Establishing and Maintaining Employee Motivation from Recruitment through Induction, Transition, and Retirement

Professional Doctorate
In Occupational Psychology

Joseph Michael Ungemah
London Metropolitan University

June 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract Page 4

Prologue Page 5

Chapter 1: Critical Literature Review Page 11
The Distinction between Generational and Natural Ageing
Effects on Employee Motivation

Chapter 2: Quantitative Research Page 31
Person-Environment Fit in the Selection, Performance, and
Engagement of New Recruits
Study 1 - Construct Validity of a Fit Measure of Motivation
Study 2 - Prediction of Engagement and Performance
Study 3 - Replication of Busy Bee's Usefulness

Chapter 3: Case Study Page 113
Sustaining Employee Motivation through Alignment
In the Psychological Contract

Chapter 4: Intervention Page 137
Motivating Employees for Change through a
Development Programme

Epilogue Page 162

References Page 169

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1: Ageing and generational effects on motivation p.28
Table 2: Internal reliabilities of Busy Bee dimensions p.53
Table 3: Factor Analysis of the Busy Bee measure p.56
Table 4: Normality of applicant preferences for the Busy Bee measure p.59
Table 5: Normality of trainee preferences for the Busy Bee measure p.60
Table 6: Normality of trainee perceptions of the Builders programme p.61
Table 7: Trainee and applicant misfit by motivator category p.63
Table 8: Trainee demographics p.64
Table 9: Relationship between the Busy Bee measure and the OPQ p.66
Table 10: Relationship between the Busy Bee measure and the MQ p.67
Table 11: Personal Contribution misfit related to higher interview scores p.81
Table 12: Social Opportunity misfit and MQ related to higher interview scores p.82
Table 13: MQ Status preferences related to lower group exercise scores p.83
Table 14: Personal Growth fit predicts total level of engagement p.84
Table 15: Personal Growth fit and OPQ Democratic predicts Absorption p.85
Table 16: Workplace Support fit predictive of Organisational Alignment p.85
Table 17: OPQ Democratic and Achieving predicts self-rated Effort p.86
Table 18: OPQ Persuasive predicts self-rated Extra-Role Behaviour p.87
Table 19: Social Opportunity fit predictive of self-rated Advocacy p.87
Table 20: Personal Contribution fit predictive of General Performance p.88
Table 21: Social Opportunity fit predicts Competency Performance p.88
Table 22: Personal Growth fit and OPQ anxiety predictive of potential p.89
Table 23: Personal Contribution fit predictive of potential p.90
Table 24: Graduate misfit by motivator category compared to trainees p.100
Table 25: Personal Contribution fit predicts total level of engagement p.102
Table 26: Social Opportunity fit predicts Identification p.103
Table 27: Social Opportunity and Org. Integrity fit predicts Absorption p.103
Figure 1: Rousseau's (1995) illustration of psychological contract types p.118

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores how motivation changes across the employee life cycle, from recruitment through induction, transition, and retirement. After a short prologue about why motivation is of personal interest, a literature review is conducted that identifies the key theoretical traditions of motivation, which fall into the broad categories of needs, traits, and values. By investigating how each of the three types of motivation are affected by ageing and generational cohorts, a theoretical contribution is made by identifying how motivational change occurs and where gaps in knowledge exist. Chapter 2 focuses on how employee motivators can be assessed at the time of hiring. Through a series of quantitative studies performed on a trainee population within an international merchant of building materials, a new motivation measure based upon person-environment fit is proven as a reliable and valid predictor of performance and engagement. The studies make both a practitioner contribution to the assessment of motivation and an empirical contribution with insight into the key motivators of early career employees. The third chapter investigates the management of employee expectations following a career transition. A case study of two employees from an international Human Resources consultancy illustrates how a breakdown in the psychological contract can lead to attrition, with implications for professional practice in recording employee and organisational perspectives, identifying key motivators, and fulfilling unmet obligations. Chapter 4 explores how development programmes can be used for renewing the psychological contract of long-term employees when organisational change occurs. An intervention is presented, wherein a national electric grid operator required support in establishing a new corporate culture amongst employees. The intervention makes a contribution to professional practice by demonstrating the strengths and limitations of development programmes based upon self-awareness for encouraging behavioural change. Throughout the dissertation, research implications are noted for practitioners, researchers, participating organisations, and the development of my own professional practice.

PROLOGUE

After 11 years of working in the field of Human Resources, undertaking a professional doctorate has created an opportunity for me to reflect upon my professional practice, question the approaches I have taken, and explore where I would like to progress my career next. When considering the range of possible research topics, I settled upon motivation as the central theme of this dissertation. Employee motivation appealed to me, as the knowledge I would gain through the research would complement my existing skill set and help guide my future career decisions. Currently, I am a consultant for a private company that specialises in the assessment of people at work. SHL is a major publisher of psychometrics, operating in nearly 40 countries and employing approximately 750 staff members. My typical client engagement at SHL involves designing and implementing an assessment strategy that differentiates between candidates for hiring or promotion. Even when development work is undertaken, assessment is used to raise self-awareness before any learning occurs. The perspective adopted by my employer and requested by our clients places emphasis on individual ability and leadership potential, with underlying assumptions about the fixed nature of personal characteristics, the value of a few gifted staff for driving performance, and dominance of organisational needs in the employment relationship. Through this professional doctorate, I wanted to question whether an alternative perspective based upon staff perceptions of their workplace environment and employment relationship could complement the approach I typically adopt as a consultant.

A perspective based upon employee motivation challenges a fixed, organisationally dominated employment relationship. Unlike typical views of ability as innate and fixed, motivation varies across the employee life cycle, responding to changes in personal circumstances, physical and mental dexterity, and organisational stature. What once motivated new hires may hold little importance when they are established in their careers, due to the complete fulfilment of needs (e.g. through promotion or increase in salary) or a decrease in relevance for specific motivators on personal satisfaction and

well-being (e.g. fulfilment of needs occurs outside the world of work). Instead, motivators such as intrinsically satisfying work or career alignment to personal values may take on increased importance. How and why these changes occur rest partially in the employee's life experiences, but also with societal and economic pressures that lie outside an employee's control.

Although the specific types of motivators are likely to change in content and importance over time, the influence of motivation on engagement and performance remains. As will be shown later in this dissertation, motivation plays a major role in directing, focusing, and sustaining behaviours that determine how work is done. By understanding what motivates employees at various times in the employee life cycle and adapting the workplace environment accordingly, employers have the ability to improve the employment relationship and through it, both employee engagement and job performance. As a result, focus in the employment relationship shifts from organisational needs to valuing the interaction between staff and their workplace. In this dissertation, I will explore this interaction, identifying how to establish a strong employment relationship, manage the relationship through change, and restore confidence when obligations go unfilled.

The dissertation contributes to an understanding of motivation for four main audiences, specifically researchers, practitioners, the participating organisations, and for the development of my own professional practice. A variety of approaches will be taken in this dissertation to explore the topic of motivation. A literature review is conducted to identify different types of motivators and how these are to likely to change in importance due to ageing or generational effects. A series of quantitative studies explore the assessment of motivation at the time of hiring, comparing preference-only measures to one based upon person-environment fit. A case study is performed to discover why motivation is sometimes lost due to a break in the psychological contract. Finally, an intervention is presented about how motivation can be restored through development programmes focused on increasing self-awareness. When compared to the British Psychological Society, Division of Occupational Psychology Guidelines (2005), the research falls primarily within three of the eight defined areas of practice, specifically

Personnel Selection and Assessment (quantitative studies), Performance Appraisal and Career Development (case study), and Employee Relations and Motivation (intervention). In the following discussion, a brief description of the dissertation's major contributions are described by primary audience (researchers, practitioners, participating organisations, and self), followed by a commentary about the common strengths and limitations discovered across the dissertation's components.

Regarding the contribution made to researchers interested in the topic of employee motivation, the dissertation presents a literature review of the major theories of motivation, which fall broadly into the categories of traits, needs, and values. By investigating how ageing and generational cohorts influence the expression of these three types of motivators, changes in motivation are identified for both individuals and groups. The model provided in the literature review allows for gaps to be identified in the field's understanding of motivation, as well as potential areas for the development of intervention techniques. For example, if the Millennial Generation (those born between 1982 and 2005) are characterised by desires for immediate personal gratification, then reward models can be designed and validated for their ability to motivate Millennials, whilst maintaining fairness across other generational cohorts. As a second form of contribution, researchers can benefit from the empirical data captured about the key motivators identified for new hires, as well as for different demographic groups, in the quantitative research presented in Chapter 2. Interestingly, a shift in preferences was discovered between the application phase and hiring of employees, thus providing a topic for future study.

For practitioners, the dissertation contributes with a variety of techniques that can be used for the identification and management of employee motivation. In the quantitative research conducted in Chapter 2, a new approach for measuring motivation based upon person-environment fit is demonstrated as a valid and reliable measure of engagement and performance. Unlike preference-only alternatives, the fit measure accounts for how fulfilled employees feel in their roles, allowing for specific recommendations about how to change the workplace environment. In the

case study presented in Chapter 3, the concept of the psychological contract is introduced as a means of summarising the strength of the employment relationship. The principles of exploring obligations not addressed at hiring, providing realistic descriptions of work requirements and benefits, and promising only what is possible were highlighted to practitioners as a means of preserving the psychological contract. In Chapter 4, a development programme based upon increased self-awareness is evaluated for its ability to transform the psychological contract and motivate staff following considerable organisational change. The technique appears to be effective at renewing the psychological contract for long-term employees, through its provision of the support, resources, and opportunities required for behavioural change. For all the techniques presented for practitioners, limitations of each approach are highlighted, such that decisions can be made about the type of intervention that is most appropriate for a given context.

Three separate organisations took part in the current research. In the quantitative studies found in Chapter 2, an international merchant of building materials was interested in understanding the key motivators of its trainee population, to improve staff engagement and performance whilst on the Management Trainee Programme. The research contributed to an understanding of their employees' needs, raising a key question about the objectives of the development programme that led to large-scale adjustment in the programme's content and selection of candidates. In the case study presented in Chapter 3, an international Human Resources consultancy took part to understand why high levels of attrition were occurring amongst consultants. The case study unearthed issues of professional development and career advancement, both in how jobs were described to applicants and the fulfilment of expectations. Recommendations for the induction of new hires and the ongoing management of the psychological contract were presented as a means of increasing engagement and lowering attrition. A national electric grid operator took part in the intervention described in Chapter 4. Undergoing a change in corporate identity from a government owned to semi-state organisation, the participating organisation was interested in understanding the capability of its senior staff to transform the

business. The intervention proved successful at increasing self-awareness and motivating behavioural change towards the new corporate culture. As described above, the three participating organisations differed in their specific requirements for identifying and managing employee motivation, but benefited equally from the practical recommendations that resulted from the research.

As the final beneficiary of this dissertation's research, I gained insight into my own professional practice and career interests. My interest in the topic of motivation was driven by a desire to understand the assumptions that I make as a practitioner, as well as the motivators that have led to my current role, such that I can make better career choices. Specifically, I am at a crossroads about whether to pursue a long-term career as a consultant or to return to an internal role in Human Resources. By exploring the academic literature on motivation and conducting original research with my clients, I hope to expand my knowledge of techniques and gain greater self-awareness about the needs, traits, and values that I value most, such that I can make a career decision at the completion of this professional doctorate. I will talk in greater depth about how the research has shaped my own professional development during the epilogue.

The present dissertation provides a snapshot into employee motivation and how it is likely to change across the employee life cycle. Special attention is placed on the identification and management of key motivators, with implications for researchers and practitioners alike. Despite the contributions described above, some common limitations will be noted across the chapters. First, the research is based upon real client interactions and as result, the quality of the organisational data is sometimes questionable. This is particularly apparent in the assessment data used in the quantitative studies found in Chapter 2, where the participating organisation was solely responsible for selecting candidates onto the programme. Moreover, the clients were influential in the choice of methods used, incurring deviation from pure forms of intervention as recommended by the research on motivation. This is apparent in the intervention presented in Chapter 4, where an assessment before development approach was preselected by the client without the consideration of other intervention techniques. Second, the

available academic literature is dominated by particular cultures and research methods, for example the dominance of American research on generational cohorts. Future studies should investigate whether the trends discovered here are appropriate across cultures or whether adjustment is required in the motivational model presented in Chapter 1. Additional extensions are recommended for investigating ageing effects outside the field of Occupational Psychology (e.g. Sociology or Clinical Psychology), as well as for longitudinal studies of the psychological contract at various points in an employee's career (to remedy the bias created by autobiographical memory). Despite these limitations, the dissertation is thought to provide a comprehensive review of employee motivation and insight into techniques that can effectively identify and manage the motivators valued most by employees.

CHAPTER 1: CRITICAL LITERATURE REVIEW

The Distinction between Generational and Natural Ageing Effects on Employee Motivation

Research on the topic of motivation shares a rich tradition established by some of the seminal works found in the field of Occupational Psychology. What started as an exploration of workplace performance gradually grew into a complex web of environmental and dispositional factors that had the ability to influence the satisfaction, engagement, and performance of workers. The link between satisfaction and motivation was researched early in the topic's history, during the first quarter of the 20th Century, followed closely by a consideration of employee needs that dictate motivation and the goals set to achieve them. Contemporary research on motivation focuses on validating and building upon the rich theoretical foundations established by Maslow, Herzberg, and their contemporaries, through testing specific hypotheses around the interaction, long-terms effects, predictive validity, and measurement of different types of motivators (Latham, 2007).

In the following chapter, the topic of motivation will be explored through a variety of vantage points with the aim of identifying key motivators and how they are likely to change due to factors such as the workplace environment, the economic climate, and the passage of time. Motivation is defined by Pinder (1998, p. 496) as the "Set of energetic forces that originate both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behaviour and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration." As this definition implies, understanding an individual's primary motivators and how they are likely to change over time or in different contexts can unlock the reasons why employees behave as they do in the workplace. Questions about whether employees are acting on their own volition, how long a specific behaviour is likely to last, whether performance is as intense as it could be, or where energy is likely to be directed can all be addressed through a motivational paradigm (Latham, 2007; Vroom and Deci, 1992).

Of particular interest in the current chapter is the distinction between the effects of natural ageing and generation membership on personal

motivation. Rhodes (1983) proposed that these two factors are of crucial importance in understanding motivation, along with the effects of the current economic or political climate. If practitioners are able to make the distinction between motivators arising from specific generations from those that are likely to change over an employee's career, choices can be made about how best to recruit, select, and engage workers. Human Resources policies and practices may require adaptation from time-to-time to meet the needs of incoming generations or to support workers as they progress in their service with the organisation.

In the following chapter, the discussion will first define the influence of generational effects and natural ageing on motivation. A more detailed review of predominant theories of motivation is then provided, grouped into the broad categories of needs, traits, and value based theories. Although differing in their specific vantage-point, previous reviews by Latham and Pinder (2005), Kanfer (1994), and Vroom and Deci (1992) support this generic categorisation between theories. Generational and natural ageing effects will be considered for each of the three types of motivators. Implications for this review on the recruitment, selection, and engagement of employees will be explored in the chapter's summary, with ramifications for the concepts of person-environment fit and the psychological contract introduced later in this dissertation.

Through the analysis described above, the chapter provides a theoretical contribution to the field of Occupational Psychology by grounding current research on generations and ageing with established theories of motivation. At present, research about group differences in employee motivation report a wide range of generational and ageing effects, but do so in an unstructured way. For example, the extensive reviews undertaken by Twenge (2006) on generations and Rhodes (1983) on ageing indicate group differences, however they report their findings without commenting upon the relationships between motivators or their potential for change through the employment relationship. Such issues are addressed explicitly by theories of motivation, wherein different types of motivators are organised by type (needs, traits, or value based) and commentary is provided about whether they can be fulfilled adequately by different types of workplaces. In this

chapter's conclusion, a summary matrix is provided that displays key trends identified from the research on ageing and generations, organised by motivation theory type (trait, need, or value based). This summary matrix provides an original contribution to research on motivation. As will be discussed, the analysis underlying the summary matrix has the potential to direct future research by identifying motivators where little research has been conducted on ageing and generations, such that the full ramifications of these variables can be understood. Additionally, the analysis can help direct the types of interventions undertaken by practitioners, with choices in how to fulfil specific needs, allow for the expression of traits, or establish common values amongst different age groups and generational cohorts.

As an Employee Ages

Life span research has discovered that development during adulthood (independent of the influence of childhood or adolescence) has the potential to alter one's motivation, personality, affect, vocational interests, values, and self-concept (Kanfer and Ackerman, 2004). Employees typically experience a loss in their ability to perform tasks requiring speed, accuracy, or a high degree of working memory, however show growth in their ability to solve problems due to their advanced knowledge and experience (Kanfer and Ackerman, 2004; Rhodes, 1983). Merzenich quoted in an interview with Doidge (2008) explains, "We have an intense period of learning in childhood. Every day is a day of new stuff. And then, in our early employment, we are intensely engaged in learning and acquiring new skills and abilities. And more and more as we progress in life we are operating as users of mastered skills and abilities (p. 87)." Experienced workers may believe that they are continuously learning new skills, but the majority of activity is instead a deviation on already mastered tasks. In translating this trade-off to overall job performance, no major relationship has been found between age and performance across the majority of professions (Goldberg, 2005), with the exception of peak performance occurring during the early 30s for employees in the fields of science, philosophy, music, art, and literature (Rhodes, 1983).

The effects of ageing are more pronounced for employee attitudes. In a review of 60 studies on job attitudes and 115 studies on performance, Rhodes (1983) discovered that overall job satisfaction, job involvement, and organisational commitment increase with age. However, Warr (2007) cautions that overall job satisfaction may decrease slightly after the age of 65, possibly reflecting the transition into retirement. This trend in overall job satisfaction is driven primarily by how pleased employees are with the work they are conducting, rather than by features of the workplace (e.g. satisfaction with their supervisor, workmates, or organisation). Moreover, both Rhodes (1983) and Warr (2007) found that the relationship is not linear, with initial excitement of young employees dropping after a few years and then rebounding to the high level initially experienced. This drop in satisfaction may be related to higher levels of turnover and avoidable absences experienced by younger workers (Rhodes, 1983). As will be discussed in later sections, age is also noticeable in the needs, traits, and values held by employees, where motivators either grow or decline in importance (SHL Internal Study, 2007; Kanfer and Ackerman, 2004).

At the end of one's career, workers are faced with a decision about how they will withdraw from the labour market, in the form of retirement. Workers who work past the official retirement age or adopt a bridging job (often part-time, self-employed, or of a voluntary nature) fare better in their level of happiness and well-being (Warr, 2007). Key to this relationship is the individual's preference for working and their ability to choose when they retire (Warr et at., 2004). Individuals who are forced to retire or those who cannot retire due to personal circumstance both report lower levels of happiness as compared to those with choice in their employment status. As discussed in the section below, attitudes towards retirement are changing, with Baby Boomers wishing to continue working past the official retirement age. If this cohort successfully challenges the rules and perceptions governing retirement, greater flexibility may be witnessed in the workplace to the benefit of both those who wish to remain employed and those who wish for retirement.

Generational Divisions

One of the most notable features of the literature on generations is how little agreement exists on the classification and cut-off dates of each generational cohort. In a paper by Howe and Strauss (2007), six generations are identified, specifically the GI Generation (born between 1901 and 1924), Silent Generation (born between 1925 and 1942), Baby Boomers (born between 1943 and 1960), Generation X (born between 1961 and 1981), Millennial Generation (born between 1982 and 2005), and the Homeland Generation (born between 2005 and 2025). Although few authors challenge the first three generational distinctions, controversy exists over the X, Millennial, and Homeland designations. For example, the Millennial Generation is commonly referred to as Generation Y (NAS Insights, 2006), whilst Twenge (2006) refers to half of Generation X and all of the Millennial and Homeland generations collectively as Generation Me (born between 1970 and the present). Added to this uncertainty is the predominance of American research, drawing question as to how the generations differ on a global basis.

Smola and Sutton (2002) define a generation as sharing similar birth years and significant life events, as well as a common geographic location. Based upon this definition, the uncertainty created by multiple cut-off dates and the dominance of American research poses a significant limitation to research on generational cohorts. Depending upon whether a significant life event falls within a specific cut-off date or whether its psychological ramifications are witnessed in a given culture has the potential to affect the strength and influence of a cohort effect. Although beyond the scope of the current chapter, these limitations will be addressed more fully in the conclusion. In the text that follows, focus will be drawn to the three most common generational distinctions in the workforce (Baby Boomers, Generation X, and the Millennial Generation) and the effects each cohort has on the types of workplace motivation exhibited.

