntarily.
- ____ e. I may be the next recipient of the employee of the month award if I continue to do the little things.
- ____ f. It is my personal standard to see that things that need to be done are done.

5. A customer at the store where you work has been shorted an item in their order. They call from home to tell you of the error but they can't come back to get the missing item. What makes you decide to drop it off to their house on your way home? Please choose one:

- ____ a. It was my fault and I could be put on warning for the mistake if the customer decides not to shop here anymore.
- ____ b. It's my job to make sure that customers are happy.
- ____ c. Our shift will get a bad rating for my mistake and the whole team will suffer.
- ____ d. I will be praised/thanked by the customer and/or my boss.
- ____ e. Next time I ask for a day off/special favor, I might get special consideration for my dedication.
- ____ f. It is my personal standard to perform this way on the job.

6. ____ Male ____ Female

7. Age: _____

8. Highest grade completed in school: _____

9. Present job is: ____ For-profit (food service, retail, etc.)
 ____ Non-profit (government, school)

10. How often do you interact with the public as part of your job? (please circle)

Often Sometimes Seldom Never

11. How much does your job require that you interact with co-workers in order to do your job?

Often Sometimes Seldom Never

12. How often does your job require you to work independently to get things done?

Often Sometimes Seldom Never

13. Time in present job: _____ (years/months)

14. Number of years working (total): _____

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11

Appendix B -- Survey Data

1		Question 1	Question 2	Question 3	Question 4	Question 5	Question 6
2	1	F	F	B	B	F	FEMALE
3	2	F	F	F	B	F	FEMALE
4	3	F	F	B	F	F	FEMALE
5	4	F	C	F	B	F	FEMALE
6	5	F	F	B	F	F	FEMALE
7	6	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE
8	7	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE
9	8	B	C	B	B	E	FEMALE
10	9	F	F	F	F	B	FEMALE
11	10	F	C	F	F	F	FEMALE
12	11	F	B	F	F	D	FEMALE
13	12	F	C	B	F	B	FEMALE
14	13	F	F	F	F	F	MALE
15	14	B	C	F	C	B	FEMALE
16	15	B	C	B	C	B	MALE
17	16	F	C	A	F	F	FEMALE
18	17	F	F	F	D	F	MALE
19	18	F	F	F	D	F	MALE
20	19	B	F	B	F	B	FEMALE
21	20	F	C	F	F	B	MALE
22	21	F	F	F	C	D	FEMALE
23	22	D	C	A	C	B	FEMALE
24	23	F	F	F	F	F	MALE
25	24	E	A	C	C	C	MALE
26	25	B	F	B	F	B	FEMALE
27	26	F	F	B	F	B	FEMALE
28	27	D	C	D	C	D	MALE
29	28	C	F	F	F	F	MALE
30	29	F	F	F	B	B	MALE
31	30	B	C	A	A	A	FEMALE
32	31	C	B	A	B	E	FEMALE
33	32	B	B	F	C	B	MALE
34	33	F	B	B	B	E	FEMALE
35	34	C	C	G	G	E	FEMALE
36	35	B	F	B	B	D	FEMALE
37	36	E	F	A	B	D	FEMALE
38	37	F	E	A	B	D	FEMALE
39	38	F	F	B	B	E	MALE
40	39	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE
41	40	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE
42	41	F	B	F	C	B	MALE
43	42	B	B	F	B	B	FEMALE
44	43	C	B	B	B	B	MALE