Howe and Strauss (2007) propose four main archetypes that denote generational differences. In their model, Baby Boomers represent the 'prophet' archetype, which is characterised by value-driven, moralistic, and self-directed behaviour. Having experienced life events such as the Vietnam

War, the Kennedy Assassination, the Sexual Revolution, and Watergate (Smola and Sutton, 2002), the Baby Boomers seek out individual meaning, prestige, and self-sufficiency and therefore, view retirement as challenge to their self-identity. In contrast, Generation X represents the 'nomad' archetype (Howe and Strauss, 2007), whose members are described as tough, unwanted, adventurous, and cynical of social institutions. Members of this generation are considered effective in pushing efficiency, cutting bureaucracy, and driving innovation. Having experienced rapid change that has resulted in financial, familial, and societal insecurity (Smola and Sutton, 2002), Generation X members have adopted an independent approach to the workplace and are willing to switch employers and jobs frequently. The Millennial Generation represents the 'hero' archetype in Howe and Strauss's (2007) model, which is characterised by a return to conventional and institutionally-driven behaviour, thereby demonstrating a high degree of loyalty and trust. Members of the Millennial Generation are racially and ethnically diverse, technologically savvy, and self-confident (Twenge, 2006). However, this cohort is also characterised by a sheltered upbringing that is likely to result in a high degree of employer dependency (Howe and Strauss, 2007). Not yet seen is the 'artist' archetype in the model, which is predicted for the Homeland Generation. This cohort completes the cycle with an emphasis on emotion and compromise that will likely lead to a new cultural awakening of what should be valued in life.

Differences in the social, economic, and political environment are evident in the descriptions of the generations above. These forces have led to characteristics that are held in common by generational members, which include different expectations and attitudes held about the workplace. For example, Generation X members are likely to thrive under autonomous working arrangements, determining for themselves the best way for accomplishing a task. In contrast, members of the Millennial Generation are likely to thrive under stronger organisational structures and close supervision. If employers are unable to bridge this transition between autonomous working and high organisational support, the motivation of the Millennial Generation members may be lost. By adapting effectively to the motivational differences

held by each generation, researchers believe that employers will benefit from increased productivity, innovation, and corporate citizenship behaviour (Smola and Sutton, 2002). In practice, such adaptation is required simultaneously for each of the three generations currently employed in the workplace (i.e. Baby Boomer, Generation X, and Millennial Generation) and therefore, is difficult to achieve in a fair and sustainable way.

Needs

The first of the three main types of motivation theories discussed in this literature review relates to employee needs that lead to motivated behaviour towards their fulfilment. A key differentiator in the research is the distinction between extrinsic and intrinsic forms of motivation. Intrinsic motivation is defined by an individual doing a task because it is inherently interesting and provides immediate satisfaction, whereas extrinsic motivation involves an instrumentality between the activity and some form of indirect consequence (Vroom and Deci, 1992). The distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation indicates that different types of needs are fulfilled by doing a task, forming the basis for the theoretical models discussed below. These models attempt to map out and classify the various types of needs held by employees in the workplace, as well as identify the ways they might interact to drive motivation. For example, recent research has discovered that extrinsic rewards diminish intrinsic motivation by undermining how a worker rationalises their behaviour and the gratification they would normally receive from self-directed work (Gagne and Deci, 2005; Vansteenkiste and Deci, 2003; Deci, Koestner, and Ryan, 1999; Kanfer, 1994).

One of the earliest and most prominent need theories was developed by Maslow in 1943. Although not intentionally created for the workplace, the model has held great influence for the study of motivation in Occupational Psychology (Latham, 2007). In Maslow's model, a hierarchy is proposed where the achievement of lower level needs provides the freedom to seek out higher level needs (Latham and Pinder, 2005; Vroom and Deci, 1992). At the lowest level in the hierarchy, individuals are thought to seek ways of satisfying deficiencies in physiological needs, such as finding food or shelter. In a

workplace context, physiological needs can be satisfied through the provision of financial reward. The second level in the hierarchy involves safety through the creation of stability and predictability, which could be represented by a permanent offer of employment. The third level is love with the establishment of affectionate relations with others, such as with work colleagues or one's manager. The fourth level involves esteem, where an individual seeks respect and achievement. This could occur through accomplishing difficult work objectives or being recognised for exceptional performance. The final level is actualisation, characterised by individuals fulfilling their full potential. Employees who feel that they have found the perfect vocation and who are engrossed in its pursuits may be described as attaining this level in the hierarchy.

An alternate model is provided by Herzberg (1968) who suggested two distinct forms of motivators. Hygiene factors, similar to the lower levels in Maslow's hierarchy, have the potential to demotivate employees if not provided for, however do little to encourage employees to work harder. The provision of pleasant work conditions, stable pay, supportive supervision, and the opportunity for social interaction are thought to create an environment that allows employees to fulfil basic job requirements. To encourage employees to work harder, Herzberg suggested that organisations provide motivators such as personal responsibility, challenging work, and opportunities for professional growth.

As a third example, Warr (2007, 1986) proposes the vitamin model of motivation, whereby the satisfaction of certain needs is related to positive mental health. Individuals experiencing a high level of fulfilment from their workplace would be expected to demonstrate affective well-being, competence to perform job requirements, aspiration to grow in their vocation, autonomy in how they go about their work, and social integration with peers. Warr (2007, 1986) identified nine primary motivators inherent to an employee's job. The motivators of opportunity for control, opportunity for skill use, externally generated goals, variety, environmental clarity, and opportunity for interpersonal contact are thought to follow a u-shaped relationship with motivation, whereby both low and excessive levels are thought to hinder an

employee's mental health. The remaining job features of availability of money, physical security, and valued social position are considered universally good for mental health, as are the three organisational features of having a supportive supervisor, career outlook, and equity. Research conducted on the vitamin model has generally supported the link between the satisfaction of needs and positive mental health, however the u-shaped distribution has not been validated (De Jonge and Schaufeli, 2007; Jeurissen and Nyklicek, 2001; De Jonge and Schaufeli, 1998). Excessive amounts of motivators do not appear as harmful as predicted in Warr's model.

Common across all three models discussed above is a series of needs amongst employees that can be satisfied by the workplace. Depending upon the dimension, fulfilment of needs results in motivation for increased job performance, following the basic tenants of operant conditioning (Vroom and Deci, 1992; Skinner, 1974). However, it is unclear whether denying motivators once provided, as a form of punishment, can have an equal affect on job performance. If this was the case, the needs models discussed above may be too simplistic in assuming only a positive relationship between motivator and performance. A second uncertainty in the models is whether employees value the same needs universally and in the same order. Universality in employee needs is implied by Maslow's (1943) hierarchy, however other research suggests that the fit of employees' needs to their workplace differs across individuals. For example, Salancik and Pfeiffer (1977) suggest that employees should be selected for roles based upon whether individual needs are likely fulfilled by a given job. Differentiation in needs is most evident in Warr's (1986, 2007) vitamin model, where no evident order is suggested between the nine job and three organisational motivators. Thus, the legacy of need theories appears to rest more in the identification of different types of motivators rather than in their relationship to each other.

Consistent with this interpretation, the literature suggests that employee needs vary (both in type and potency) due to the effects of age and generational cohort. Regarding age, older workers are not less motivated than younger workers as sometimes assumed, but appear to be motivated by different needs (SHL Internal Study, 2007). As mentioned above, the abilities

that older workers bring to their employers are different from younger workers, specifically advanced problem solving and tacit knowledge. Kanfer and Ackerman (2004) suggest that this trend transcends into motivation, with older employees seeking out work where their knowledge can be used more effectively, at the expense of trying out new experiences. They tend to seek out work that is consistent with their self-identity and provides intrinsic gratification (SHL Internal Study, 2007). This emphasis on security is not limited to the type of work undertaken, but can also be expressed in the hours worked, the types of employee benefits sought, and support provided by their supervisors or co-workers (Warr, 2007; Kanfer and Ackerman, 2004; Rhodes, 1983). Security needs replace younger employees' desires for experience, as characterised by career progression, work variety, self-actualisation, and opportunities for socialising (Warr, 2007; Rhodes, 1983; Cherrington, Condie, and England, 1979). However, Rhodes (1983) cautions that age effects are generally weak, accounting for only 4% of the variance in motivation as discovered via a meta-analysis of 31 studies.

Compared with age, more ambiguity in the research was discovered about generational effects on employee needs, possibly due to the disagreement previously noted about how recent generations are designated. Howe and Strauss (2007) suggest that Baby Boomers seek out positions that convey high social status, whereas Generation X members prefer to work in roles with loose structures and where individual discretion is allowed for how work is accomplished. The Millennial Generation is motivated by roles that offer quick job progression, immediate gratification, self-expression, and variety (NAS Insights, 2006). However, this generation is also characterised by needs for a high degree of organisational support, recognition, and feedback (Howe and Strauss, 2007). Taken together, this literature suggests that a potential conflict in needs exists amongst the three generations, with Baby Boomers seeking out meaning and the approval of their peers, Generation X members wanting independence, and the Millennial Generation pursuing their own personal agenda. How employers can satisfy these competing needs will be addressed in the chapter's conclusion.

Traits

Unlike need theories that focus on how the external environment brings satisfaction to employees through the provision of some positive workplace feature, the research on traits focuses on internal drives specific to each individual that can lead to anxiety and negative affect if prevented from expression (Latham, 2007). Such traits include such divergent themes as the amount of social expression sought by employees (extroversion), whether tasks are left unfulfilled (conscientiousness), or the expression of emotion (Latham and Pinder, 2005). Common across the literature is a belief that individual differences in the expression of personality traits alter how an employee interacts with their workplace. For example, Neuberg and Newsom (1993) found that tendencies towards chronic information processing resulted in employees seeking a simple structure in their work, whilst Conroy and Elliott (2004) discovered that preferences for achievement and fear of failure (avoidance of situations that could lead to loss) affected the types of performance objectives and job mastery goals employees set for themselves. Less apparent in the literature is research that questions whether a specific type of personality preference (whether fulfilled or not) is universally beneficial or harmful to the individual. Scarpello and Campbell (1983) provide one such example, discovering that preferences for aspiration and career progression are related to higher levels of employee satisfaction.

Unlike much of the research on traits that focuses on the effects of a single personality preference, Self-Determination Theory is notable for its recognition of a thematic link between three types of preferences. Self-Determination Theory identifies the innate needs of competence (to achieve job mastery), autonomy (control over how work is done), and relatedness (importance of tasks for building skill) as strong predictors of goal directed behaviour, as well as related to employee growth, integrity, and well-being (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Ryan and Deci, 2000). Characteristic of trait theories in general, the external environment affects whether self-determination is expressed in the workplace, with supportive supervision, positive feedback, and acknowledgement providing an environment where employees can seek professional development (Deci, Connell and Ryan, 1989).

In general, the trait literature draws attention to a range of personality preferences that have the potential to motivate employees if the preferences can be expressed freely within the workplace. The expression of preferences differs from fulfilment as defined by need theories, with the latter emphasising that the external environment provides some motivating feature. Even with intrinsic motivation, the provision of interesting work is thought to motivate the employee by fulfilling a need. Yet, the distinction between trait and needs is not always clear. For example, the highest need in Maslow's (1943) hierarchy involves actualisation, which thematically appears similar to Self-Determination Theory (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Ryan and Deci, 2000). In both cases, a workplace environment that promotes professional development can motivate employees. If viewed from a needs perspective, the right amount of challenge and managerial support can engross an employee in their work to achieve actualisation. From a trait perspective, the same challenge and managerial support allows for the expression of innate preferences for autonomy and competence. Whether or not the source of motivation lies within the individual (trait) or from the external environment (need), the workplace features act as the catalyst for motivated behaviour.

As can be inferred from the definition of a trait, little variation has been found in the internal drives of employees as they age. Of the available research, Kanfer and Ackerman (2004) discovered that extroversion (activity level), neuroticism (anxiety), and openness to experience show some decline with age. This finding is consistent with the previous discussion of need theories, where older workers were found to be less interested in pursuing new experiences than seeking security in their work and employer. Change is seen however in the literature on generations, where the emphasis between different traits varies by generational cohort. Baby Boomers demonstrate tendencies for introspection and self-absorption (Twenge, 2006), whereas Generation X members prefer pragmatism and flexibility (Smola and Sutton, 2002). Traits discovered for the Millennial Generation include a high degree of self-confidence, optimism, trust, and risk aversion (Howe and Strauss, 2007; NAS Insights, 2006). These traits are complementary to the generational needs already discussed and together drive Baby Boomers to

seek out meaning in their work, Generation X members to strive for autonomy, and Millennial Generation members to pursue work environments that they believe will bring them the greatest fulfilment.

A more specific account of generational trait differences is provided by Twenge (2006), who compared preferences of Baby Boomers and Generation Me (i.e. late Generation X and Millennial Generation members), whilst controlling for age effects. By exploring survey responses from the past five decades, Twenge (2006) discovered that Generation Me members were not driven by duty or cohesion as sometimes assumed in the popular press. Instead, they are driven by a fulfilment of their own emotional and physical needs. Twenge's research uncovered a marked decrease in social desirability amongst Generation Me members as compared to Baby Boomers (the level of social desirability expressed in 2001 decreased by 12% as compared to 1958), as well as an increase in self-esteem (with levels increasing by 36% for men and 21% for women between 1968 and the 1990s). These trends are complemented by a rise in agency, as defined by assertiveness, dominance, independence, and self promotion (the level of agency expressed in the 1990s was 25% higher than for Baby Boomers), and extroversion, as defined by confidence, action orientation, and sociability (the level of extroversion rose by 37% in the same period). The gender gap appears to be closing with Generation Me, with measures of masculinity (i.e. competitiveness, independence, tenacity, self-reliance, forcefulness, and ambition) rising amongst women (the level of masculinity increased 30% between Baby Boomers and Generation Me).

Unfortunately, these changes in preference are not without their consequences, as members of Generation Me report high levels of anxiety, possibly due to the conflict between expectation and reality. Generation Me members reported 31% more anxiety as compared to people in 1971 and 35% more anxiety than people in the 1950s. How the expectations of Generation Me members can be managed by employers will be addressed later in the chapter.

Values

Unlike needs or traits that are well rooted in the individual and relatively stable across time, values are constructed through a person's interaction with the external world and their later reflection on these experiences. The difference between values and goals is one of degree, in which values represent trans-situational versions of goals that act as overarching principles (Latham and Pinder, 2005). Both values and goals arouse, direct, and sustain employee behaviour, however goals are more specific and therefore more immediate to action (Latham, 2007). Not all goals are equal in their effects on behaviour. Specific goals with a clearly defined outcome (for example attaining a Masters Degree in Marketing by 2012 at the local university) accomplish more than vague goals (Latham and Locke, 1979). Moreover, the extent of self-regulation and monitoring of achievement can influence overall success rates on goal attainment (Vroom and Deci, 1992).

How a value is internalised and becomes the basis of goal directed behaviour has been of interest to Occupational Psychologists, as not all experiences lead to a shift in values. Generally, a value goes through a number of phases before becoming solidified in the mind of an employee. Gagne and Deci (2005) suggest that an experience leads to the recognition of the importance of a specific motivator (such as promoting fairness in the workplace following a situation where an employee has felt discriminated against). The individual will then identify with the motivator if they believe that it is important. Full integration of the value into an employee's psyche occurs when behaviours are performed that are congruent with the value (such as changing how promotions are considered in using the previous example). Once established, values affect employees' self-concept, the behavioural norms adopted, and the goals set for themselves and others (Latham, 2007; Kanfer, 1994; Latham and Locke, 1979).

Pursuing a specific goal involves choice and commitment to use cognitive energy at the expense of some other objective (Latham, 2007). How much energy is spent depends on what needs to be accomplished and the likelihood of outside resistance (Latham and Pinder, 2005). Expectancy Theory argues that the direction, intensity, and persistence of goal-relevant

behaviour depend upon the probability of whether a goal will be accomplished (Latham, 2007; Latham and Pinder, 2005; Vroom and Deci, 1992). A later version of the theory, titled the Valence-Instrumentality-Expectancy Model, expands upon the original concept. An individual's desire for the goal's outcome (valence), how strongly an action is related to the outcome (instrumentality), and a subjective prediction of the desired outcome occurring (expectancy) creates a 'force score' that predicts an individual's commitment to goal-directed behaviour (Van Eerde and Thierry, 1996; Pinder, 1984). A third version, titled the Temporal Motivation Theory, adds the variable of time, whereby a delay between action and reward weakens both valence and expectancy (Pinder, 1984).

How an individual feels when seeking a goal is also thought to influence commitment, with positive emotion leading to greater commitment and attainment (Latham, 2007; Latham and Pinder, 2005). In occupational settings, the concept of organisational justice is particularly influential for employee emotions. The ratio of inputs (e.g. effort or skill) to outputs (e.g. reward or recognition) determines an employee's evaluation of organisational justice, resulting in either goal-relevant behaviour if fairness and trust is perceived or tension when the imbalance is high (Latham and Pinder, 2005; Kanfer, 1994). The literature identifies three different types of organisational justice, distributive (allocation of rewards), procedural (perceptions of the reward process), and interactional (perceptions about leader sincerity and objectiveness), each of which influences employee behaviour, feelings of belonging, and self-esteem (Latham, 2007).

Some researchers have investigated the impact of specific types of values in the workplace. On the positive front, Kasser and Ryan (1993) discovered that values promoting self-acceptance, affiliation, and community feeling were related to employee well-being. In comparison, values that centred on wealth and money were associated with poor adjustment, lower productivity, and behavioural disorders by precluding an investment in family, friends, and community. When looking at whether certain values are more relevant across industries, countries, and organisations, Latham (2007)

reports that values relating to individualism / collectivism and power distance were reflected most in employees' self-concept, behaviour, and goals.

Beyond potential cultural or industry differences, values have been found to vary as an employee ages. Much of the research has focused on the topic of the Protestant Work Ethic (PWE), which provides an encompassing framework for exploring employee values. PWE has been defined by Wentworth and Chell (1997) as capturing employee beliefs for hard work, rationality, and frugality. Li-Ping Tang and Yann Tzeng (1991) add to this list with the values of individualism and asceticism. The effects of ageing on the PWE are mixed, with research by Wentworth and Chell (1997) and Li-Ping Tang and Yann Tzeng (1991) indicating that PWE decreases with age. Younger employees are proposed to enter the workplace valuing their chosen profession, believing that their academic achievements and hard work will result in a bright future. As employees age, they gain less idealised views of the workplace that dissolve the link between work accomplishments and self-worth (Smola and Sutton, 2002).

Other researchers have found the opposite effect for age on PWE. In a meta-analysis of the PWE research, Rhodes (1983) discovered that older workers adhere more to a high work ethic (Rhodes, 1983), whilst Cherrington, Condie, and England (1979) found that older workers value work to a greater extent and have increased pride in their profession. As a possible reconciliation of these contradictory findings for PWE and ageing, the dimensions underlying PWE may be influenced by what employees seek to accomplish at different ages. Young workers might adopt a PWE as a strategy for achieving greater career progression and professional growth (extrinsic rewards), as well as a means of justifying their investment in education and training (Wentworth and Chell, 1997). In contrast, older workers may adopt a PWE to drive greater intrinsic satisfaction from their work, irrespective of whether their effort will be rewarded by their employer (Kanfer and Ackerman, 2004). As such, employees at various ages may embrace a strong PWE to rationalise and direct future behaviours, but do so for different reasons.

Values are also influenced by generational cohort. Baby Boomers have been found to value material success, self-sufficiency, and tradition, whilst Generation X members emphasise decisions made by sound logic, meritocracy, and the distribution of power (Howe and Strauss, 2007; Smola and Sutton, 2002). The Millennial Generation demonstrate both pro-social and selfish tendencies. This generational cohort values ethnic, gender, and experiential diversity in the workplace and seeks to gain from the variety it brings to social interactions (Howe and Strauss, 2007). However, the Millennial Generation is ultimately driven by a feeling of entitlement for emotional and physical gratification (NAS Insights, 2006) that can sometimes interfere with the promotion of a positive workplace environment. Across all three generations, Smola and Sutton (2002) have discovered an overall decrease in the amount of pride, self worth, and identity employees are gaining from their workplace, resulting in further complexity for how employers should adapt the work environment to increase alignment in the employment relationship.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

In the literature review above, research on ageing and generational cohorts was examined in relation to three distinct types of motivators, specifically those arising from needs, traits, and value based theories. Need based theories focus on employee behaviours to either directly or indirectly fulfil personal desires. Trait theories relate to the internal drives that can lead to anxiety or negative affect if prevented from expression in the workplace. The literature on values addresses overriding principles that are translated into goals that arouse, direct, and sustain employee behaviour. Acting in concert, these three motivator types define how an employee interacts with their employer. Whether employees will act in a way that is aligned to the organisation, as demonstrated through performance and commitment, depends in part upon whether their motivators are being adequately addressed in the employment relationship.