Appendix B -- Survey Data

4 5	44	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE
4 6	45	F	B	F	F	F	MALE
4 7	46	F	F	F	C	E	MALE
4 8	47	F	F	B	B	E	FEMALE
4 9	48	C	F	A	B	A	MALE
5 0	49	F	F	F	F	B	FEMALE
5 1	50	F	F	A	B	B	MALE
5 2	51	F	F	F	F	D	FEMALE
5 3	52	D	F	F	B	B	FEMALE
5 4	53	F	C	F	F	B	FEMALE
5 5	54	C	F	F	C	F	MALE
5 6	55	D	D	F	F	B	FEMALE
5 7	56	B	D	F	B	C	MALE
5 8	57	F	F	F	C	F	FEMALE
5 9	58	F	C	F	A	D	FEMALE
6 0	59	F	B	F	B	B	MALE
6 1	60	B	A	A	B	B	MALE
6 2	61	B	E	D	B	B	MALE
6 3	62	B	C	B	B	E	FEMALE
6 4	63	F	F	F	F	B	FEMALE
6 5	64	F	C	F	F	F	FEMALE
6 6	65	F	B	F	F	D	FEMALE
6 7	66	F	C	B	F	B	FEMALE
6 8	67	F	F	F	F	F	MALE
6 9	68	B	C	F	C	B	FEMALE
7 0	69	B	C	B	C	B	MALE
7 1	70	F	C	A	F	F	FEMALE
7 2	71	F	F	F	D	F	MALE
7 3	72	F	F	F	D	F	MALE
7 4	73	B	F	B	F	B	FEMALE
7 5	74	F	C	F	F	B	MALE
7 6	75	F	F	F	C	D	FEMALE
7 7	76	F	E	A	B	D	FEMALE
7 8	77	F	F	B	B	E	MALE
7 9	78	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE
8 0	79	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE
8 1	80	F	B	F	C	B	MALE
8 2	81	B	B	F	B	B	FEMALE
8 3	82	C	B	B	B	B	MALE
8 4	83	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE
8 5	84	F	B	F	F	F	MALE
8 6	85	F	F	F	C	E	MALE
8 7	86	F	F	B	B	E	FEMALE
8 8	87	B	C	B	B	E	FEMALE

Appendix B -- Survey Data

89	88	F	F	F	F	B	FEMALE
90	89	F	C	F	F	F	FEMALE
91	90	F	B	F	F	D	FEMALE
92	91	F	C	B	F	B	FEMALE
93	92	F	F	F	F	F	MALE
94	93	B	C	F	C	B	FEMALE
95	94	B	C	B	C	B	MALE
96	95	F	C	A	F	F	FEMALE
97	96	F	F	F	D	F	MALE
98	97	F	F	F	D	F	MALE
99	98	B	C	A	A	A	FEMALE
100	99	C	B	A	B	E	FEMALE
101	100	B	B	F	C	B	MALE
102	101	F	B	B	B	E	FEMALE
103	102	C	C	G	G	E	FEMALE
104	103	B	F	B	B	D	FEMALE
105	104	E	F	A	B	D	FEMALE
106	105	F	E	A	B	D	FEMALE
107	106	F	F	B	B	E	MALE
108	107	B	D	E	F	F	MALE
109	108	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE
110	109	F	F	F	F	F	FEMALE

Appendix B -- Survey Data

1	Question 7	Question 8	Question 9	Question 10	Question 11
2	51	COLL GRAD	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
3	34	2 YRS COLL	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
4	43	3 YRS COLL	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
5	42	COLL GRAD	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
6	38	12	NON	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
7	23	12	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
8	22	2 YRS COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
9	23	2.5 COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
10	23	SOME COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
11	26	ASSOC DEG	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
12	21	1.5 YRS COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
13	33	COLL GRAD	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
14	20	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
15	18	N/A	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
16	N/A	COLL GRAD+	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
17	51	RN	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
18	21	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
19	46	COLL GRAD+	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
20	23	JR COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
21	26	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
22	26	14	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	SOMETIMES
23	21	14	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
24	32	14	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
25	20	14	N/A	SELDOM	SOMETIMES
26	21	14	NON	SELDOM	OFTEN
27	27	N/A	FOR PROFIT	NEVER	SOMETIMES
28	N/A	N/A	N/A	SELDOM	SELDOM
29	29	COLL GRAD	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
30	25	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
31	21	17	NON	SELDOM	SELDOM
32	24	15	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
33	47	14	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
34	31	12	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
35	N/A	N/A	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
36	42	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
37	31	14	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
38	25	16	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
39	23	N/A	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
40	42	15	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
41	40	GRAD LEV	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
42	21	16	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
43	24	15	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
44	22		FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN

Appendix B -- Survey Data

4 5	43	14	NON PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
4 6	43	12	NON-PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
4 7	45	COLLEGE	NON PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
4 8	50	GRAD	NON-PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
4 9	25	12	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	SOMETIMES
5 0	46	17	NON PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
5 1	30	COLL GRAD	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
5 2	25	16	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
5 3	25	17	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
5 4	47	14	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
5 5	23	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
5 6	24	COLL GRAD	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
5 7	27	15	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
5 8	47	13	FOR PROFIT	SELDOM	SOMETIMES
5 9	27	GRAD LEVEL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
6 0	26	COLL GRAD	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
6 1	24	14	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
6 2					
6 3	23	2.5 COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
6 4	23	SOME COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
6 5	26	ASSOC DEG	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
6 6	21	1.5 YRS COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
6 7	33	COLL GRAD	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
6 8	20	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
6 9	18	N/A	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
7 0	N/A	COLL GRAD+	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
7 1	51	RN	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
7 2	21	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
7 3	46	COLL GRAD+	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
7 4	23	JR COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
7 5	26	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
7 6	26	14	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	SOMETIMES
7 7	25	16	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
7 8	23	N/A	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
7 9	42	15	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
8 0	40	GRAD LEV	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
8 1	21	16	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
8 2	24	15	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
8 3	22		FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
8 4	43	14	NON PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
8 5	43	12	NON-PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
8 6	45	COLLEGE	NON PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
8 7	50	GRAD	NON-PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
8 8	23	2.5 COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN

Appendix B -- Survey Data

8 9	23	SOME COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
9 0	26	ASSOC DEG	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
9 1	21	1.5 YRS COLL	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
9 2	33	COLL GRAD	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
9 3	20	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
9 4	18	N/A	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
9 5	N/A	COLL GRAD+	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
9 6	51	RN	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
9 7	21	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
9 8	46	COLL GRAD+	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	SOMETIMES
9 9	21	17	NON	SELDOM	SELDOM
1 0 0	24	15	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
1 0 1	47	14	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
1 0 2	31	12	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
1 0 3	N/A	N/A	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN
1 0 4	42	15	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
1 0 5	31	14	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
1 0 6	25	16	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
1 0 7	23	N/A	FOR PROFIT	OFTEN	OFTEN
1 0 8	21	15	N/A		
1 0 9	42	15	FOR PROFIT	SOMETIMES	OFTEN
1 1 0	40	GRAD LEV	NON	OFTEN	OFTEN

Appendix B -- Survey Data

1	Question 12	Question 13	Question 14		Code
2	SOMETIMES	2 YRS	10 YRS		13
3	OFTEN	3 MONTHS	3 MONTHS		7
4	OFTEN	1 YEAR	25 YEARS		7
5	OFTEN	12 YEARS	20 YEARS		7
6	OFTEN	1 YEAR	N/A		7
7	OFTEN	5 YEARS	9 YEARS		11
8	OFTEN	18 MONTHS	9 YEARS		11
9	SOMETIMES	6.5 YEARS	10 YEARS		11
10	SOMETIMES	3.5 YEARS	8 YEARS		11
11	SOMETIMES	6 MONTHS	10 YEARS		2
12	OFTEN	3 YRS 1 MO	5 YEARS		2
13	OFTEN	1 MONTH	7 YEARS		2
14	OFTEN	4 MONTHS	4 YEARS		2
15	OFTEN	9 MONTHS	3 YEARS		2
16	OFTEN	4.5 YEARS	38 YEARS		13
17	OFTEN	7 YEARS	7 YEARS		13
18	SOMETIMES	4 YEARS	5 YEARS		8
19	OFTEN	17 YEARS	25 YEARS		19
20	SELDOM	8 YRS 6 MO	10 YEARS		8
21	OFTEN	1 YR 4 MO	10 YEARS		8
22	OFTEN	4 YRS 6 MO	10 YEARS		8
23	OFTEN	1 YEAR	4 YEARS		8
24	OFTEN	5 YEARS	12 YEARS		18
25	OFTEN	N/A	5 YEARS		8
26	OFTEN	2 YEARS	7 YEARS		8
27	OFTEN	2 YEARS	6 YEARS		19
28	SOMETIMES	N/A	N/A		8
29	SOMETIMES	2.5 YEARS	2.5 YEARS		19
30	OFTEN	5 YEARS	11 YEARS		8
31	OFTEN	SEM	SAME		20
32	OFTEN	2.5 YEARS	10 YEARS		8
33	OFTEN	26 YEARS	28 YEARS		17
34	OFTEN	8 YEARS	N/A		8
35	OFTEN	5 YEARS	16 YEARS		18
36	OFTEN	10 YEARS	23 YEARS		17
37	OFTEN	7 YRS 3 MO	14 YEARS		8
38	OFTEN	5 YEARS	N/A		8
39	SOMETIMES	1 YEAR	9 YEARS		8
40	OFTEN	4 YEARS	24 YEARS		17
41	OFTEN	25 YEARS	27 YEARS		18
42	SELDOM	6 YEARS	9 YEARS		8
43	OFTEN	2 MONTHS	8 YEARS		12
44	OFTEN	4 YEARS	6 YEARS		12

Appendix B -- Survey Data

4 5	OFTEN	4 YRS 5 MO	20 YEARS	12
4 6	OFTEN	24 YEARS	33 YEARS	12
4 7	OFTEN	6 MONTHS	25 YEARS	13
4 8	OFTEN	2 YRS 10 MO	12 YEARS	13
4 9	SOMETIMES			10
5 0	OFTEN	3 YEARS	14 YEARS	10
5 1	OFTEN	8 YRS 5 MO	8 YRS 5 MO	10
5 2	OFTEN	2 YRS 9 MO	8 YEARS	10
5 3	OFTEN	3 MONTHS	9 YEARS	10
5 4	OFTEN	6 YEARS	13 YEARS	9
5 5	SOMETIMES	5 MONTHS	7 YEARS	9
5 6	OFTEN	5 YEARS	8 YEARS	9
5 7	OFTEN	1 YR 6 MO	10 YEARS	9
5 8	OFTEN	2 MONTHS	27 YEARS	9
5 9	SELDOM	8 YEARS	12 YEARS	6
6 0	SOMETIMES	1 YEAR	12 YEARS	1
6 1	SELDOM	5 YEARS	7 YEARS	3
6 2				
6 3	SOMETIMES	6.5 YEARS	10 YEARS	11
6 4	SOMETIMES	3.5 YEARS	8 YEARS	11
6 5	SOMETIMES	6 MONTHS	10 YEARS	2
6 6	OFTEN	3 YRS 1 MO	5 YEARS	2
6 7	OFTEN	1 MONTH	7 YEARS	2
6 8	OFTEN	4 MONTHS	4 YEARS	2
6 9	OFTEN	9 MONTHS	3 YEARS	2
7 0	OFTEN	4.5 YEARS	38 YEARS	13
7 1	OFTEN	7 YEARS	7 YEARS	13
7 2	SOMETIMES	4 YEARS	5 YEARS	8
7 3	OFTEN	17 YEARS	25 YEARS	19
7 4	SELDOM	8 YRS 6 MO	10 YEARS	8
7 5	OFTEN	1 YR 4 MO	10 YEARS	8
7 6	OFTEN	4 YRS 6 MO	10 YEARS	8
7 7	OFTEN	5 YEARS	N/A	8
7 8	SOMETIMES	1 YEAR	9 YEARS	8
7 9	OFTEN	4 YEARS	24 YEARS	17
8 0	OFTEN	25 YEARS	27 YEARS	18
8 1	SELDOM	6 YEARS	9 YEARS	8
8 2	OFTEN	2 MONTHS	8 YEARS	12
8 3	OFTEN	4 YEARS	6 YEARS	12
8 4	OFTEN	4 YRS 5 MO	20 YEARS	12
8 5	OFTEN	24 YEARS	33 YEARS	12
8 6	OFTEN	6 MONTHS	25 YEARS	13
8 7	OFTEN	2 YRS 10 MO	12 YEARS	13
8 8	SOMETIMES	6.5 YEARS	10 YEARS	11

Appendix B -- Survey Data

8 9	SOMETIMES	3.5 YEARS	8 YEARS		11
9 0	SOMETIMES	6 MONTHS	10 YEARS		2
9 1	OFTEN	3 YRS 1 MO	5 YEARS		2
9 2	OFTEN	1 MONTH	7 YEARS		2
9 3	OFTEN	4 MONTHS	4 YEARS		2
9 4	OFTEN	9 MONTHS	3 YEARS		2
9 5	OFTEN	4.5 YEARS	38 YEARS		13
9 6	OFTEN	7 YEARS	7 YEARS		13
9 7	SOMETIMES	4 YEARS	5 YEARS		8
9 8	OFTEN	17 YEARS	25 YEARS		19
9 9	OFTEN	SEM	SAME		20
1 0 0	OFTEN	2.5 YEARS	10 YEARS		8
1 0 1	OFTEN	26 YEARS	28 YEARS		17
1 0 2	OFTEN	8 YEARS	N/A		8
1 0 3	OFTEN	5 YEARS	16 YEARS		18
1 0 4	OFTEN	10 YEARS	23 YEARS		17
1 0 5	OFTEN	7 YRS 3 MO	14 YEARS		8
1 0 6	OFTEN	5 YEARS	N/A		8
1 0 7	SOMETIMES	1 YEAR	9 YEARS		8
1 0 8					20
1 0 9	OFTEN	4 YEARS	24 YEARS		17
1 1 0	OFTEN	25 YEARS	27 YEARS		18