The review conducted here provides a theoretical contribution to the Occupational Psychology literature by grounding the effects of ageing and

generational cohorts in established theories of motivation. The summary matrix in Table 1 displays the trends identified in the research on ageing and generations, structured by the three main types of motivators.

	Needs	Traits	Values
Age	Young Workers Career Progression, Work Variety, & Socialisation Older Workers Physical Security, Predictability, & Managerial Support	Decreases with Age - Extroversion - Neuroticism - Openness to Experience	Young Workers Instrumentality of Hard Work (with reward and self-worth linked to achievement) Older Workers High Work Ethic, Pride in Craft, & Intrinsic Value of Work
Generation	Baby Boomer Status & Prestige Generation X Loose Structure & Discretion in Work Organisation Millennial Generation Progression, Self Expression, Variety, & Managerial Support	Baby Boomer Introspected & Self-Absorbed Generation X Pragmatic & Flexible Millennial Generation Confident, Optimistic, Trusting, & Risk Adverse	Baby Boomer Material Success, Self Sufficiency, & Tradition Generation X Logic, Meritocracy, & Distribution of Power Millennial Generation Diversity & Entitlement to Personal Gratification

Table 1: Ageing and generational effects on motivation.

As illustrated in Table 1, an individual's motivation changes as they age in the workplace. Early careers are dominated by gaining breadth and depth in experience that is believed to lead to career progression and professional development. For older workers, security is the dominant theme as employees seek to bank on the knowledge and experience they have gained in their career, providing a transition into retirement. Generational themes are likewise present in Table 1, with Baby Boomers seeking meaning from their work, Generation X members wishing for independence, and Millennial Generation members seeking their own physical and emotional gratification.

The analysis conducted in this chapter and summarised in Table 1 has the potential to aid researchers in identifying whether gaps exist in their understanding of ageing and generational cohort effects. From the literature reviewed, it is unclear whether the trends identified for generations and ageing surfaced because they are the strongest effects amongst motivators or whether the motivators were those studied first. By using the motivation theories identified in this literature review, future research can address a wider range of motivators to validate the inclusiveness of current research. For

example, longitudinal research could be conducted on Warr's (2007, 1986) vitamin model, with all nine job features and three organisation features tracked across an employee's career. Alternatively, generational cohorts could be audited by the traits identified by Self-Determination Theory (Deci and Ryan, 2000; Ryan and Deci, 2000). The structure of established theories of motivation provides a mechanism for a thorough review of the relationships amongst motivators and a validation that the most influential effects have been identified.

The analysis also has the potential to direct how interventions are conducted by practitioners. By structuring ageing and generational cohort effects by motivation theory, the potential for change becomes evident. Although all three motivator types (needs, traits, and value based) can be influenced by an employer, needs may be easier to fulfil than either traits or values. For example, providing greater managerial time or training for the Millennial Generation maybe more easily accomplished than allowing for the expression of confidence (trait) in the organisational hierarchy or an indulgence of personal gratification (value) through instant financial reward. As the research on ageing and generational cohorts grows, practitioners can use the framework provided to formulate their interventions, by focusing on either fulfilling needs, allowing for the expression of traits, or altering organisational values. By meeting the needs of employees in different age groups and generational cohorts, practitioners can help organisations to attract, recruit, and engage employees with the right skills and experience. Moreover, they can help organisations prepare for the conflict expected between new cohorts and established employees. For example, conflict is expected between Millennial Generation members and Baby Boomers due to a clash in new hirers' expectations for quick career progression and Baby Boomers resisting retirement.

There are a number of limitations to the literature that could be addressed by future studies. As mentioned previously, the research on generational cohorts suffers from confusion over the cut-off dates applied and a dominance of American research. Future studies should focus on clearly articulating what significant life events and geographical boundaries

demarcate generations. Although this may create greater complexity in the generational literature, as subtypes might be defined according to country, greater clarity will allow for a refined understanding of generational cohort effects on motivation. Second, the literature reviewed focused exclusively on ageing and generational cohort effects on the workplace. Research from the fields of Sociology or Clinical Psychology might provide insight into other facets of motivation not discovered here. Lastly, the relationship between motivation and organisational design is not explicitly discussed in the research on generations or ageing. Whether new working practices, such as virtual teams and flexible hours, have caused younger employees' preferences or are an effect of ageing or generational cohort can help inform the recommendations made by practitioners.

In the following chapters, the themes of understanding key motivators and adapting the workplace environment are explored further. In the next chapter, auditing a workplace environment to evaluate how well it fulfils the needs of new recruits is demonstrated, through the concept of person-environment fit. With this knowledge in hand, the participating organisation can make choices about how best to adapt the workplace environment to improve performance, engagement, and employee well-being. In Chapter 3, the concept of the psychological contract is introduced as a means of expressing how the articulation and fulfilment of important features of the employment relationship can motivate staff. In Chapter 4, development interventions are explored as a means of aligning behaviour to organisational values amongst experienced employees. The distinction between motivation types (needs, traits, and value based) provides a useful framework not only for ageing and generational cohort effects, but for grounding the present dissertation in the motivation research traditions. As done in this chapter's conclusion, theoretical and practical implications will be identified for the remaining chapters.

CHAPTER 2: QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH

Person-Environment Fit in the Selection, Performance, and Engagement of New Recruits

When embarking on a new career or change in career, difficult decisions are made about which organisations to target for employment and what types of job offers should be accepted. How much choice individuals have is shaped in part by the economic climate and their choice of industry, however candidates ultimately decide who they want to work for based upon their knowledge of the hiring organisation and their perceptions of the job market. When making a career choice, candidates evaluate whether their needs will be fulfilled by the hiring organisation. This decision depends upon both the self-awareness of the candidate to recognise what their key motivations are and their ability to assess accurately whether a potential employer can fulfil them adequately. Experienced employees may have an advantage over recent graduates, if they have reflected upon what types of employers have worked well in the past. As will be discussed later in this chapter, fit between a candidate and an employer benefits both the individual (through greater job satisfaction and emotional well-being) and the organisation (with higher performance and lower turnover intention). Due to these reciprocal benefits, recruiters undergo a similar process in evaluating whether the candidate is the best fit for their organisation's needs.

This chapter focuses on the role motivation plays in guiding career choices, though the concept of person-environment fit. Traditional preference-only approaches to evaluating key motivators will be challenged both conceptually and through empirical research. The following literature review will provide background on how a consideration of the workplace environment alongside motivational preferences can improve how career choices are made, as well as who should receive job offers by recruiters. With this background in place, a series of studies will be presented to illustrate how assessments based upon person-environment fit can help predict the performance and engagement of employees in a Management Trainee Programme, with practical implications for the selection and development of

recruits in the participating organisation. This chapter's contribution to the field of Occupational Psychology is twofold. First, an empirical contribution is made through a detailed consideration of the key motivators held by applicants and employees on trainee programmes. As will be discussed later, the person-environment fit measure accounts for wider range of motivators than existing measures of motivation or employee satisfaction. Additionally, the importance of motivators are shown to change between when an individual applies for a trainee programme and when they become a staff member, raising questions about how best to respond to changing employee expectations. Second, the chapter contributes to the practice of Occupational Psychology in both auditing and reacting to the motivational profile of employees. An approach based upon on person-environment fit is demonstrated as an effective alternative to traditional, preference-only measures of motivation, especially when exploring issues of engagement and performance. Limitations of the approach will also be discussed, relating to the need for trained professionals to make hypotheses and conduct statistical analyses on the data captured through measures of person-environment fit.

Motivation as a Product of Fit

Occupational Psychologists have introduced the concept of person-environment fit as a means of summarising whether employees' desires are fulfilled by their working environment (Ostroff and Schalte, 2007), with high levels of fit contributing to employee motivation to engage with and perform role requirements. Kristof (1996) defines fit as occurring whenever at least one entity (person or organisation) provides what the other requires or when the employee and organisation share certain fundamental characteristics in common. As will be discussed below, the concept of person-environment fit involves a different methodology for measuring motivation in the workplace. Traditional measures of motivation, such the SHL Motivation Questionnaire introduced later in this chapter, ask about an individual's preferences without respect to whether these characteristics are provided for within a given workplace. In contrast, fit measures capture both what the individual desires and what is on offer within the organisation. Before the potential benefits of a

methodology based upon fit for predicting selection, performance, and engagement can be considered in detail, a literature review about the origins, consequences, content, and measurement of person-environment fit is provided.

The concept of person-environment fit was first introduced in the psychological literature in the 1930s, however did not gain widespread recognition until the 1960s and 1970s with the arrival of interactionist theories in personality and social psychology (Ostroff and Schalte, 2007). A recent meta-analysis by Romaswami (2007) discovered that 349 peer-reviewed articles and chapters have been written on the topic of person-environment fit between 1960 and 2006, which includes 280 empirical studies. Recent interest in the topic is evident in this meta-analysis, as 50% of the articles and chapters were written in the last six years. Romaswami (2007) suggests that the literature regularly differentiates between levels (organisation, group, and individual) and types of fit (complementary and supplementary), both of which are meaningful for explaining how fit contributes to employee motivation.

Five levels of person-environment fit are regularly referred to within the literature, including person-job, person-group, person-organisation, person-vocation, and person-supervisor fit (Ostroff and Schalte, 2007; Kristof, 1996). The term 'person-environment fit' itself represents the aggregate alignment between employee desires and organisational characteristics across the five levels (Schneider, 1987). Person-environment fit has generally been associated with various employee and organisational benefits, including employee satisfaction, organisational identity, commitment, physical health, organisational citizenship behaviour, and task performance (Piasentin and Chapman, 2007; Ostroff and Schalte, 2007; Edwards and Shipp, 2007; McCulloch and Turban, 2007; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman and Johnson, 2005; Kristof-Brown, Jansen and Colbert, 2002; Taris and Feij, 2001; Slocombe and Bluedorn, 1999; Boxx, Odom and Dunn, 1991; Edwards and Cooper, 1990). However, the employee and organisational benefits detailed above are more prevalent at specific levels of fit. For example, person-organisation fit has been associated with employee identification with the organisation, whilst person-vocation fit has been linked to job commitment and person-job fit

related to satisfaction (Kennedy and Huff, 2005; Vancouver and Schmitt, 1991).

Other researchers have focused on the consequences of misfit between employees and their environment. Through active comparison of beliefs, attitudes, values, personality, and demographics (Edwards and Shipp, 2007), employees assess their overall level of fit with the environment. If misalignment is found, the resulting negative affect can lead to dissatisfaction, depression, or turnover intention (Waterman, 2004; Lee and Mowday, 1987). Depression is usually reported with misfit between an employee's skills and the requirements of the job, whereas misfit between individual and organisational values is related to dissatisfaction (Shaw and Gupta, 2004; Edwards, 1996). The effects of misfit are particularly pronounced when performance is rated poorly by a supervisor, as individuals may actively search for the causes underlying their negative evaluations (Shaw and Gupta, 2004). When misfit occurs, employees have a choice in how they can resolve the tension between themselves and their workplace. Wheeler et al. (2005) and Wheeler, Brouer, and Sablynski (2007) suggest that employees adapt their behaviour to improve fit, leave the organisation, voice their concerns as a means of influencing others, or hide the signs of tension. The success of these strategies is dependent upon the type of fit under consideration, as some types of misfit are more easily resolved than others. For example, gaining a new set of skills may be more easily resolved than attempting to change deep-seated values or beliefs (Posner, 1992; Finegan, 2000).

As briefly discussed above, fit can occur across a variety of individual characteristics, including beliefs, attitudes, values, personality, and demographics (Edwards and Shipp, 2007). The fit literature consistently differentiates between two types of fit, specifically supplementary and complementary fit (Ostroff and Schalte, 2007; Edwards and Shipp, 2007; McCulloch and Turban, 2007; Cable and Yu, 2007; Van Vianen, 2005; Van Vianen, 2000). Supplementary fit is described as a relationship that embellishes shared goals, values, norms, personality or attitudes (Cable and Edwards, 2004; Taris and Feij, 2001; Kristof, 1996) between an individual and their organisation. Supplementary fit can occur across a variety of social

groups, including teams, departments, or vocations (Edwards and Shipp, 2007; Kennedy and Huff, 2005). In contrast, complementary fit occurs when the relationship is made whole with the needs of either the employee or organisation fulfilled by the other party. For the employee, the organisation can provide finance, resources, or interpersonal opportunities, whereas the employee can provide the organisation with knowledge or skills (Cable and Edwards, 2004; Kristof, 1996). Complementary fit occurs at the personal level and relies upon an awareness of what either entity can provide the other (Piasentin and Chapman, 2007). Complementary fit is further broken down into demands-abilities and needs-supplies types, with the former focused on the requirements of the organisation and the latter on those of the individual (Edwards and Shipp, 2007). The distinction is particularly important for predicting the outcomes of alignment between employees and their workplace, as demands-abilities fit is related to performance, whilst needs-supplies fit influences satisfaction and organisational citizenship behaviour (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman and Johnson, 2005). In the studies that follow, both the engagement and performance of trainees are measured, providing an opportunity to validate this assertion.

Due to this chapter's focus on how employees are recruited and inducted into the participating organisation, the following discussion will touch briefly on how person-environment fit influences hiring choices and new employee perceptions. At the earliest stages of an employee's relationship with an organisation, emphasis is placed on the recruitment of applicants and the level of attraction they exhibit towards the organisation. Applicants actively seek out information about a given organisation and evaluate fit based upon the credibility of the source (Cable and Yu, 2007). For example, an applicant is likely to view a recommendation by a recruitment agency more sceptically than a recommendation from a close friend. In terms of the content used to evaluate fit, applicants will generally focus upon the organisation's culture and role requirements when evaluating a job opening (Cable and Yu, 2007; Van Vianen, 2005; Judge and Cable, 1997).

Organisations too evaluate fit, especially when selecting amongst a pool of qualified candidates. Organisations tend to seek out valid and

objective data on the values, skills, abilities, and personality of candidates as a means of evaluating fit (Cable and Yu, 2007; Van Vianen, 2005; Dineen, Vandewalle and Noe, 2005; Judge and Cable, 1997). Interviews are crucial to this process, allowing for open questions, feedback, and probing by both candidates and the recruiter (Cable and Yu, 2007). Across interview stages, emphasis shifts from person-job fit (can the individual fulfil job requirements) to person-organisation fit (will the individual fit-in here) before a hiring decision is made (Chuang and Sackett, 2005; Kristof-Brown, 2000; Adkins, Russell and Werbel, 1994; Rynes and Gerhart, 1990). Research has shown that views of employability (person-job fit) and person-organisation fit are relatively consistent across recruiters from the same organisation (Kristof-Brown, 2000; Adkins, Russell and Werbel, 1994; Rynes and Gerhart, 1990) and therefore are considered a reliable framework for selection. When the job offer is made, an applicant relies upon a combination of person-environment fit cues to make a decision, aided by the extent and breadth of previous work experiences (Kristof-Brown, Jansen and Colbert, 2002). However, acceptance of actual job offers extends beyond person-environment fit (Judge and Cable, 1997) by including economic and social factors.

Once an applicant accepts a job offer and becomes an employee, the person-environment literature suggests that a process of mutual adjustment begins with perceptions of fit leading to increased alignment through socialisation (Kammeyer-Mueller, 2007; Kristof, 1991; Chapman, 1989). The Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) model (Schneider, Goldstein and Smith, 1995; Schneider, 1987) suggests that initial perceptions of fit are strengthened in a self-fulfilling manner, whereby complementary goals are actively sought out and misfits weeded out through rejection by other organisational members (Kammeyer-Mueller, 2007; Warr and Pearce, 2004; Schneider et al., 1996). For employees who demonstrate a high degree of fit, the personal and organisational benefits of employee satisfaction, commitment, organisational citizenship behaviour, and retention (Kammeyer-Mueller, 2007; Kristof, 1991; Chapman, 1989) are witnessed. The processes of socialisation are not without their costs, as greater homogeneity can reduce the organisation's flexibility to adapt to the external environment (Warr and Pearce, 2004;

Schneider et al., 1996). As a means of aiding a new employee during the induction phase, the research suggests that a combination of self-awareness and setting realistic expectations about the job can ease the transition (Wheeler et al., 2005; Werbel, Landau and DeCarlo, 2001).

To conclude this section on person-environment fit, discussion turns to how fit is measured within the literature. No consistent method of measuring person-environment fit is adopted universally. Rather, three main types of criteria have been identified, specifically subjective, perceived, and objective fit types (Hoffman and Woehr, 2005; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman and Johnson, 2005). Subjective fit is found by asking employees directly whether they feel they fulfil job requirements or share group or organisational values (Wheeler et al., 2005; Cable and DeRue, 2002). Perceived fit is determined by asking employees first about the skills they bring to the organisation, as well as their individual desires. This information is then compared to what the employee perceives the organisation as providing. Objective fit is considered the strongest measure of person-environment fit (Harrison, 2007; Ostroff, 2007; Van Vianen, 2005; Van Vianen, 2000), wherein self-described skills and needs are compared to independent information about the organisation (real data about what is provided for in the workplace). Reliable measures of fit are dependent upon nominal equivalence (characteristics described by the same terms), scale equivalence (employee and organisational characteristics use the same metric), and a representative sample of organisational members included in the research (Edwards and Shipp, 2007; Ostroff, 2007; Kristof, 1996; Edwards and Cooper, 1990; Chapman, 1989). In the studies that follow, the motivational fit measure introduced attempts to satisfy these three requirements in its construction.

The use of questionnaires to measure person-environment fit is a less common approach than the use of interviews that qualitatively explore the employment relationship (Judge, 2007; Billsberry et al., 2005). Whether questionnaires or interviews are used, researchers must decide how to summarise the degree of person-environment fit for a given employee. Single score measures are commonly used due to their simplicity, but are thought to discard information, conceal sources of fit, and restrict prediction of outcomes

(Ostroff et al., 2007; Edwards, 2001; Edwards, 1993). Alternatively, the dimensions of person-environment fit can be kept separate, allowing for the identification of individuals sharing common needs through cluster analysis (Ostroff et al., 2007) or the creation of hypotheses that can be tested through regression (Edwards, 2007; Edwards, 1993). In the following studies, the latter approach is adopted as a means of identifying specific areas of strength and concern for the trainee programme.

Overview of the Present Research

The research presented in this chapter sets to accomplish two separate goals. The first goal is to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a new fit-based measure of motivation, as compared to traditional measures of motivation and personality, to predict both employee engagement and performance. The fit-based motivation scale, titled by SHL as 'Busy Bee,' is a prototype psychometric that the company wishes to launch as a commercial product in 2010. In preparation for this launch, SHL sought to capture information about the scale's validity and reliability, as a means of establishing Busy Bee as a legitimate measure of occupational motivation. As will be spoken about below, the Busy Bee measure has already undergone a series of scale validation studies, however research is missing about how well the measure predicts engagement and performance, as well as its differentiation from existing SHL products. The three studies included in this chapter directly address these issues of validity and reliability. In Study 1, the construct validity of the Busy Bee measure will be tested and compared to previous studies of its structure. Moreover, comparisons will be made between Busy Bee and the SHL Motivation Questionnaire, a traditional tool for evaluating motivation, and the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire. From this analysis, the unique contribution of the Busy Bee measure as a form of psychometric can be identified. In Study 2, the ability of the Busy Bee measure to predict engagement and performance will be evaluated, with an analysis of Busy Bee's contribution beyond existing measures of motivation and personality. Study 3 strives to replicate the measure's usefulness with a second graduate programme existing in the same participating company. The

ability of Busy Bee to predict engagement in this second population of graduates can thus establish the merit of the new measure.

The second goal of the present research is to support a client organisation in improving the selection and development of employees in a Management Trainee Programme. The participating company, referred to here as 'Builders' to maintain anonymity, is an international merchant of building materials. The company employs 13,500 staff members in the UK at 1,600 branches. With a fleet of 2,000 vehicles, 400,000 product lines across 6 principle divisions, and 6 regional distribution centres together offering 4 million square feet of warehousing, the company is one the largest UK suppliers of building materials (company brochure, 2005). The company also operates across Europe and North America, through ownership of locally recognised brands. To maintain the competitiveness of the business and provide excellent customer service to tradesmen (who value long-standing relationships with their suppliers), Builders invests highly in the selection and development of staff. Builders' vision statement sums up this need, "Start with good people, train and motivate them, give them the opportunity to advance and the Company will continue to succeed" (company profile, 2006).

As a visible reminder of Builders' commitment to its people, the Management Trainee Programme was established five years ago to train high potential graduates for long-term careers with the company. Although the programme is focused on recruiting and preparing future Branch Managers, trainees have been known to take on a variety of roles in head office following the programme. Interest in the programme has been a phenomenal success, with thousands of applicants applying for between 25 and 60 roles depending upon the year. In regards to the two trainee years included in the present research, the intakes were 30 and 60 trainees respectively. The assessment of applicants begins with ability testing, followed by a biographical interview conducted over the telephone, and assessment centre consisting of two interviews, a group exercise, and personality assessment.

Once selected onto the programme, the trainees take part in a three-day induction programme where they meet the leaders of the company, learn about the company's history, gain clearance in Health and Safety standards,

and take a tour of the head office. At the completion of the induction programme, trainees undertake their first job rotation in a branch (6 months in duration), where they learn basic store operations and principles of customer service. A further three rotations (all 6 months in duration) are planned for the trainees that expose them to different divisions in the Builders' corporate structure, as well as roles in head office. Interspersed across the rotations, the trainees come together for an occasional training week where they learn principles of management. By the end of the programme, the trainees gain a Professional Diploma in Management Studies, which also involves a project that is presented to senior management. As a last notable feature of the programme, trainees are assigned a mentor from the training department, who guides them in their development.

Despite genuine intentions to develop the trainees as outlined above, the experience of many trainees fall short of expectation. For example, the trainees' experiences during the first job rotation varied greatly, with some trainees undertaking structured on-the-job training, whilst others receiving only a brief introduction. Moreover, the length of the job rotations varied between one and nine months, with many ending prematurely for a range of reasons. Performance management meetings with supervisors occurred sporadically, depending in large part on the individual manager's preferences. Particularly worrying for the programme's sponsors was the erratic placement of trainees into permanent jobs following the programme. Individual jobs were secured through personal contacts held by either the trainee or members of the training team, rather than through a formalised and objective system. Due to these inconsistencies in how the programme was carried out and frustrations voiced by the trainees, the programme sponsors at Builders sought feedback about the strengths and weaknesses of the programme, as well as strategies for improving the selection and development of trainees. Research implications for Builders will be made across the three studies. In addition, feedback from the programme sponsors about the results will be presented in the General Discussion section found at the end of this chapter.

Study 1

Construct Validity of a Fit Measure of Motivation

In the following study, the construct validity of the Busy Bee measure will be explored in relation to previous studies carried out in the tool's development. In addition, responses to the Busy Bee measure will be compared to responses from the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire and the SHL Motivation Questionnaire, to explore what the Busy Bee measure brings to the study of motivation that would otherwise be missed. The approach taken in this study is to explore Busy Bee as a new form of psychometric and as such, to evaluate both the structure of the new tool and to explore how it compares to other measures of workplace preferences. After determining how Busy Bee acts as a new form of psychometric, the discussion will turn to considering how well the tool predicts engagement and performance in Study 2. Before the specific aims and hypotheses of the study are stated, a short literature review is provided about how measures of motivation differ in general from other forms of psychometrics. Moreover, detail is provided about the content and development of the three psychometrics used in the current research.

The measurement of motivation provides a complementary perspective to tests of either ability or personality. Klehe and Anderson (2007) conclude that the difference between what an individual can do (their maximum performance) and what they typically do is a function of motivation. As such, motivation confounds an accurate assessment of ability, as maximum performance (when an individual is keen to prove themselves, such as during a hiring process) cannot be sustained in the long-term. The specific relationship between levels of ability and motivation also result in different behavioural outcomes. For example, an employee displaying high motivation and low ability tends to uncover a greater range of solutions when problem solving than the highly skilled (Kehr, 2004).

In relation to personality, the measurement of motivation is thought to share a fair amount of overlap with personality measures. However, personality is thought to focus more on the individual and their beliefs and

affect, whilst motivation focuses to a greater extent on the environment and the individual's relationship to it through their goals and values (Inceoglu, Warr and Bartram, 2007). Barrick, Piatrowski, and Stewart (2002) contend that motivation is a mitigating factor in the link between personality and performance. For example, the researchers found that extroversion (a personality trait) is linked to status seeking (a motivator) in predicting workplace behaviour.

Other researchers have attempted to resolve the distinction between ability, motivation, and personality through overarching models of individual differences. Ackerman and Beier (2003) suggest that there exist four main trait complexes (social, clerical, scientific, and cultural) that capture how an individual interacts with their environment. For example, a clerical individual in the model holds conventional interests, exhibits a controlled and conscientious personality, and has a high degree of perceptual ability. However, this form of research is uncommon due to the wide range of dimensions uncovered in the literature on ability, motivation, and personality. Such an overarching view of individual differences falls outside the scope of the present research. Instead, the chapter focuses on the distinction between two methods for measuring motivation and their relationship to one model of personality. In the discussion below, the three measures used in this chapter's studies will be outlined in detail.

Busy Bee

As stated in the SHL Technical Specification (2008) document on the Busy Bee project, the measure was founded through a review of the literature on person-environment fit and the vitamin model of motivation as developed by Warr (2007,1986). The measure focuses on the person-job level of fit as outlined by Ostroff and Schalte (2007) and Kristof (1996). The dimensions it includes explore the degree of complementary fit experienced by employees (Ostroff and Schalte, 2007; McCulloch and Turban, 2007; Cable and Yu, 2007; Van Vianen, 2005; Van Vianen, 2000) in how their needs are addressed by their employer (Edwards and Shipp, 2007). The Busy Bee measure is composed of 38 dimensions that cover a breadth of workplace features. For

example, the dimension of Voice contains the scale items of "To what extent would you have the opportunity to voice your opinion?" and "To what extent would you be encouraged to express what you think?" Two to four items make up each dimension, with reliabilities between dimension items ranging between .70 and .92 as reported in previous trials (total number of participants in the trials equalled 1,038). The mean Cronbach Alpha statistics across trials for the dimensions was .76 for preferred characteristics and .78 for actual workplace features.

As reviewed in this chapter's discussion on person-environment fit, different criteria can be used to evaluate the degree of fit an individual experiences, ranging from subjective (where an individual estimates their own fit) to perceived (comparison between an individual's preferred and actual experiences) and objective (preferred experiences compared to organisational data) types of fit (Hoffman and Woehr, 2005; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman and Johnson, 2005). In the present study, perceived fit is assessed by measuring individual desires against perceptions of the Management Trainee Programme as reported by those on the programme. The Busy Bee measure satisfies the criteria set by the literature for a valid measure by ensuring nominal equivalence (same terms used for both preferred and actual characteristics), scale equivalence (identical scale anchors), and a representative sample of respondents reporting on their experiences (Edwards and Shipp, 2007; Ostroff, 2007; Kristof, 1996; Edwards and Cooper, 1990; Chapman, 1989). The Busy Bee measure utilises a nine-point scale for both preferred and actual characteristics, with '0' labelled as 'None at All' and '8' labelled as 'The Most Possible.' Fit is reported in the Busy Bee measure by dimension, rather than through a single score of fit across dimensions. As pointed out by Edwards (2007, 1993), avoiding a single fit score allows for a more thorough analysis of the measure's ability to predict engagement and performance.

SHL Motivation Questionnaire

The SHL Assessors Guide for the Motivation Questionnaire (2005) states that its approach "is concerned with the assessment of individual

differences in the factors which energise, direct, and sustain behaviour in the workplace." The SHL Motivation Questionnaire is founded in the literature on needs (e.g. Maslow, Herzberg, and McClelland), behaviour re-enforcement (e.g. Skinner and Hull), and cognition (e.g. Adams and Vroom), accounting for characteristics of the person that explain the "why behind behaviour." Sixty original constructs with 1,000 items were trialled with 1,400 participants in 30 organisations. The finalised measure includes 144 items across 18 dimensions, using a normative five-point scale that ranges from 'Greatly Reduces my Motivation to Work' to 'Greatly Increases my Motivation to Work.' Internal reliabilities between items within each dimension were high, with reliabilities falling between .60 and .85, based upon a sample of 700 respondents. The 18 dimensions fall into four categories of motivators, specifically Energy and Dynamism, Synergy, Intrinsic Motivation, and Extrinsic Motivation. These four categories were derived by a principle components analysis, which explained 61% of the variance in the sample. An individual's responses are compared against a norm group to determine the likely drivers of motivation for a given job. The norm group used in the following study was composed of 487 respondents, from a range of industries and job functions. The sample had an average age of 35.5 and was 35% female. SHL notes that information derived from the Motivation Questionnaire is helpful in determining an individual's attraction to an organisation, whether they will do jobs in a dependable way, and if innovative or extra-role behaviour can be expected (SHL, 2005).

SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire

The Occupational Personality Questionnaire is the most substantiated of SHL's psychometrics. Developed in two phases in 1981 and 1984, the Occupational Personality Questionnaire is now available in 27 languages and is actively used in 40 countries (SHL, 2005). Five criteria were used in the measure's development. The designers sought to develop a tool specifically for the workplace, that avoided clinical constructs, was comprehensive in the dimensions included, could be used by the HR community, and based upon sound psychometric principles. A total of 500 items were trialled during the

construction of the Occupational Personality Questionnaire, with 230 items chosen for the final version. The resulting model identifies 32 dimensions of preferred or typical styles of behaviour at work, with six to eight items making up each dimension. These dimensions fall into the three categories of Relationships with People, Thinking Style, and Feelings and Emotion, as found through a principle components analysis. The Occupational Personality Questionnaire comes in two different versions, depending upon how respondents identify their preferences. The normative version utilises a five-point scale, whereas the ipsative version (used in this chapter) presents four statements in a block and asks the participant to select the most and least preferred options. Responses are compared to a norm group to identify likely personality preferences that underlie workplace behaviour. In the following research, a norm group of 2,321 graduates was used, with respondents predominately working in the retail sector. The sample had an average age of 22 and was 56% female.

Research Hypotheses

The following study sets out to explore the construct validity of the Busy Bee measure of motivation, especially as it relates to existent measures of motivation and personality. Since the Busy Bee measure is still within its development phase and not ready for commercial use, attention is placed on replicating previous studies focused on the tool's structure. This study strives to evaluate how Busy Bee acts as a form of psychometric and whether it can be adopted in a similar fashion to the Occupational Personality Questionnaire and Motivation Questionnaire by practitioners. Due to the workplace specific content of the Busy Bee measure, asking respondents about their actual workplace environment rather than exploring motivators in general terms, the hypotheses listed below largely predict that Busy Bee will not perform as a typical preference-only measure. Moreover, the responses made by trainees are thought to differ from experienced employees (who are likely to require different workplace environments), possibly influencing how the new tool reacts to separate demographic populations.

As mentioned above, the SHL Technical Specification (2008) document for the Busy Bee measure states that previous trials have found strong reliabilities between dimension items. These trials were conducted on a general population of employees and therefore, replication with a trainee population has the potential to substantiate the claim that the tool's dimensions are well constructed. Cronbach Alphas were chosen to evaluate reliability, due to their ability to effectively detect item-specific variance within a given dimension (Cortina, 1993). As such, the first hypothesis tested in Study 1 is:

Hypothesis 1: Dimensions within the Busy Bee measure will demonstrate good internal consistency (Cronbach Alpha statistics above .70).

Initial trials of the Busy Bee measure discovered that the 38 dimensions were structured by similarity in preferences for certain workplace features. The SHL researchers labelled the nine factors as Challenge, Competition, Getting Ahead, Influence, Clarity and Safety, Ethics, Support, People, and Development. Identifying motivator categories has the benefit of allowing a more structured approach for evaluating Busy Bee's ability to predict workplace behaviour (38 dimensions would reduce the statistical power of the analysis without a large population of respondents). If a category was found predictive of either engagement or performance, post-hoc analyses can be carried out to determine which dimensions were driving the relationship. A similar category approach has been taken with the SHL Motivation Questionnaire (with the categories of Energy and Dynamism, Synergy, Intrinsic Motivation, and Extrinsic Motivation) and the SHL Personality Questionnaire (Relationships with People, Thinking Style, and Feelings and Emotion). As the previous trials on the Busy Bee measure were conducted with experienced employees and in a limited number of organisations, it is anticipated that a slightly different structure may arise when studying a trainee population. For example, social interaction may be viewed by trainees as an opportunity to learn, whereas experienced employees may

focus on the personal enjoyment gained from working with their peers. As such, the second hypothesis suggests:

Hypothesis 2: The structure of Busy Bee dimensions for trainees found through factor analysis will differ from that of experienced employees.

In the previous research on the Busy Bee measure of motivation, preferences were skewed towards desiring positive workplace characteristics for the majority of dimensions. To combat this skew and create a wider range of responses, the SHL research group revised the rating scale from 7 points to 9 points. In relation to the present research, it is expected that the skew towards a positive workplace will remain and is likely a permanent feature of this form of psychometric until an ipsative version (forced choice between dimensions) is created. A greater amount of variation however is expected for actual workplace features, reflecting the specific workplace environment under consideration. The resulting pattern of fulfilled and unfilled dimensions (degrees of fit) is therefore thought to be specific to each organisation:

Hypothesis 3: The distribution of preferred workplace characteristics will be skewed towards desiring a positive workplace. The distribution for actual workplace characteristics will reflect perceptions specific to the Management Trainee Programme.

In the present research, information about the age, gender, and education will be available about both the applicants and employees on the Management Trainee Programme. Research on the other psychometrics used in this study (SHL Occupational Preferences Questionnaire and SHL Motivation Questionnaire) have found a range of demographic effects that led to the creation of a variety of norm groups to identify an individual's preferences. As the Busy Bee measure of motivation is still within its trial phase and previous research on the measure did not analyse demographic information, it is unclear what types of differences in preferences will arise due to age, gender, and education. As such, the following hypothesis is adopted:

Hypothesis 4: Demographic characteristics of age, gender, and education will have little effect on trainees' feelings of fit.

As stated previously, the measurement of motivation is expected to overlap with measures of personality. Inceoglu, Warr and Bartram (2007) state that personality focuses more on the individual and their beliefs, whist motivation focuses to a greater extent on the environment. This assertion is mirrored in the distinction between motivators arising from trait theories and those from the literature on needs. The individual maybe motivated to change or sustain their behaviour, but for different reasons (i.e. to avoid anxiety when failing to express personality traits or to gain pleasure from the environment). In the present research, the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire represents a measure of personal traits, asking individuals to identify how they would like to act without reference to their specific workplace. The SHL Motivation Questionnaire focuses strongly on the environment, asking participants about their desired workplace features. However, it is unclear in the SHL Motivation Questionnaire what individuals are using as their reference point. Respondents could be thinking about their preferences in relation to their present workplace or generically about work without reference to their current environment. The Busy Bee measure of motivation attempts to solve this measurement issue, by distinguishing between what would be preferred universally in a job and the features actually provided in the workplace. Since the three measures arise in part from the motivation literature, a fair amount of overlap is anticipated:

Hypothesis 5: Responses to the Busy Bee measure will correlate moderately (with R in the range of .30 to .40) with the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire and the SHL Motivation Questionnaire.

Each of the above five hypotheses will now be explored in this first study of the Management Trainee Programme. The hypotheses will be used to structure the results and discussion sections, as a means of evaluating the construct validity of the Busy Bee measure of motivation.

Method

Participants

Two separate populations took part in the present study. The first population included employees on the Builders' Management Trainee Programme. Of the 90 employees on the programme in Spring 2008, 78 trainees took part in the study as part of their professional development. The majority of participants in this population (63.6%) were aged between 21 and 24 years old, whilst 28.6% were aged between 25 and 29 years old. There was an equal split between males and females taking part in the research. Most participants (48.7%) had between 2 and 5 years work experience. The average amount of time that the participants had spent in their current job at the time of the research was just under a year at 327 days. All trainees taking part in the research received personalised reports about their motivation and personality preferences and were invited to attend a careers workshop at the end of the programme.

The second population of respondents included 115 applicants to the 2008 Builders' Management Trainee Programme. These applicants were required to complete the psychometrics after successfully passing the telephone-screening phase in the hiring process. The majority of applicants (66.1%) were aged between 21 and 24 years old and 65.2% were male. Half of the sample (50.4%) was educated to degree level, with 19.2% achieving at least a Masters degree. Only 20% of the population were educated to A-Level standard or below. All candidates except 2 had previous work experience before applying, with 48.7% having between 2 and 5 years of experience. After completing the psychometrics, applicants received a report detailing their workplace motivations (results to the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire were not disclosed to applicants as they were used by Builders to make hiring decisions).

Design

To test the construct validity of the Busy Bee measure of motivation, the preferred workplace characteristics of both trainees and applicants were

explored separately from reported workplace features and fit scores. Before comparisons were made with existing measures, focus was placed on the quality of items included within dimensions (Hypothesis 1) to effectively capture preferences. The measure's category structure (Hypothesis 2) was explored through factor analysis and then compared to previous research findings. Employee perceptions about the Management Trainee Programme were considered alongside applicant and trainee workplace preferences to evaluate skew in Busy Bee responses (Hypothesis 3).

Fit scores were created by two separate methods, depending upon the participant population. For trainees, a fit score per dimension was derived by subtracting perceptions of the actual workplace from preferences for each dimension. As such, positive fit scores represent situations where employees want more from their workplace, whereas negative fit scores represent situations where employees desire less. For applicants, responses across the trainees were averaged to create a composite view of the Management Trainee Programme. Fit scores were then derived by subtracting the composite view (as reported by trainees) from applicant preferences for each dimension. To evaluate how demographics of age, gender, and education affected the degree of fit experienced by trainees and applicants (Hypothesis 4), the category structure found when testing Hypothesis 2 was utilised. Through a series of t-tests, the influence of demographics on fit was explored, with post-hoc analyses to determine which specific dimensions held the most influence. In addition, the motivator categories were used to evaluate the relationship between the Busy Bee measure and the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire and SHL Motivation Questionnaire (Hypothesis 5) through the use of correlation analysis. For all statistical analyses carried out, the computer programme SPSS was utilised.

Materials and Procedure

Three different types of psychometrics were explored in Study 1, specifically the Busy Bee measure of motivation, the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire, and the SHL Motivation Questionnaire. For more information about the background and content of these measures, please

refer to the text introducing this first study. The section below focuses on how the psychometrics were experienced by trainees and included as part of the hiring process for applicants.

In April 2008, employees on the Builders' Management Trainee Programme were invited to take part in the present research. After an initial e-mail from the programme sponsor, the trainees received an electronic link to complete the Busy Bee measure of motivation. When they logged onto the system, information was captured about the general background of the trainees, including their gender (male, female), age (18-20, 21-24, 25-29, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44), education (secondary, undergraduate, postgraduate), and amount of previous work experience. After this information was recorded, the participants were invited to complete the actual Busy Bee questionnaire, asking them to indicate their preferences for each scale item. For example, trainees were asked "In your ideal job, to what extent would you like to have variety in your work?" They were then presented with a second question for each scale item, asking them to rate how much of this feature they were currently experiencing in Builders. For example, trainees were asked "To what extent do you work in an innovative environment?" The trainees had previously completed the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire as part of their recruitment to the programme. The computerised reports generated from both the Busy Bee measure and the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire were given to the trainees during a careers workshop aimed at helping them select a permanent placement in the organisation.

From December 2007 through March 2008, applicants to the Builders' Management Trainee Programme were required to sit the Busy Bee measure of motivation, SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire, and SHL Motivation Questionnaire as part of the hiring process. Upon successfully being screened by CV and telephone interview, applicants were sent an electronic link to the three psychometrics. Like the trainees, information was captured about their gender, age, education, and amount of previous work experience. In terms of the actual Busy Bee questionnaire, applicants were asked only about their ideal workplace preferences. An automatically generated report for the Busy Bee measure was sent to applicants in

recognition of the time invested in completing the assessments. Only the results to the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire were used in the hiring process, as this was the current practice at Builders.

Throughout the data gathering phase of the research, participants were encouraged to contact the researcher about any questions or concerns about the assessments.

Results

Hypothesis 1

To evaluate the scale items within each of the 38 dimensions of the Busy Bee measure, analyses of internal reliability were carried out for applicant and trainee preferences of workplace characteristics, as well as trainee perceptions about the actual features of the Management Trainee Programme. In previous trials of the Busy Bee measure, the mean Cronbach Alpha statistics across trials for the dimensions were .76 for preferred characteristics and .78 for actual workplace features. When the internal reliabilities were computed on the present data set, the mean Cronbach Alpha statistics for preferred workplace characteristics equalled .78 for applicants (N= 115) and .70 for trainees (N = 78), whilst actual workplace features (N = 78) resulted in a mean Cronbach Alpha statistic of .76. As displayed in Table 2, eight of the dimensions failed to reach .70 on two or more occasions, specifically Non-conflicting Goals, Supportive Supervisor, Contribution to Society, Ethics, Networking, Fairness, Competitive Industry, and Payment for Results. Please note that a limited number of scale items are presented in Table 2, as means of protecting copyrighted material owned by SHL.

Scale	Applicants	Graduates Preferred	Graduates Actual	Item (To what extent would...)
Physical Work Environment	.82	.74	.87	You have a comfortable workplace?
				Item 2
Role Clarity	.72	.71	.75	Your role be clearly specified?
				Item 2
Job Security	.86	.83	.89	You have a high level of job security?
				Item 2
Non-Conflicting Goals	.80	.55	.54	You be free from conflicting demands at work?
				Item 2
				Item 3
Material Resources	.79	.64	.73	You have top-quality equipment or tools for the job?
				Item 2
Supportive Supervisor	.60	.67	.85	Your supervisor or manager be concerned about your welfare?
				Item 2
Safety	.90	.93	.86	High safety standards be followed?
				Item 2
Feedback	.74	.61	.78	Be told how well you are meeting your line manager's expectations?
				Item 2
Work Life Balance	.73	.88	.85	You have time for activities outside your job?
				Item 2
				Item 3
				Item 4
Autonomy	.70	.72	.80	You have the ability to organise your own work activities?
				Item 2
Voice	.61	.87	.85	You have the opportunity to voice your opinion?
				Item 2
Influence	.77	.60	.71	You have impact on the wider organisation, not merely your own job?
				Item 2
Innovation	.82	.73	.61	You have opportunity to be creative?
				Item 2
				Item 3
Contribution to Society	.65	.51	.57	Your work contributes to the welfare of others?
				Item 2
Ethics	.79	.55	.64	Respecting the environment be a primary concern?
				Item 2
				Item 3
Values	.79	.71	.79	Your work be strongly consistent with your values?
				Item 2
Networking	.69	.64	.52	You have the opportunity to get together with people you would not otherwise meet?
				Item 2
				Item 3

Table 2: Internal reliabilities of Busy Bee dimensions.

Scale	Applicants	Graduates Preferred	Graduates Actual	Item (To what extent would...)
Fairness	.72	.53	.67	Would equal opportunities be strongly promoted?
				Item 2
Competitive Industry	.80	.59	.69	You be exposed to competition with other organisations?
				Item 2
Financial Focus	.75	.75	.77	You have to focus on financial outcomes for the organisation?
				Item 2
Inernal Competition	.86	.80	.57	You have to compete against other people for success?
				Item 2
Payment for Results	76	.67	.63	Payment be related to personal achievement rather than being fixed?
				Item 2
Expertise	.76	.70	.80	You be required to use a lot of expertise (mental or manual)?
				Item 2
Development	.89	.81	.85	You have the opportunity to extend your skills?
				Item 2
Challenge	.76	.52	.80	You have goals that are very demanding?
				Item 2
Large Workload	.84	.63	.73	You have many demands to deal with at the same time?
				Item 2
				Item 3
Task Variety	.87	.68	.82	You have variety in your work?
				Item 2
				Item 3
High Standards	.70	.53	.74	You have to work towards high standards?
				Item 2
Varried Work Locations	.97	.90	.86	You work in a range of different locations?
				Item 2
Status	.77	.74	.57	You have high social standing?
				Item 2
Career Progression	.74	.68	.90	You have excellent career opportunities?
				Item 2
Income	.76	.74	.78	You have a chance to earn a lot?
				Item 2
Career Mobility	.80	.81	.75	There be potential for you to have various roles in your career?
				Item 2
Responsibility	.80	.61	.83	You have responsibility for a team or large unit?
				Item 2
Quantity of Social Contact	.80	.77	.85	You have interaction with other people?
				Item 2
Team Work	.82	.79	.84	You work in a team that works closely together?
				Item 2
Quality of Social Contact	.71	.73	.86	You have friendly people to work with?
				Item 2
Enjoyment	.81	.82	.89	Your work be entertaining?
				Item 2
				Item 3

Table 2: Internal reliabilities of Busy Bee dimensions.

Despite lower reliabilities for eight of the 38 dimensions, the internal reliability of Busy Bee dimensions on the whole was consistent with previous trials and supports Hypothesis 1. The eight dimensions with lower reliabilities are considered strong enough to be included in the remaining analyses, however if similar marginal reliabilities for these dimensions are discovered in future studies, the content of the items may require revision.

Hypothesis 2

The identification of motivator categories amongst the 38 Busy Bee dimensions will aid in the evaluation of the measure's ability to predict engagement and performance, as well as in the interpretation of trends across the Management Trainee Programme. Previous trials of the Busy Bee measure discovered nine categories of motivators, those of Challenge, Competition, Getting Ahead, Influence, Clarity and Safety, Ethics, Support, People, and Development. In the current study, a factor analysis was carried out on the combined preferences of workplace characteristics for both applicants and trainees (N = 193). Based upon the recommendations by Costello and Osborne (2005), a Principle Factor Analysis was chosen due to its ability to distinguish between shared and unique variance between factors. In the final model, a Varimax rotation (to maximise differences between factors) was used to find seven motivator categories. As shown in Table 3, the majority of dimensions held factor loadings in the range of .4 - .7 and all were above .32, which was the rule of thumb identified by Costello and Osborne (2005) as the criterion for a valid factor. The presented model accounts for a combined sample variance of 65.35%. Also displayed in Table 3 are the original factors found in previous trials of the Busy Bee measure, which used experienced employees as participants.

New Factor	% of Variance	Scale	Factor Loading	Old Factor
Role Intensity	34.09%	Large Work Load	.52	Challenge
		Challenge	.41	
		Competitive Industry	.75	Competition
		Financial Focus	.80	
		Internal Competition	.76	
		Payment for Results	.55	
		Responsibility	.49	Getting Ahead
		Status	.35	
		Varied Workplace	.45	Influence
		Work Life Balance	-.58	Clarity and Safety
Workplace Support	11.04%	Values	.38	Ethics
		Supportive Supervisor	.54	Support
		Quality of Social Contact	.66	
		Physical Work Environment	.65	
		Non Conflicting Goals	.60	
		Role Clarity	.60	Clarity and Safety
		Job Security	.63	
		Material Resources	.55	
Organisational Integrity	3.97%	Ethics	.65	Ethics
		Fairness	.59	
		High Standards	.53	Challenge
		Safety	.77	Clarity and Safety
Social Opportunity	5.04%	Quantity of Social Contact	.67	People
		Networking	.56	
		Team Work	.42	
		Contribution to Society	.40	Ethics
		Career Mobility	.50	Getting Ahead
		Enjoyment	.36	
		Task Variety	.62	Influence
Personal Contribution	4.84%	Expertise	.49	Challenge
		Innovation	.61	Influence
		Influence	.54	
		Autonomy	.62	
		Voice	.47	
Personal Growth	3.50%	Income	.66	Getting Ahead
		Career Progression	.68	
		Development	.52	Development
Feedback	2.89%	Feedback	1.00	Development

Table 3: Factor Analysis of the Busy Bee measure.

As shown in Table 3, the factors discovered for trainees differed substantially from those identified for experienced employees, in support of Hypothesis 2. The themes underlying the motivator categories appear to be specific to how a fixed-term graduate programme is conceived by applicants and trainees. For example, the dimensions of Career Mobility and Task Variety take on a social dimension by creating an opportunity for meeting people, rather than as a means of getting ahead in the organisation or influencing others, as found with experienced employees. For each of the motivator categories, a title was created based upon the theme that appeared to tie the dimensions together. Each of the seven categories has been defined as follows:

Role Intensity – The pressure to achieve objectives and the recognition gained from attaining them.

Workplace Support – Understanding what is expected in the job and having the environment to perform well.

Organisational Integrity – A workplace that promotes equality between employees and the needs of the larger community.

Social Opportunity – Interacting meaningfully with colleagues across the organisation.

Personal Contribution – The freedom to gain expertise and contribute to how work is performed.

Personal Growth – The potential to move up in the organisation either financially or in position.

Feedback – Receiving personal feedback about performance.

Correlation analyses were carried out between dimensions within each of the motivator categories. All correlations were significant at the $p < .01$ level, with the mean category correlation equalling .42 for Role Intensity, .39

for Workplace Support, .51 for Organisational Intensity, .39 for Social Opportunity, .56 for Personal Contribution, and .53 for Personal Growth (Feedback only contained one dimension). This level of correlation demonstrates the independent contribution of each dimension for the seven motivator categories. Based upon these results, the specific structure identified for the applicants and trainees will be retained for the remainder of the analysis, as opposed to the previous structure developed for experienced employees.

Hypothesis 3

To evaluate how well the nine-point scale aided in reducing the skew experienced in previous trials of the Busy Bee measure, tests of normality were carried out for each of the 38 dimensions. In the following tables, information is displayed about the mean, standard deviation, skew, kurtosis, and Shapiro-Wilk test of normality for each of the dimensions. As shown in Tables 4 and 5, preferences for workplace features were highly skewed towards wanting a positive workplace environment for both applicants and trainees. Only two dimensions demonstrated a normal distribution for applicants (Work Life Balance and Large Workload), whereas 5 dimensions demonstrated a normal distribution for trainees (Non-conflicting Goals, Work Life Balance, Financial Focus, Internal Competition, and Challenge). Where normal distributions were found, respondents demonstrated a greater range of preferences for these specific workplace features. The following results indicate that a positive skew may be inherent to the Busy Bee measure of motivation. Because variation in preferences is necessary to pinpoint specific areas of fit for respondents, developing an ipsative (forced choice) version of the measure may be beneficial in the long-term.

Scale	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Test of Normality		
					w	df	Sig.
Physical Work Environment	7.27	1.28	-.52	.05	.94	115	.00
Role Clarity	6.65	1.19	-.32	.79	.96	115	.00
Job Security	7.49	1.27	-.95	1.27	.91	115	.00
Non Conflicting Goals	5.54	1.44	.24	.51	.97	115	.01
Material Resources	7.08	1.41	-.74	.44	.94	115	.00
Supportive Supervisor	6.93	1.34	-.41	-.47	.96	115	.00
Safety	7.68	1.42	-.89	-.29	.85	115	.00
Feedback	7.60	1.15	-.46	-.52	.92	115	.00
Work Life Balance	5.34	1.10	-.05	-.10	.99	115	.36
Autonomy	7.06	1.17	-.32	-.23	.96	115	.00
Voice	7.35	1.00	-.36	-.04	.96	115	.00
Influence	6.98	1.18	-.12	-.56	.97	115	.01
Innovation	6.99	1.27	-.23	-.55	.97	115	.01
Contribution to Society	7.09	1.15	-.24	-.51	.97	115	.01
Ethics	7.14	1.25	-.46	-.57	.96	115	.00
Values	6.94	1.33	-.42	-.17	.96	115	.00
Networking	7.08	1.00	.09	-.61	.97	115	.02
Fairness	8.14	0.96	-1.22	.89	.82	115	.00
Competitive Industry	7.07	1.44	-.90	.98	.93	115	.00
Financial Focus	6.39	1.49	.71	.83	.96	115	.00
Internal Competition	6.19	1.56	-.53	.74	.97	115	.00
Payment for Results	6.52	1.28	-.25	-.38	.97	115	.02
Expertise	7.17	1.17	-.20	-.58	.96	115	.00
Development	8.12	1.01	-1.13	.76	.83	115	.00
Challenge	6.76	1.15	0	-.48	.97	115	.03
Large Workload	6.99	1.01	-.30	.08	.98	115	.08
Task Variety	7.28	1.05	-.15	-.53	.97	115	.01
High Standards	7.82	1.02	-.74	.23	.91	115	.00
Varied Work Locations	6.65	1.59	-.45	-.22	.95	115	.00
Status	6.66	1.39	-.29	-.38	.97	115	.02
Career Progression	8.16	0.93	-1.09	.71	.84	115	.00
Income	7.27	1.10	-.58	.30	.95	115	.00
Career Mobility	7.52	1.18	-.55	-.43	.93	115	.00
Responsibility	7.56	1.10	-.50	-.27	.94	115	.00
Quantity of Social Contact	7.53	1.01	-.42	-.28	.94	115	.00
Team Work	7.56	1.18	-.54	-.46	.92	115	.00
Quality of Social Contact	7.38	1.16	-.80	1.07	.94	115	.00
Enjoyment	6.94	1.24	-.04	-.60	.97	115	.01

Table 4: Normality of applicant preferences for the Busy Bee measure.

Scale	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Test of Normality		
					w	df	Sig.
Physical Work Environment	7.88	1.04	-.98	.63	.88	65	.00
Role Clarity	7.55	0.84	-.56	.29	.94	65	.00
Job Security	8.07	0.97	-1.24	1.84	.84	65	.00
Non Conflicting Goals	6.42	1.28	-.21	.63	.97	65	.12
Material Resources	7.92	0.84	-.40	-.65	.92	65	.00
Supportive Supervisor	7.68	1.01	-.54	.21	.93	65	.00
Safety	7.05	1.55	-.78	1.06	.92	65	.00
Feedback	7.65	0.91	-.55	.41	.94	65	.00
Work Life Balance	5.72	1.65	-.22	-.33	.97	65	.16
Autonomy	7.67	0.97	-.80	.68	.91	65	.00
Voice	7.86	0.99	-1.16	2.44	.89	65	.00
Influence	7.26	1.10	-.97	1.33	.92	65	.00
Innovation	7.09	1.33	-.78	1.00	.94	65	.01
Contribution to Society	7.32	1.00	-.20	-.96	.94	65	.00
Ethics	6.95	1.35	-.58	.16	.96	65	.02
Values	7.30	1.27	-.86	.81	.93	65	.00
Networking	7.02	1.11	-.67	.11	.94	65	.00
Fairness	7.97	1.04	-1.12	.84	.86	65	.00
Competitive Industry	6.45	1.11	-.71	.43	.95	65	.01
Financial Focus	5.62	1.64	-.44	.17	.98	65	.28
Internal Competition	5.28	1.64	-.34	-.46	.97	65	.13
Payment for Results	6.57	1.49	-.50	.58	.95	65	.01
Expertise	7.12	1.12	-.42	.23	.96	65	.03
Development	8.14	0.82	-.68	-.40	.88	65	.00
Challenge	6.47	1.05	-.03	.36	.97	65	.17
Large Workload	6.68	0.95	.24	-.78	.95	65	.01
Task Variety	7.47	0.96	-.25	-.19	.95	65	.01
High Standards	7.42	0.88	-.18	-.64	.96	65	.02
Varied Work Locations	6.48	1.75	-.75	.15	.94	65	.00
Status	7.08	1.35	-.80	.62	.94	65	.00
Career Progression	8.32	0.74	-1.29	2.26	.83	65	.00
Income	8.12	0.88	-.84	.04	.87	65	.00
Career Mobility	7.35	1.04	-.47	-.14	.94	65	.00
Responsibility	7.47	1.07	-.63	-.30	.93	65	.00
Quantity of Social Contact	7.35	1.10	-.51	-.11	.95	65	.01
Team Work	7.28	1.15	-.55	.12	.95	65	.01
Quality of Social Contact	8.16	0.81	-1.13	1.32	.86	65	.00
Enjoyment	7.47	1.21	-.66	.19	.93	65	.00

Table 5: Normality of trainee preferences for the Busy Bee measure.

Similar tests of normality were carried out for trainee perceptions of actual workplace features. As shown in Table 6, greater diversity in responses was found as compared to workplace preferences, resulting in 15 of the dimensions demonstrating a normal distribution in support of Hypothesis 3.

Scale	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis	Shapiro-Wilk Test of Normality		
					w	df	Sig.
Physical Work Environment	6.03	1.79	-.43	-.19	.97	65	.08
Role Clarity	5.03	1.68	-.21	-.17	.98	65	.40
Job Security	5.30	1.98	-.64	-.58	.93	65	.00
Non Conflicting Goals	5.28	1.30	-.40	-.27	.97	65	.10
Material Resources	5.65	1.73	-.37	-.17	.97	65	.16
Supportive Supervisor	5.98	1.90	-.73	-.05	.94	65	.00
Safety	6.62	1.74	-.88	1.11	.93	65	.00
Feedback	5.31	1.74	-.23	-.66	.97	65	.19
Work Life Balance	5.81	1.96	-.53	-.44	.95	65	.01
Autonomy	5.98	1.73	-.59	-.28	.95	65	.01
Voice	5.85	1.76	-.72	-.18	.94	65	.00
Influence	4.33	1.65	.20	-.76	.97	65	.10
Innovation	5.08	1.57	-.52	-.39	.94	65	.01
Contribution to Society	5.08	1.64	-.27	-.19	.97	65	.20
Ethics	5.69	1.61	-.39	-.08	.97	65	.11
Values	5.62	1.52	-.50	-1.03	.95	65	.02
Networking	5.57	1.72	-.09	-.61	.96	65	.03
Fairness	6.75	1.51	-.55	-.36	.93	65	.00
Competitive Industry	6.08	1.67	-.34	-.56	.97	65	.08
Financial Focus	5.52	1.98	-.12	-.29	.97	65	.12
Internal Competition	5.15	1.64	-.16	-.98	.98	65	.47
Payment for Results	3.36	1.64	.12	-.36	.95	65	.01
Expertise	5.48	1.71	-.51	1.07	.96	65	.03
Development	6.25	1.70	-1.16	.39	.89	65	.00
Challenge	5.38	1.46	.06	.89	.98	65	.23
Large Workload	6.15	1.56	-.84	-.44	.94	65	.00
Task Variety	5.68	1.54	-.59	.28	.94	65	.00
High Standards	5.95	1.52	-.65	-1.00	.96	65	.02
Varied Work Locations	5.01	2.04	-.01	-.23	.97	65	.06
Status	4.11	1.44	.09	-.23	.98	65	.49
Career Progression	5.64	1.90	-.60	-.70	.96	65	.02
Income	4.55	1.62	-.22	-.39	.97	65	.13
Career Mobility	5.69	1.62	-.68	-.20	.93	65	.00
Responsibility	3.64	1.98	.34	-.91	.94	65	.01
Quantity of Social Contact	6.35	1.53	-.67	-.29	.94	65	.00
Team Work	6.03	1.76	-.30	-.91	.94	65	.01
Quality of Social Contact	6.42	1.84	-.72	-.29	.93	65	.00
Enjoyment	5.23	1.83	-.54	-.33	.96	65	.02

Table 6: Normality of trainee perceptions of the Builders programme.

Captured in Tables 4, 5, and 6 is a picture of what types of features are likely to attract and retain employees on the Management Trainee Programme, as well as a description of typical experiences on the programme. As seen in Table 4, applicants report that they were attracted to a workplace offering a large amount of Career Progression (M = 8.16),

Fairness (M = 8.14), Development (M = 8.12), High Work Standards (M = 7.82), and Safety (M = 7.68). From Table 5, trainees report that they share a number of these preferences in common, valuing a high amount of Career Progression (M = 8.32) and Development (M = 8.14), however they emphasise the Quality of Social Contact (M = 8.16), Income (M = 8.12), and Job Security (M = 8.07) offered by the programme. The information contained in Table 6 helps depict what the programme actually offers to employees. The programme is characterised most by a high degree of Fairness (M = 6.75), Safety (6.62), Quality of Social Contact (M = 6.42), Quantity of Social Contact (M = 6.35), and Development (M = 6.25). On the other side of the spectrum, the programme does not appear to offer much Payment for Results (M = 3.36), Responsibility (3.64), Status (M = 4.11), Influence (M = 4.33), or Income (M = 4.55).

To understand whether the combination of preferences and actual workplace features were of concern for the selection, performance, and engagement of staff, fit scores were calculated by subtracting perceptions of actual workplace features from trainee preferences (please note that fit scores for applicants were derived by subtracting trainee perceptions from applicant preferences). To ease the interpretation of the analyses conducted, the term 'misfit' is used to indicate the degree of variance between preferences and perceptions of workplace features. Positive misfit statistics indicate where participants want more from their workplace on a given dimension or motivator category. In Table 7, the degree of misfit is shown for each of the 7 motivator categories identified in the analysis conducted for Hypothesis 2. As displayed, the relationship between actual programme characteristics and degree of fit is not straight-forward. Moreover, the rank order of fit between categories differs between trainees and applicants. It is notable that the three areas of greatest misfit are held in common, specifically Personal Contribution, Feedback, and Personal Growth. These areas will be of particular concern for Study 2 when measures of performance and engagement are considered.

Factor	Actual Programme	Trainees' Misfit	Applicants' Misfit
Organisational Integrity	6.25	1.10	1.44
Workplace Support	5.66	1.96	1.24
Social Opportunity	5.66	1.66	1.62
Personal Growth	5.48	2.71	2.37
Personal Contribution	5.34	2.06	1.76
Feedback	5.31	2.35	2.29
Role Intensity	5.02	1.36	1.59

Table 7: Trainee and applicant misfit by motivator category.

At the dimension level, a high degree of fit for trainees was noted for the amount of Work Life Balance (M = -.08), Financial Focus (M = .10), Internal Competition (M = .12), Competitive Industry (M = .37), and Safety (M = .44) experienced. Potential fit for applicants shared the dimensions of Work Life Balance (-.47) and Financial Focus (M = .88) in common, but differed slightly by identifying a high degree of fit for Non-conflicting Goals (M = .26), Large Workload (M = .84), and Supportive Supervisor (M = .94).

The greatest degree of misfit for trainees was experienced in the amount of Responsibility (M = 3.83), Income (M = 3.57), Payment for Results (M = 3.21), Status (M = 2.98), and Influence (M = 2.93) experienced. These results translate into 94% of trainees wanting greater responsibility, 91% wishing for an increase in salary, 88% hoping for pay related to results, 85% desiring greater influence in the company, and 83% wanting higher status. For applicants, a high degree of potential misfit was identified along the same dimensions, in the order of Responsibility (M = 3.92), Payment for Results (M = 3.16), Income (M= 2.72), Influence (M = 2.65), and Status (M = 2.55). It is notable that three of the greatest areas of misfit (i.e. Responsibility, Payment for Results, and Status) fall within the Role Intensity motivator category, which was not found as particularly poor amongst the other motivator categories. As such, other dimensions within the Role Clarity category balanced out the misfit experienced on these three items.

The trends identified here regarding fit will be considered further in Study 2, in relation to their effects on selection, performance, and

engagement, such that recommendations can be made to Builders about how best to improve the Management Trainee Programme.

Hypothesis 4

Demographic information was captured about the trainees' age, gender, and education. As it was unclear how these factors could influence the level of fit experienced by participants as captured by the Busy Bee measure, Hypothesis 4 states that no effects will be witnessed. In Table 8, demographic information about the trainees is displayed.

Demographic	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	38	48.7%
Female	38	48.7%
No Response	2	2.6%
TOTAL	78	100%
Age		
21-24	49	62.8%
25-29	22	28.2%
30-34	5	6.4%
35-39	1	1.3%
No Response	1	1.3%
TOTAL	78	100%
Education		
Secondary	3	3.9%
Undergraduate	65	83.3%
Postgraduate	9	11.5%
No Response	1	1.3%
TOTAL	78	100%

Table 8: Trainee demographics.

Due to the low distribution of trainees finishing their education at either the secondary or postgraduate levels, a statical analysis on education was not possible. Moreover, the distribution on age is skewed towards employees in their 20s. Despite this skew, two groups for age are proposed for this population (above and below age 25), as those under the age of 25 are likely to be entering Builders from their undergraduate degrees with little or no work experience. Those over the age of 25 are likely to have had at least one job

between finishing their education and joining builders. As such, trainees have been categorised into two age groups for the following analysis.

To test whether demographic information regarding age and gender affected person-environment fit as recorded in the Busy Bee measure, a series of t-tests was carried out for each of the seven Busy Bee motivator categories. When performed, gender did not hold any effect on the graduates' motivators, as both genders responded similarly to the questionnaire. However for age, an independent samples t-test between the two age groups (above and below age 25) discovered a significant effect for age on Personal Growth, $t(63) = -1.80, p < .05$. This result indicates that older trainees desired an opportunity to move up in the organisation either financially or in position. A post-hoc analysis on the dimensions making up the Personal Growth category discovered that this relationship was driven by how much fit graduates experienced in their Development of skills and experience, $t(63) = -1.84, p < .05$. Trainees who were older in age held higher expectations about the amount of training they should receive on the Management Trainee Programme.

Taken together, these results indicate that Hypothesis 4 is not supported and that demographic variables such as age are important for identifying employee populations with specific workplace needs. In the discussion section, the implications for older employees in the Builders' Management Trainee Programme will be considered.

Hypothesis 5

The final hypothesis explores the relationship between preferences identified by the Busy Bee measure and the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire and SHL Motivation Questionnaire. To evaluate the overlap between the psychometrics, correlations were carried out between preferences for the motivator categories and the dimensions from the other two measures. For the relationship between Busy Bee and the Occupational Personality Questionnaire, data from both the trainees and applicants was considered. As shown in Table 9, six of the seven motivator categories were related to dimensions from the personality measure. The level of correlation

was generally in the weak to moderate range, providing evidence for Hypothesis 5.

Factor	OPQ Dimensions		
Role Intensity	Persuasive .511 ** Controlling .348 ** Modest -.322 ** Caring -.266** Emotionally Controlled -.210 *	Conventional -.236 * Innovative .307 ** Detail Conscious -.394 ** Relaxed -.192 *	Worrying -.345 ** Trusting -.268 ** Competitive .470 ** Achieving .413 **
Workplace Support	None		
Social Opportunity	Persuasive .248 ** Controlling .201 * Independent Minded -.198 *	Modest -.229 * Innovaitive .200 * Detail Conscious -.334 **	Worrying -.225 * Competitive .193 * Achieving 221 *
Personal Contribution	Persuasive .399 ** Controlling .283 ** Modest -.361 ** Caring -.209 * Evaluative .219 *	Conventional -.266 ** Innovative .393 ** Detail Conscious -.335 ** Conscientious -.203 * Emotionally Controlled -.272 **	Worrying -.356 ** Trusing -230 * Competitive .339 ** Achieving 443 **
Organisational Integrity	Persuasive .305 ** Modest -.244 *	Conceptual .235 * Innovative .193 *	Achieving 286 **
Personal Growth	Pesuasive .260 ** Conventional -.266 ** Adaptable .192 *	Conscientious -.196 * Rule Following -.215 * Trusting -.227 *	Competitive .223 * Achieving 303 **
Feedback	Persuasive .201 * Controlling .204 *	Modest -.191 * Detail Conscious -.263 **	Worrying -.225 *

* Significant at $p < .05$ level

** Significant at $p < .01$ level

Table 9: Relationship between the Busy Bee measure and the OPQ.

In Study 2, the ability of the Busy Bee measure to predict engagement and performance will be compared to the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire and SHL Motivation Questionnaire. However, including all 32 dimensions from the personality questionnaire and 18 dimensions from the motivation questionnaire weakens the statistical analysis. As such, one personality item was chosen for each of the motivator categories based upon its pattern of correlation and its face validity in measuring a similar construct. For the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire, the following dimensions were chosen: Competitive for Role Intensity, Controlling (-) for Workplace Support, Persuasive for Social Opportunity, Innovative for Personal Contribution, Democratic for Organisational Integrity, Achieving for Personal Growth, and Relaxed (-) for Feedback.

To investigate the relationship between the SHL Motivation Questionnaire and the Busy Bee measure, only the applicant population was

considered (the trainees did not complete this measure). In Table 10, the correlations between the Busy Bee measure and SHL Motivation Questionnaire are displayed.

Factor	MQ Dimensions		
Role Intensity	Level of Activity .427 ** Achievement .417 ** Competition .619 **	Power .579 ** Immersion .353 ** Commercial Outlook .701 **	Personal Principles .198 * Personal Growth .235 * Autonomy .244 *
Workplace Support	Recognition .233 * Personal Principles .247 * Ease and Security .297 **	Autonomy .240 * Material Reward .323 ** Progression .202 *	Status .377 **
Social Opportunity	Achievement .299 ** Competition .354 ** Power .372 **	Commercial Outlook .382 ** Affiliation .304 ** Personal Principles .268 **	Personal Growth.248 * Autonomy .247 *
Personal Contribution	Level of Activity .336 ** Achievement .453 ** Competition .521 ** Power .644 **	Immersion .349 ** Commercial Outlook .613 ** Personal Principles .274 ** Personal Growth .348 **	Interest .266 ** Autonomy .371 ** Progression .233 * Status .307 **
Organisational Integrity	Competition .266 ** Power .307 ** Immersion .259 **	Commercial Outlook .455** Personal Principles .429 ** Autonomy .259 **	Status .217 *
Personal Growth	Achievement .246 * Competition .271 ** Power .352 ** Commercial Outlook .364 **	Personal Growth .336 ** Interest .233 * Autonomy .378 ** Material Reward .333 **	Progression .399 ** Status .214 *
Feedback	Power .284 ** Commercial Outlook .381 ** Personal Principles .273 **	Personal Growth .239 * Material Reward .205 * Progression .246 *	Status .205 *

* Significant at $p < .05$ level

** Significant at $p < .01$ level

Table 10: Relationship between the Busy Bee measure and the MQ.

In general, the Busy Bee motivator categories were moderately correlated with dimensions from the SHL Motivation Questionnaire, in support of Hypothesis 5. However, three dimensions held notable relationships with the Busy Bee measure. Specifically, the motivator category of Role Intensity was found to be highly correlated with the dimensions of Competition ($R = .619$, $p < .01$), Power ($R = .579$, $p < .01$), and Commercial Outlook ($R = .701$, $p < .01$). These same three dimensions were also highly correlated to the motivator category of Personal Contribution, with correlations of .521 ($p < .01$), .644 ($p < .01$), and .613 ($p < .01$) respectively. This pattern suggests that the Busy Bee measure and the SHL Motivation Questionnaire are tapping into similar preferences regarding these specific aspects of the workplace environment. From the data analysed here, it appears that the SHL Motivation Questionnaire is more highly related to the Busy Bee measure of motivation as compared to the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire. However,

the moderate relationships discovered suggest that Busy Bee is measuring different employee preferences than what is otherwise captured by the other two psychometrics.

As done with the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire, dimensions from the SHL Motivation Questionnaire have been selected for use in Study 2 based upon their pattern of correlation and face validity. The chosen dimensions include Commercial Outlook for Role Intensity, Recognition for Workplace Support, Affiliation for Social Opportunity, Status for Personal Contribution, Personal Principles for Organisational Integrity, Progression for Personal Growth, and the Motivation Questionnaire dimension of Personal Growth for Feedback.

Discussion

Commentary on the Busy Bee Measure

This first study set out to explore the construct validity of the Busy Bee measure of motivation. The approach taken throughout the study was to look at the psychometric properties of Busy Bee, to see if it is a comparable tool to existing preference-only measures of motivation. In this discussion section, a review of the Busy Bee measure is provided, concluding that in many ways the measure does not represent a typical psychometric. By asking respondents to report on their actual workplaces, rather than using a generic reference point, Busy Bee was discovered as particularly vulnerable to both the sample population (either graduates or experienced employees) and the workplace environment they are experiencing. As a result, the structure of the measure, how it is administered and interpreted, and comparisons made to other populations do not follow the model set by other preference-only measures. Despite such complications, it is argued below that the Busy Bee measure has the potential to contribute to an understanding of workplace motivation that is not accounted for by alternatives measures.

The study began by exploring the questionnaire items, discovering that Busy Bee appears to be a reliable measure of workplace preferences (Hypothesis 1), yet how the results are interpreted relies strongly upon the

group under consideration, such as experienced employees or trainees (Hypothesis 2). The skew experienced in previous studies, whereby participants used the top of the scale to a great extent (Hypothesis 3), was replicated with the current population and appears to be a permanent feature of the Busy Bee measure. Although this skew is not thought to affect the results of the current study, a greater range in responses between dimensions may aid organisations in identifying those workplace features that should take priority. To this end, a forced choice (ipsative) version of the questionnaire is recommended, whereby participants are asked to choose their most and least preferred options amongst a list of dimensions.

As little was known about how participant demographics might influence preferences identified by the Busy Bee measure, Hypothesis 4 stated that little effects would be witnessed. The analysis discovered that the age of the trainee influenced desires for greater Personal Growth than what was currently experienced on the programme. No gender effects were discovered in the data. Moreover, the homogeneous educational background of the current trainee population disallowed an analysis of the demographic. In the future, education should be researched more thoroughly, as trainees holding advanced degrees would be anticipated to have greater expectations of their workplace (to repay the effort exerted in attaining a higher degree). Taken alone, the effects witnessed for age indicate that trainees are not equal in how they view the Management Trainee Programme and special attention may be required to ensure that older trainee needs are fulfilled in regards to the acquisition of new skills and experience.

When compared to existent measures of personality and motivation, Busy Bee appears to be identifying preferences not fully captured by the other two measures (Hypothesis 5). The shared emphasis on the workplace environment likely resulted in a moderate amount of overlap between the Busy Bee measure and the SHL Motivation Questionnaire. The difference between the measures likely rests in how workplace features are conceptualised by participants, either generically (SHL Motivation Questionnaire) or in reference to their present workplace (Busy Bee). A lower amount of overlap was found between the Busy Bee measure of motivation

and the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire. This is likely due to latter's focus on the fulfilment of personality traits, rather than needs fulfilled by the workplace environment (the two measures have different theoretical traditions, specifically trait and need theories as presented in Chapter 1). However, the lower amount of overlap could be do to the time lag experienced in the trainee population between their completion of the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire and the Busy Bee measure of motivation. On average, the trainees completed these measures a year apart, potentially affecting the results. As such, future research could verify the relationship between measures of personality and person-environment fit measures of motivation.

As shown across the study's hypotheses, the Busy Bee measure of motivation appears to hold strong construct validity and is supported by reliable dimensions. The measure effectively captured information about trainee preferences that were not otherwise discovered by existing measures of motivation or personality. Setting the reference point as the respondent's own workplace appears to tap different information than asking about generic preferences. This reference point may be responsible for the change in category structure discovered for trainees, as compared to the general population of experienced employees used in previous studies. From the data reported here, a dynamic structure may be a permanent feature of Busy Bee due to the contextual nature of the questionnaire. Two potential limitations for the Busy Bee measure were discovered in Study 1. First, a positive skew in preferences continues and may hinder its use in predicting employee metrics such as engagement, performance, or attrition. Second, it is unclear how demographics beyond age affect preferences and thus, is a topic for future exploration. How practitioners can react to demographic differences whilst maintaining fairness across the organisation also requires further enquiry. In total, the analyses conducted here indicates that Busy Bee's constructive validity is strong and that the tool is ready for research on engagement and performance, as presented in the following two studies.

Implications for Builders

A variety of themes emerged about what applicants and trainees desire from a development programme at Builders. For applicants, a Management Trainee programme should be characterised by a high degree of career progression and opportunities for development, whilst ensuring that employees are rewarded fairly, high standards are maintained, and that the workplace is free from danger. Trainees on the programme don't disagree with the applicants' desires for career progression and development, but instead emphasise the need for higher income, greater job security, and opportunities for social contact. It is likely that features such as income or security are more difficult for applicants to express, as they do not wish to jeopardise their chances for selection onto the programme. The identification of these preferences can aid recruiters understand what will likely attract future applicants to the programme and as such, they can change their marketing strategy accordingly.

Beyond attraction to the programme, the analysis here allows a view as to which needs are adequately addressed by the Management Trainee Programme. Trainees reported that the programme is characterised by a high degree of fairness, safety, social contact, and personal development, which should provide some reassurance to Builders that the programme is delivering on a number of the major expectations held by applicants and trainees. However, the analysis also unearthed a large amount of misfit on the motivator categories of Personal Contribution (gaining and using expertise), Personal Growth (moving up in the company), and Feedback. At the dimension level, particular concern was raised around the level of responsibility given to trainees, how they are remunerated, the status their role conveys, and the level of influence they hold in changing how work is done. This data appears to indicate that graduates are unhappy with how their role is perceived by more established employees within the company.

What is missing from the above analysis is an indication of the implications misfit has for both the organisation and employees. Although trainees maybe experiencing misfit between their preferences and the reality of the programme, their disappointment may not be important enough to affect

their engagement or performance. By analysing measures of engagement and performance (as done in Study 2), the trends identified above for Personal Contribution, Personal Growth, and Feedback can be validated and highlighted for change. Based upon Study 2's findings, a number of recommendations will be made to Builders about their recruitment strategy and the programme's content. Before this analysis takes place, a short introduction is provided about the relationship between motivation and performance.

Study 2

Prediction of Engagement and Performance

The relationship between motivation and performance has been difficult for Occupational Psychologists to clearly articulate and demonstrate. As mentioned previously, the effects of motivation and ability are often hard to distinguish in laboratory research, as it is unclear whether maximum or typical performance is being measured (Klehe and Anderson, 2007). In most situations, ability is thought to be the primary determinant of performance, with motivation differentiating typical and maximum performance (Waterman, 2002). In studies conducted outside the laboratory, motivation has been found related to the level of absenteeism experienced by employees (Wegge et al., 2007), organisational commitment (Eby et al., 1999), energy levels (Nix et al., 1999), customer service, and organisational citizenship behaviour (Grant, 2007).

Other researchers have identified motivation as a moderating factor between satisfaction and performance. For example, Judge et al. (2001) identified the motivators of financial reward, role complexity, and work pressure as determinants of job satisfaction, whereas Becker et al. (1996) identified the motivators of supportive supervision and shared values as predictors of satisfaction. With job satisfaction in place, performance in the form of higher levels of customer service, productivity, and accident reduction have been found (Harter, Schmidt and Hayes, 2002).

To improve performance, organisations can act on improving either ability or motivation, with the latter option explored in Study 2's discussion section. Ability can be raised through changing how employees are selected and the training they receive once on the job, whereas motivation can be improved by better meeting employees' motivational needs (Deci, 1992). Changing the workplace to improve motivation has been a constant theme in the literature. Early research involving Scientific Management principles focused on altering the level of pay employees received, whilst the Human Relations movement encouraged employee voice in how work was done (Vroom, 1992). McGregor (1957) suggests that managers can follow two

distinct philosophies in how they interact with employees. Managers who ascribe to Theory X believe that employees are naturally resistant to work and need constant pressure to achieve work objectives. Motivation under Theory X involves the avoidance of punishment. In contrast, managers adopting Theory Y believe employees are not lazy, but require direction in how they can be involved in meeting organisational goals.

Work practices, such as management by objectives, derive from Theory Y in providing specific goals, decision-making responsibility, and clear feedback as a means of motivating employees (Tosi and Carroll, 1970). Although influential, such practices represent only one method for improving motivation by changing the workplace environment. For example, Katz and Kahn (1978) suggest that employees react to three primary types of motivators, specifically increased role clarity, providing extrinsic rewards, and enlarging jobs in scope or responsibility. In the present study, the scope of potential change agents considered will be expanded beyond those identified by Katz and Kahn (1978) to include the seven Busy Bee motivator categories identified in Study 1.

To evaluate the ability of the Busy Bee measure of motivation to predict employee trends in workplace behaviour, information about the assessment and selection of applicants, as well as the engagement and performance of trainees, is considered in this study. Across the criteria, fit on the Busy Bee motivator factors (Role Intensity, Workplace Support, Social Opportunity, Personal Contribution, Organisational Integrity, Personal Growth, and Feedback) will be compared against seven similar dimensions from the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire (Competitive, Controlling, Persuasive, Innovative, Democratic, Achieving, and Relaxed) and seven dimensions from the SHL Motivation Questionnaire (Commercial Outlook, Recognition, Affiliation, Status, Personal Principles, Progression, and Personal Growth).

Based upon conversations with the Management Trainee Programme sponsors, the assessment and selection of candidates onto the programme is of particular concern to Builders. The process was developed based upon the role profile for a Management Trainee with little consideration of what the programme actually offers. The sponsors believe that the selection process

identifies candidates with generic leadership ambitions, rather than characteristics aligned with success on the programme and potential to act as a Branch Manager within the company (the target role for trainees after they successfully complete the programme). As a result, it is proposed that:

Hypothesis 6: Applicant performance on hiring assessments will be unrelated to potential fit to the Management Trainee Programme, as measured by the Busy Bee measure.

The ability of the Busy Bee measure to predict behaviour is expected to be stronger for the trainee population, where direct effects on engagement and performance are anticipated. When the Busy Bee measure was administered, information was captured from the trainees about their current level of engagement. Kahn (1990) notes that "in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performance" (p.694). When disengaged, workers are physically present, but do not deploy emotions, energies, or passion in their work. The measure included here was developed by SHL in 2008 from a literature review on role engagement (Rich and LePine, 2007; Schaufeli, Bakker and Salanova, 2006; Kahn, 1990), work flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1975), organisational commitment (Meyer, Allen and Smith, 1993; Meyer and Allen, 1991), and psychological attachment (O'Reilly and Chatman, 1986). From this review, engagement was viewed as a state characterised by four employee characteristics. Two of these characteristics focused on employee cognition, specifically job absorption (the extent employees lose themselves in their work) and organisational alignment (congruence in beliefs about where the organisation is headed). The remaining two characteristics concentrated on employee emotion, as defined by their energy (drawn from conducting work) and organisational identification (the emotional bond employees experience with an organisation). In regards to the Busy Bee measure of motivation:

Hypothesis 7: The amount of fit trainees experience on the Management Trainee Programme will predict how engaged they feel in their work.

Also captured in the present research are two forms of performance data. During the administration of the Busy Bee measure, three scales of self-rated performance were developed by SHL in 2008 and included to explore how much effort the trainees invested into their work (Van Scotter and Motowidlo, 1996), the extra-role behaviour given beyond their direct job (Organ and Ryan, 1995), and how much they acted as an advocate for the organisation (Van Dyne, Graham and Dienesch, 1994). A second measure of performance was developed specifically for the present study and administered to the trainees' line managers. This performance questionnaire explored each trainee's generic performance on the job, their fulfilment of the trainee competencies as defined by their role profile, and the trainees' potential to progress as either a Branch Manager, Senior Manager, or as a Specialist in Builders' Head Office. In regards to the Busy Bee measure of motivation:

Hypothesis 8: The amount of fit trainees experience on the Management Trainee Programme will predict their levels of performance on the job and their potential to progress.

Each of the above hypotheses will now be explored in this second study of the Management Trainee Programme. The hypotheses will be used to structure the results and discussion sections, as a means of evaluating the ability of Busy Bee to predict workplace behaviour.

Method

Participants

The same two populations of 115 applicants and 78 trainees from Study 1 took part in the current study. For information regarding the participants, please refer to the Method section of Study 1.

Design

To test the ability of the Busy Bee measure of motivation to predict employee behaviour, the fit scores calculated for Study 1 were considered alongside selected dimensions from the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire (Competitive, Controlling, Persuasive, Innovative, Democratic, Achieving, and Relaxed) and the SHL Motivation Questionnaire (Commercial Outlook, Recognition, Affiliation, Status, Personal Principles, Progression, and Personal Growth). Please note that the SHL Motivation Questionnaire was only administered to the applicants and therefore, this data was unavailable for analyses on engagement and performance. All analyses were carried out at the motivator category level for the Busy Bee measure (Role Intensity, Workplace Support, Social Opportunity, Personal Contribution, Organisational Integrity, Personal Growth, and Feedback), followed by post-hoc analyses as necessary with the dimensions making up each of the motivator categories.

The analysis presented in this study utilises a combined model of regression, as a means of exploring whether the Motivation Questionnaire and Occupational Personality Questionnaire add to the prediction of workplace behaviour beyond Busy Bee. In a combined model, a hierarchy is defined between groups of variables, with stepwise methodology used supplementarily within each group. "Stepwise and hierarchical regression can be combined," states Williams (2004, p. 3). "An investigator may be clear that some groups of variables are logically, causally, or structurally prior to others, and yet have no basis of ordering variables within such groups. This type of analysis is likely to be primarily hierarchical (between classes of Independent Variables) and only incidentally stepwise (within classes)."

In the following analyses, the motivation categories from the Busy Bee measure were entered first in the hierarchy, followed in order by dimensions from the Motivation Questionnaire and then dimensions from the Occupational Personality Questionnaire. This hierarchy was chosen based upon the theoretical argument that the person-environment fit measure of motivation would be the best predictor of engagement and performance. With the Motivation Questionnaire and Occupational Personality Questionnaire placed further down in the hierarchy, the unique predictive contribution of these

measures can be identified (controlling for the effects of Busy Bee in the equation). As shown in Study 1, the Motivation Questionnaire is more closely related to Busy Bee than the Occupational Personality Questionnaire and therefore, was chosen as second in the hierarchy.

Within each group of the regression hierarchy, the categories / dimensions from the tools are entered in a forward stepwise manner in SPSS, as no prediction was made as to which specific category / dimension would hold the most influence on the dependent variables. Such an analysis allows for specific dimensions to be pinpointed for further exploration and remedial action by Builders. In the analyses that follow, this combined regression approach was used to evaluate applicants' assessment scores (Hypothesis 6), trainees' engagement (Hypothesis 7), and trainees' performance (Hypothesis 8). Please note that a two-step hierarchy (rather than three) was used for trainee engagement and performance, as data from the Motivation Questionnaire was not available for this population. When a significant result was found for a given Busy Bee motivator category, post-hoc analyses were carried out on the underlying dimensions and the dependent variable to highlight what feature was driving the regression model.

Materials and Procedure

As mentioned briefly in the Method section of Study 1, applicants completed a series of assessments as part of the hiring process for the Builders' Management Trainee Programme. Applicants were first telephone screened, followed by completion of the three psychometrics used in the study (Busy Bee measure, SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire, and SHL Motivation Questionnaire) and involvement on an assessment day. In total, nine assessment days were conducted over a six month period. All assessments (except the online questionnaires) were designed and conducted by the Builders' recruitment team.

On the assessment day, applicants first experienced a biographical interview that focused on their education, work experience, and career ambitions. The applicants were also asked about their expectations of the Management Trainee Programme. Responses to the biographical interview

were scored from 'No Fit to Builders' (1) to 'Exceptional Fit to Builders' (4). The applicants then experienced the first competency-based interview, which explored the competencies of Management and Leadership, Managing Customers and Relationships, and Personal Drive. The second competency-based interview sought information about the competencies of Communication, Making Decisions, Delivering Results, and Growing the Business. For both interviews, applicants were given a total score ranging from 'No Evidence' (1) to 'Exceptional Evidence' (4). The last section of the assessment day involved a group exercise (SHL's Swedish Visit simulation) where applicants were assessed on all the seven competencies discussed above. The same scale of 'No Evidence' (1) to 'Exceptional Evidence' (4) was used in determining an overall group exercise score.

When the Busy Bee measure of motivation was administered to the trainees, information was captured at the end of the questionnaire about their work engagement and self-rated performance. As discussed, a four component model of engagement (Energy, Absorption, Alignment, and Identification) was adopted, presenting trainees with a total of 12 items. Previous tests of the engagement measure conducted by SHL demonstrated strong reliabilities between items (Cronbach Alpha statistics ranging from .83 - .94) for each of the four components. A nine-point frequency scale was used ranging from 'Never' (0) to 'Always' (8). The self-rated performance measure included the components of Effort, Extra-Role Behaviour, and Advocacy, with three items each. Previous studies conducted by SHL found strong internal reliability for these components, with Cronbach Alpha statistics ranging from .71 - .92. The same nine-point scale was used.

A second source of performance data was collected from the trainees' line managers. A paper and pencil questionnaire specifically designed from the Trainee Role Profile was distributed to managers when the online tools were completed by trainees. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. The first section concentrated on the trainees' performance:

Job Performance (1 = Well Below Standard; 5 = Well Above Standard)

1. To what extent does this person work as hard as possible to get things done?

2. To what extent does this person achieve the objectives of the job?
3. Overall how would you rate this person's performance?

A total performance score was derived from the average score to the above three questions. The second section focused on the trainees' potential to progress in the organisation:

Potential to Progress (1 = No Potential; 5 = A Great Amount)

1. Do you believe this individual has the potential to work as a Branch Manager?
2. Do you believe this individual has the potential to reach a Senior Management position in time?
3. Do you believe this individual has the potential to work in Essential Functions?

Answers to the above questions were kept separate in the following analyses, as the items represented independent career tracks. The last section focused on how the trainees were behaving in their role:

Competency Performance (1 = Not Effective; 5 = Completely Effective)

1. Demonstrated an interest to learn about their job and Builders in general?
2. Supported others both in their placements (branch and HQ) and in the trainee programme?
3. Demonstrated personal drive to achieve objectives and progress in the organisation?
4. Communicated in a clear and appropriate manner?
5. Maintained focus on delivering excellent customer service?
6. Inspired others to perform well?

A total competency performance score was derived from the average rating to the above questions.

Throughout the data gathering phase of the research, participants and managers alike were encouraged to contact the researcher about any questions or concerns.

Results

Hypothesis 6

To evaluate the ability of the Busy Bee measure to predict applicant performance during the hiring process, a series of combined hierarchical / stepwise multivariate regressions were carried out. The seven motivator categories were entered first in the three-tier hierarchy, followed by dimensions from the SHL Motivation Questionnaire and then dimensions from the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire, with the dependent variables of applicant performance on the telephone screening, biographical interview, competency-based interviews, and the group exercise. When performed, no significant effects were discovered for either the telephone screening or biographical interview.

For the first competency-based interview assessing the competencies of Management and Leadership, Managing Customers and Relationships, and Personal Drive, a relationship was found between potential misfit on Personal Contribution and applicant performance in the interview. Applicants who preferred a great deal more Personal Contribution than the programme was offering were likely to score well in the interview, as shown in Table 11.

	B	***SE B***	**β**
Busy Bee - Personal Contribution	0.18	0.09	0.24

Notes: $R^2 = .06$ $(ps < .05)$.

Table 11: Personal Contribution misfit related to higher interview scores.

Although this relationship is not entirely consistent with Hypothesis 6, the relationship is thought to be dominated more by applicant preferences than their degree of fit to the programme. The competencies being assessed in the interview, specifically Managing and Leadership (i.e. inspiring and developing others, providing clear direction, and delegating) and Personal Drive (i.e. demonstrating energy and enthusiasm, acting proactively and with integrity, and focusing on self-development) are similar in content to the

definition of the Personal Contribution motivator category (the freedom to gain expertise and contribute to how work is performed). As such, applicants who exhibit definite preferences for Personal Contribution, despite the reality of the programme, can be logically expected to score higher in the first interview. This finding raises questions about the content of the assessment process and whether it is identifying candidates who are likely to thrive in the trainee programme, as these preferences are unlikely to be fulfilled when they join Builders.

The second competency-based interview assessed the competencies of Communication, Making Decisions, Delivering Results, and Growing the Business. When a combined hierarchical / stepwise multivariate regression was carried out on the interview scores, a model with the Busy Bee category of Social Opportunity and two dimensions from the SHL Motivation Questionnaire predicted interview performance, as shown in Table 12.

	B	***SE B***	**β**
Busy Bee			
- Social Opportunity	0.17	0.09	0.22
Motivation Questionnaire			
- Personal Growth	0.08	0.03	0.33
- Commercial Outlook	- 0.05	0.02	- 0.24

Notes: $R^2 = .18$ ($ps < .01$).

Table 12: Social Opportunity misfit and MQ related to higher interview scores.

This result provides further indication that the assessment process is misaligned to what is on offer in the programme. Applicants who want high amounts of Social Opportunity (which is reported by trainees as a strength of the programme) perform badly during the interview. This may be due to the overt focus on the individual's contribution to work during the interview (with the competencies of Making Decisions and Delivering Results). Applicants expressing their desire to work with others may be perceived by interviewers as incapable of acting independently. The focus on the individual may be responsible for the inclusion of the MQ dimension of Personal Growth, which

holds much in common with the Delivering Results competency definition of "assuming accountability, implementing strategy, and persisting in the face of challenge." The direction of the relationship between the MQ dimension of Commercial Outlook and interview scores is unexpected, as those wishing for more commercial environments would be expected to score better at interview. It is unclear from the data available why applicant preferences for Commercial Outlook were not clearly communicated in the interview.

No effects for the Busy Bee measure were discovered for the group exercise assessment. Instead, the SHL Motivation Questionnaire of Status was discovered as predictive of group exercise scores, whereby higher preferences for status were related to lower performance scores as shown in Table 13.

	B	*SE B*	β
Motivation Questionnaire - Status	-0.07	0.03	-0.30

Notes: R^2 = .09 (ps < .05).

Table 13: MQ Status preferences related to lower group exercise scores.

This finding is logical, as those who sought to dominate the group exercise or to establish themselves as higher in position would likely undermine their ability to demonstrate the competencies of Managing Customers and Relationships and Communication.

In sum, the analyses conducted here support Hypothesis 6, which held that the Busy Bee measure would be unrelated to hiring assessments. The results indicate that applicants are being assessed based upon their generic leadership ambitions, rather than their potential fit to the programme. Applicants who strive for greater influence and responsibility perform better at interview, as the Builders' recruiters actively seek such leadership characteristics. The alignment of the assessment strategy to the programme will be addressed in the discussion section, with recommendations for how Builders might better align applicant expectations to the reality they will experience on the Management Trainee Programme.

Hypothesis 7

In regards to employees on the Management Trainee Programme, fit to the programme was expected to be predictive of engagement. The reliability between the components of the engagement measure (Absorption, Energy, Alignment, and Identification) was high and validated previous studies, with a Cronbach Alpha statistic of .87. When a combined hierarchical / stepwise multivariate regression was carried out on the level of Total Engagement experienced by trainees (across the four components), the Busy Bee motivator category of Personal Growth was found to predict engagement. Trainees who felt that their Personal Growth was fulfilled by the programme reported feeling more highly engaged in the role, as shown in Table 14.

	B	***SE B***	**β**
Busy Bee - Personal Growth	-0.47	0.11	-0.51

Notes: $R^2 = .26$ (ps < .01).

Table 14: Personal Growth fit predicts total level of engagement.

A post-hoc analysis of this finding discovered that the relationship was dominated by a high correlation between the dimension of Career Progression and Total Engagement ($R = .528$, $p < .01$).

When each of the components of engagement was considered individually, Personal Growth (with emphasis on Career Progression) was likewise found predictive of Energy and Identification. For the component of Absorption, the OPQ dimension of Democratic was added to the model, improving the explanation of variance by 6%, from $R^2 = .21$ with Personal Growth only to .27 with the inclusion of Democratic, as shown in Table 15.

	B	*SE B*	β
Busy Bee - Personal Growth	-0.48	0.12	-0.47
Occupational Personality Quest. - Democratic	0.11	0.05	0.25

Notes: $R^2 = .27$ *(ps < .01).*

Table 15: Personal Growth fit and OPQ Democratic predicts Absorption.

For the component of Alignment, a different trend emerged. A combined hierarchical / stepwise multivariate regression on this engagement component discovered that the motivator category of Workplace Support was predictive of perceptions of Alignment. Trainees who felt that their needs in Workplace Support were being fulfilled reported greater Alignment to the organisation, as shown in Table 16.

	B	*SE B*	β
Busy Bee - Workplace Support	-0.37	0.19	-0.26

Notes: $R^2 = .07$ *(ps < .05).*

Table 16: Workplace Support fit predictive of Organisational Alignment.

Post-hoc analyses on this finding discovered that the relationship was dominated by a high correlation between the dimension of Role Clarity and Alignment ($R = .316$, $p < .01$).

These results together support Hypothesis 7 and the ability of the Busy Bee measure to predict trainee engagement. Issues of Personal Growth and Workplace Support have been highlighted and will be addressed in the discussion section for how the Management Trainee Programme could be improved to better fulfil trainee needs.

Hypothesis 8

Two sources of performance data was captured in the present study. The first involved self-rated performance captured during the administration of the Busy Bee measure about the amount of Effort, Extra-Role Behaviour, and Advocacy demonstrated by trainees. A series of combined hierarchical / stepwise multivariate regressions were carried out for each of these performance ratings using the seven motivator categories first in the hierarchy followed by dimensions from the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire. For self-rated Effort, the regression discovered that a combination of dimensions from the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire (Democratic and Achieving) were predictive of self-rated effort. Trainees who stated preferences for working democratically and achieving work objectives were found to rate themselves higher in the amount of effort they exerted in the job, as shown in Table 17.

	B	***SE B***	**β**
Occupational Personality Quest.			
- Democratic	0.11	0.04	0.32
- Achieving	0.11	0.05	0.28

Notes: $R^2 = .17$ $(ps < .01)$.

Table 17: OPQ Democratic and Achieving predicts self-rated Effort.

A similar level of support for the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire was found for self-rated Extra-Role Behaviour and the Persuasive dimension. Applicants who stated a preference for persuading others in the workplace were found to rate themselves as contributing greater amounts of Extra-Role Behaviour as shown in Table 18.

	B	$SE\ B$	β
Occupational Personality Quest. - Persuasive	0.09	0.04	0.28

Notes: $R^2 = .08$ (*ps* < .05).

Table 18: OPQ Persuasive predicts self-rated Extra-Role Behaviour.

Only on self-rated Advocacy did the Busy Bee measure predict performance, whereby fit on Social Opportunity was related to greater advocacy by trainees to those outside the organisation, as shown in Table 19.

	B	$SE\ B$	β
Busy Bee - Social Opportunity	-0.70	0.21	-0.41

Notes: $R^2 = .17$ (*ps* < .01).

Table 19: Social Opportunity fit predictive of self-rated Advocacy.

Post-hoc analyses carried out on the above finding discovered that this relationship was dominated by a high correlation between Contribution to Society and Advocacy (R = .330, p < .01), whereby trainees experiencing fulfilment in how much they contributed to society positively advocating on behalf of Builders to those outside the organisation.

Taken together, the results suggest that preferences expressed in personality measures may be more predictive of self-rated performance, as compared to the Busy Bee measure of motivation. This finding is a logical outcome of the way both personality and self-rated performance is measured. The preferences expressed on the personality measure likely influenced responses to questions of self-rated performance, whereby trainees identified aligned behaviours to their personality preferences. A more accurate assessment of Busy Bee's ability to predict performance (that reduces self-report bias) may lie in managers' ratings.

The three items relating to job performance demonstrated strong internal reliability, with a Cronbach Alpha statistic of .95, and therefore were

collapsed into a single dependent variable. When managers' evaluations of trainee performance were analysed through a combined hierarchical / stepwise multivariate regression, fit on Personal Contribution was found predictive of General Job Performance. Trainees who reported greater fulfilment in Personal Contribution were found to perform better on the programme, as shown in Table 20.

	B	*SE B*	*β*
Busy Bee - Personal Contribution	-0.67	0.25	-0.34

Notes: $R^2 = .12$ (ps < .01).

Table 20: Personal Contribution fit predictive of General Performance.

Post-hoc analyses carried out on this finding discovered the relationship was dominated by a high correlation between Voice and General Job Performance, whereby trainees feeling that they could express themselves freely in Builders were rated as higher performers by managers ($R = .326$, $p < .05$).

In regards to competency performance, the six competency questions demonstrated strong reliability, with a Cronbach Alpha statistic of .93, and likewise were collapsed into a single Competency Performance score. When this dependent variable was entered into a combined hierarchical / stepwise multivariate regression, fit on Social Opportunity was discovered to predict Competency Performance. Trainees who felt that they received the right amount of Social Opportunity were rated as performing better across the trainee competencies, as shown in Table 21.

	B	*SE B*	*β*
Busy Bee - Social Opportunity	-1.78	0.56	-0.40

Notes: $R^2 = .16$ (ps < .01).

Table 21: Social Opportunity fit predicts Competency Performance.

When post-hoc analyses were carried out, the relationship was found to be dominated by a correlation between Career Mobility and Competency Performance, whereby trainees reporting they experienced the right amount of Career Mobility were rated as higher performers by managers ($R = .397$, $p < .01$).

Taken together, the results for General Job Performance and Competency Performance suggest that trainees experiencing greater fit to their workplace demonstrate higher performance than those who needs are left unfulfilled, in support of Hypothesis 8. To assess how fit might influence performance beyond their current role, measures of trainees' potential to progress within the organisation were included.

When potential for placement into a Branch Manager, Essential Function, or Senior Management role were evaluated through a series of hierarchical / stepwise multivariate regressions, two of the three dependent measures held significant results. For potential as a Branch Manager, a combination of fit on Personal Growth and the Relaxed dimension from the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire was found to predict potential. Trainees reporting that their Personal Growth needs were fulfilled, as well as those describing themselves as anxious, were rated by managers as having greater potential to attain the role of Branch Manager, as shown in Table 22.

	B	***SE B***	**β**
Busy Bee - Personal Growth	-0.31	0.10	-0.38
Occupational Personality Quest. - Relaxed	-0.08	0.04	-0.29

Notes: $R^2 = .20$ ($ps < .01$).

Table 22: Personal Growth fit and OPQ anxiety predictive of potential.

When post-hoc analyses were carried out on the motivator category of Personal Growth and Branch Manager potential, a significant correlation was discovered between the dimension of Development and Branch Manager potential ($R = .364$, $p < .01$). The inclusion of the OPQ dimension of Relaxed

improved the explanation of variance by 8%, from R^2 = .12 with Personal Growth only to .20 with the inclusion of Relaxed.

The other significant relationship between potential and the Busy Bee measure was discovered for Senior Management roles. Fit on Personal Contribution was discovered as predictive of Senior Management potential, with trainees feeling fulfilled in Personal Contribution rated as having greater Senior Management potential by managers, as shown in Table 23.

	B	*SE B*	β
Busy Bee - Personal Contribution	-0.22	0.10	-0.29

Notes: R^2 = .08 (ps < .05).

Table 23: Personal Contribution fit predictive of potential.

Post-hoc correlation analyses carried out on this finding discovered that the relationship was dominated by the dimension of Autonomy, whereby trainees feeling fulfilled in the level of Autonomy provided by the programme being seen as having greater Senior Management potential (R = .30, p < .05).

As mentioned briefly, no effects were found for trainees' potential to progress in Essential Functions. The diversity of roles at Head Office may have jeopardised this dependent variable and its relationship to the Busy Bee measure of motivation. It is noteworthy that the two areas of fit identified as predictive of potential (Personal Growth for Branch Management and Personal Contribution for Senior Management) were considered low points of the Management Trainee Programme, with high levels of misfit experienced by the majority of trainees. It appears that trainees least affected by the lack of Personal Contribution and Personal Growth on the programme are considered as having the greatest potential to succeed at Builders. The dissatisfaction experienced on these two workplace characteristics appears to not only affect engagement and performance, but also future career prospects. These trends will be explored further in the discussion section.

In general, the results reported here support Hypothesis 8 and the ability of the Busy Bee measure to predict performance and potential to

progress. However, a distinction is required between self and other rated performance, as the Busy Bee measure appears to be more effective at predicting the latter construct. The implications of this finding and those of the previous hypotheses regarding the ability of the Busy Bee measure to predict workplace behaviour will now be addressed in the discussion section.

Discussion

Commentary on Busy Bee as a Predictive Measure

Study 2 set out to evaluate the ability of the Busy Bee measure of motivation to predict assessment, engagement, and performance criteria. Additionally, the Busy Bee measure was compared against the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire and SHL Motivation Questionnaire to establish the contribution a measure based upon person-environment fit holds beyond more traditional forms of psychometrics. For applicants to the Builders' Management Trainee Programme, the Busy Bee measure did not predict hiring assessments that would ensure alignment to the programme, consistent with Hypothesis 6. The way recruitment was conducted in Builders appeared to select candidates with generic leadership ambitions (those wishing to gain expertise and influence in the organisation), rather than those most likely to fit the programme. This issue will be addressed more fully in the recommendations below about the failures of the programme to attract and engage employees with potential to be placed in Branch Manager positions.

The usefulness of the Busy Bee measure was most evident when engagement and other-rated performance criteria were considered. Trainees whose needs for Personal Growth were fulfilled by the programme reported higher levels of Total Engagement (Hypothesis 7), specifically in how much energy they got from their work, how absorbed they felt, and their identification with the company. Moreover, fit on Workplace Support (especially Role Clarity) increased how aligned trainees felt with the organisation (as an indication of engagement). It is notable that Personal Growth was not considered a highlight of the programme (Study 1) and as such, it is only those applicants unaffected by the programme's failure to

provide growth opportunities that are engaged in their work. The need to address Personal Growth will be considered in further depth when recommendations to Builders are presented.

With regards to performance, personality measures appear to be better predictors of self-rated performance. This finding might have resulted from responder bias with ratings of performance chosen such that they mirrored personality preferences. When other-rated performance was considered, the Busy Bee measure was found to be effective at predicting General Performance, Competency Performance, and potential to progress in the company (Hypothesis 8). Trainees who felt that their needs for Personal Contribution were fulfilled by the programme were rated as better performers by their line managers, whereas trainees experiencing fit in the amount of Social Opportunity they were receiving were rated higher on their Competency Performance. When considering potential to progress in the company, fit on Personal Growth was found predictive of Branch Manager potential, whilst fit on Personal Contribution was found predictive of Senior Management potential. As mentioned above, it is notable that both Personal Growth and Personal Contribution were not strong features of the programme (Study 1). Trainees who demonstrate an interest in gaining greater experience and influence in the organisation (beyond what the programme offers) were deemed as poorer performers and possessing less potential to progress. This finding raises questions about the types of expectations held by trainees, how they are selected onto the programme, and the content of the Management Trainee Programme.

Study 2 provides two forms of contribution for the study of employee motivation. The first represents an empirical contribution by identifying the workplace characteristics desired most by graduates, with implications for engagement and performance. Moreover, the data indicates that motivator preferences potentially change after applicants are successfully recruited onto a programme. Further research should explore whether this finding results from a true change in preferences or greater honesty amongst trainees. Recruiters and programme sponsors can use the gained insight when devising their marketing strategies and defining a programme's content. The

second form of contribution is for practitioners, as the Busy Bee measure has demonstrated its ability to effectively predict employee engagement and performance. The measure's prediction of other-rated performance is particularly noteworthy, as previous research indicates that prediction is typically limited to engagement for similar needs-supplies measures (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson, 2005).

Study 2 also uncovered a few potential limitations of the Busy Bee measure. Based upon the evidence gathered, the measure's ability to predict assessment performance remains unclear. Future research should unravel whether the findings reported here resulted from a disconnect between recruitment and job content, a methodological issue with the way fit was computed for applicants (from a composite view of workplace features as reported by trainees), or an inability for fit measures to outperform preference-only alternatives. As a second limitation, the analysis utilised motivator categories to explore Busy Bee's ability to predict workplace behaviour, which potentially obscured dimensions that are meaningful for engagement and performance (as expected for Role Intensity in the present study). Future research should explore whether focusing on highlights, lowlights, or context-specific dimensions may provide a more effective method for identifying employee motivators that require attention.

Implications for Builders

Fundamentally, it appears that the expectations of applicants and the intentions of the programme sponsors at Builders are misaligned. Applicants appear to be attracted to the programme due to its label as a 'leadership' programme, with expectations that they will be fast-tracked into a senior management role. Furthermore, the applicants are selected onto the programme by recruiters (who sit in a different department than the programme sponsors in Builders) based upon applicants' generic leadership ambitions. Yet, the programme itself is aimed at finding Branch Managers for its 1,600 branches in the UK. Although an important role for Builders, with each branch earning approximately £1,000,000 in revenue annually, it is not the most glamorous of jobs when compared to those in Head Office. Once

placed into a Branch Manager role, the careers of trainees are not fast-tracked or managed towards senior management, despite trainees' expectations to the contrary.

When faced with this reality after starting on the programme, the trainees who desire the most career progression (Personal Growth) report feeling less engaged in their work, due in part to the misfit they are experiencing. Managers' perceptions likewise recognise this misfit in Personal Growth, as they view trainees' with the greatest ambition as less able to fulfil a Branch Manager role, possibly in recognition that the trainees would likely grow tired or frustrated in time. In regards to trainees who desire greater influence (Personal Contribution), managers rate trainees experiencing misfit as poorer performers and less able to achieve a senior management position. This finding might result from either the amount of frustration trainees experience when attempting to influence their colleagues or from managers' perceptions that the trainees must earn their voice through greater experience in Builders. In either case, failures to provide Personal Contribution and Personal Growth should be addressed.

The information collected about the Builders' Management Trainee Programme suggests that the programme is at a crossroads. To better align applicant expectations with business needs, a choice is required between either establishing a true leadership programme or recognising the current programme as a Branch Manager apprenticeship scheme. If a leadership programme is selected, little change is required for the selection of applicants, as the focus should remain on identifying candidates with leadership ambition. However, the content of the programme will require more meaningful and consistent job placements, opportunities to exercise voice and influence over how work is done, projects that will raise the trainees' profile, and a clear career map from trainee through branch management and beyond. Alternatively if a Branch Manager apprenticeship scheme is chosen, the motivation and personality profile for successful trainees identified by the present research should be used more closely in recruitment. The benefits of becoming a Branch Manager, for example the freedom of running a small and

generally autonomous business, should be expressed clearly to applicants such that they can make an informed decision when offered a position.

Whichever choice is made by the programme sponsors, it is likely that the expectations of applicants will be more closely aligned to business needs, resulting in greater trainee engagement, higher performance, and long-term maintenance of the psychological contract held between trainees and Builders. As shown in the present results on engagement, improvements to Workplace Support through the provision of a clearer structure, consistency in trainee experiences, and more active management will likely improve the alignment of trainees to the organisation. Certain other features of the programme should be retained regardless, for example the emphasis on the quantity and quality of social contact, which was shown influential in the trainees' Competency Performance.

The above recommendations were presented to the Builders' programme sponsors in February 2009. Their reactions are presented in the General Discussion found at the end of this chapter, alongside other reflections about how Busy Bee can be effectively used by practitioners.

Study 3
Replication of Busy Bee's Usefulness

Sponsors from a second Builders' graduate development programme were interested in understanding the key motivators of their graduates, especially in relation to the Management Trainee Programme spoken about in Studies 1 and 2. A study was agreed for the European Graduate Programme that would both provide the desired feedback about the programme's content and permit an analysis of Busy Bee's usefulness with a similar population of participants. Detail about the European Graduate Programme is provided below, with emphasis on the content and experiences of graduates such that trends in motivation can be better understood in comparison to those on the Management Trainee Programme. In addition to evaluating the strengths and limitations of the Busy Bee measure of motivation, recommendations for the European Graduate Programme and implications for the Management Trainee Programme will be provided in the discussion section.

Unlike the Management Trainee Programme, employees on the European Graduate Programme experience a very structured programme involving three rotations. The first rotation involves placement in a branch for nine months, whereby graduates gain experience in the warehouse and distribution centre, working at the sales counter, and handling customer queries in the sales office. In addition, graduates spend a considerable amount of time shadowing the Branch Manager, completing a branch-specific project, and attending three training weeks focused on company procedures, Health and Safety, supply chain, corporate culture, and self awareness. In the second nine month rotation, graduates are placed in a different European country, where they gain experience in stock management, sales, marketing, and showroom management. Additionally, they work on a second corporate project and attend three weeks of training on external sales, products, negotiation, project management, presentation skills, and leadership. In the third rotation lasting six months, graduates are placed anywhere in Europe depending upon the business need and are asked to complete a high profile

project. In the past, projects have involved process improvements, introduction of new products, or changes to customer service practices.

The European Graduate Programme sponsors promise applicants a programme that is practical and hands-on, highly rewarding in the professional development offered, merit-based, and Builders specific in content. To deliver on these promises, the interaction between the programme sponsors and graduates are clearly drawn-out. Monthly reports are required by graduates detailing their progress, challenges experienced, and personal learning gained. A performance review occurs every three months with a programme sponsor, whilst one-to-one meetings are arranged every five months with a designated mentor. Peer mentoring also occurs between graduates in the first and second years, whilst buddies (to share experiences) are arranged between graduates in the same year. After every training session, feedback is recorded from graduates to continuously improve the content. The career map for graduates is broader than for trainees, listing opportunities in sales, purchasing, operations, showrooms, finance, supply-chain, Human Resources, and Information Systems.

As demonstrated in the promises made to applicants, training content, and placement following the programme's completion, the European Graduate Programme appears to offer a truer reflection of a 'leadership' programme as compared to the Management Trainee Programme. In accordance, the profile of applicants targeted for the programme is placed on those having the potential and ambition for leadership roles. Applicants are recruited for their work ethic, commitment to standards, leadership ability, initiative, flexibility, entrepreneurialism, confidence, and communication skills both in English and a foreign language. Similar to the process adopted for the Management Trainee Programme, applicants undergo a series of hiring assessments before being accepted onto the programme, including ability tests, telephone screening, a competency-based interview, group exercise, and personality screening.

In the study presented, the ability of Busy Bee to predict engagement will be tested for a second time, with participants from the European Graduate Programme. The same motivator category structure identified for the

Management Trainee Programme is applied here, as this structure is thought more aligned to the present population than the alternative structure used by SHL for experienced employees. However, a different pattern of strengths and areas for improvement are expected between the two programmes, reflecting an emphasis on leadership experiences with the European Graduates. Like Study 2, no prediction is made as to what motivator categories would hold the most influence on the engagement of employees and as a result, stepwise multivariate regressions are used throughout the analysis. The main hypothesis tested in this study holds:

Hypothesis 9: The amount of fit employees experience on the European Graduate Programme will predict how engaged they feel in their work.

The analysis conducted on the graduates' level of engagement will provide a replication of the usefulness of the Busy Bee measure for predicting workplace features, as well as identify areas for improvement in Builders.

Method

Participants

In Spring 2009, employees on the European Graduate Programme took part in the current study. Of the 66 employees on the programme, 45 graduates took part in the study as part of their professional development. A large majority of participants in this population (82.2%) were aged between 25 and 29 years old, whilst 17.8% were aged between 21 and 24 years old. More men participated in the study (57.8%) than women (42.2%). Most participants (71.1%) had between 2 and 5 years work experience and many had Masters level degrees or higher (53.3%). The average amount of time that the participants had spent in their current job at the time of the research was under a year at 224 days. All graduates taking part in the research received personalised reports about their motivation preferences.

Design

Preferences about workplace characteristics were captured alongside perceptions of the European Graduate Programme, similar to the methodology used in Study 1 and Study 2. Fit scores were calculated using the same procedure specified earlier in this chapter to evaluate how well Busy Bee predicts employee engagement (Hypothesis 9). Stepwise multivariate regressions were carried out in SPSS entering the Busy Bee motivator categories in a forward manner, followed by post-hoc correlation analyses with the dimensions making up the categories.

Materials and Procedure

Employees on the European Graduate Programme completed the Busy Bee measure in a similar fashion to the employees on the Management Trainee Programme in Studies 1 and 2. At the end of the questionnaire, information was captured about their work engagement using the four component SHL model (Energy, Absorption, Alignment, and Identification).

Throughout the data gathering phase of the research, participants were encouraged to contact the researcher about any questions or concerns.

Results

Hypothesis 9

Captured within the preferences expressed by the graduates is a view of the programme features that are likely to attract and retain employees on the European Graduate Programme. Interestingly, many of the preferences expressed by graduates are shared with those on the Builders' Management Trainee Programme from Studies 1 and 2. Graduates report that they were attracted to a programme offering a great deal of Career Progression (M = 8.51), Development (M = 8.29), Income (M = 8.23), Responsibility (M = 8.18), and Voice (M = 8.11). When compared to trainees, a shared emphasis is placed on Career Progression, Development, and Income. Having Responsibility and Voice appear to attract graduates to a greater extent than for the trainees.

In terms of what the European Graduate Programme actually offers to employees, the graduates report that the programme offers a high degree of Development (M = 6.83), Fairness (6.74), Career Mobility (6.74), Quality of Social Contact (M = 6.72), and Quantity of Social Contact (M = 6.60). When compared with the Management Trainee Programme, four of these same features were highlighted as strengths, except Career Mobility, which likely reflects the opportunity of graduates to work in different countries (trainees work only in the UK). When the lowlights of the European Graduate Programme are examined, the graduates report that the programme does not appear to offer much Payment for Results (M = 3.16), Responsibility (M = 3.84), Influence (M = 4.39), Status (M = 4.48), or Income (M = 4.53). All five of these lowlights were shared with the Management Trainee Programme.

To understand whether these lowlights were of concern to graduates, fit scores were calculated by subtracting preferences from perceptions of actual workplace features. Consistent with Study 1, the relationship between fit scores and actual workplace features was not straightforward at the motivator category level. Just because a feature is in short supply does not mean that the graduates want more of it. The similarity discovered between the programmes for preferences and perceptions of workplace features are reflected in the fit scores, as shown in Table 24.

Factor	Graduates' Misfit (Study 3)	Trainees' Misfit (Study 1 & 2)
Organisational Integrity	1.12	1.10
Workplace Support	1.48	1.96
Social Opportunity	1.59	1.66
Personal Growth	2.53	2.71
Personal Contribution	2.07	2.06
Feedback	2.02	2.35
Role Intensity	1.65	1.36

Table 24: Graduate misfit by motivator category compared to trainees.

Personal Growth, Personal Contribution, and Feedback continue to be the three areas of greatest misfit at the motivational category level, whilst Organisational Integrity is the category with the most fit. At the dimension level, the areas of greatest misfit include Responsibility (M = 4.33), Payment for Results (M = 4.22), Influence (M = 3.31), Income (M = 3.70) and Status (M = 2.62). It is notable that all five dimensions were also rated as lowlights of the Management Trainee Programme. In regards to areas where graduates feel fulfilled by the programme, a high degree of fit was found on the dimensions of Financial Focus (M = .16), Work Life Balance (M = -.33), Safety (M = .38), Non-conflicting Goals (M = .53), and Competitive Industry (M = .62). When compared to the Management Trainee Programme, four of five of these features were shared, with the European Graduate Programme fulfilling Non-conflicting Goals to a greater extent.

In general, a great deal of similarity was observed between the European Graduate Programme and Management Trainee Programme in terms of the features that attract employees to Builders and their experiences once on the programmes. However, the European Graduate Programme does appear to offer a greater amount of Career Mobility through international assignments and increased clarity around work objectives. Increased clarity in job roles was an aspect of the Management Trainee Programme that was identified for improvement in Study 1 and as such, some aspects of the European Graduate Programme's structure could be adopted for trainees. The graduates also differ from the trainees in the amount of Responsibility and Voice they desire in their job, possibly reflecting the leadership profile focused on by recruiters when selecting graduates onto the programme.

To evaluate whether the fit graduates experience on the programme influences their engagement in the job, a series of stepwise multivariate regressions were carried out. The regressions explored whether fit in the motivator categories would predict engagement as measured by the four component SHL model (Energy, Absorption, Alignment, and Identification), with post-hoc correlation analyses used to explore relationships at the dimension level.

An analysis of the engagement measure discovered that the four components were reliably measuring the same construct, with a Cronbach Alpha statistic of .89 across the components. Due to such high reliability, Total Engagement will be considered first before each of the components is investigated in turn. When a regression was carried out on Total Engagement with the seven motivator categories from the Busy Bee measure, Personal Contribution was found to predict engagement, as shown in Table 25.

	B	*SE B*	β
Busy Bee			
- Personal Contribution	-0.79	0.24	-0.45

Notes: $R^2 = .20$ (ps < .01).

Table 25: Personal Contribution fit predicts total level of engagement.

Graduates who reported feeling most fulfilled in the amount of Personal Contribution they had (although not a strength of the programme), reported that they were most engaged in their work. Post-hoc correlation analyses carried out on this finding discovered that the relationship was dominated by the dimension of Influence, whereby graduates feeling fulfilled in how much they could change work processes reported greater levels of engagement ($R = .45$, $p < .01$).

In considering the four components of engagement individually, Personal Contribution (with emphasis on Influence at the dimension level) predicted the amount of Energy graduates reported in their role. Personal Contribution was also influential for the Alignment they reported between their role and the organisation, however the relationship was driven at the dimension level by how much Autonomy they had in completing work assignments ($R = .49$, $p < .01$).

A different pattern emerged for Identification and Absorption, whereby the motivator category of Social Opportunity took on increased importance. When a stepwise multivariate regression was carried out for Identification with the seven motivator categories, Social Opportunity was found to predict how much graduates identified with Builders, as shown in Table 26.

	B	*SE B*	β
Busy Bee			
Social Opportunity	-0.78	0.24	-0.45

Notes: $R^2 = .20$ (*ps* < .01).

Table 26: Social Opportunity fit predicts Identification.

Post-hoc correlation analyses carried out on this finding discovered that the amount of Enjoyment graduates received in their social interactions was related to how well they identified with the organisation ($R = .51$, $p < .01$).

When the fourth engagement component of Absorption was analysed through a stepwise multivariate regression with the seven motivator categories, a combination of Social Opportunity and Organisational Integrity was found predictive, as shown in Table 27.

	B	*SE B*	β
Busy Bee			
- Social Opportunity	-0.76	0.22	-0.48
- Organisational Integrity	0.64	0.30	0.30

Notes: $R^2 = .24$ (*ps* < .01).

Table 27: Social Opportunity and Org. Integrity fit predicts Absorption.

Graduates who felt fulfilled in the level of social interaction they received reported that they were more absorbed in their work. Post-hoc analyses discovered that the relationship between Social Opportunity and Absorption was driven by how much Task Variety the graduates experienced in their role ($R = 50$, $p < .01$). The direction of Organisational Integrity in the regression model was unexpected, as those reporting the greatest misalignment reported greater Absorption. In considering the definition of Organisational Integrity as "a workplace that promotes equality between employees and the needs of the larger community," this finding may indicate that graduates' engagement is partially driven by the amount of individual recognition that they receive as leaders in the organisations (unequal treatment).

In total, the results reported here replicate the ability of Busy Bee to predict engagement, as proposed by Hypothesis 9. Beyond confirming Busy Bee's usefulness, the data has unearthed two themes that should be investigated by Builders if they wish to maintain the engagement of their workers. First, graduates are concerned about the level of Personal Contribution they experience in the programme, especially in how much Influence and Autonomy they hold in determining how work is performed. Second, the graduates desire opportunities for social interaction arising from either greater task variety or events that are purely for entertainment. These two themes will be addressed in depth during the discussion section.

Discussion

Commentary on the Replication

Study 3 sought to replicate Busy Bee's ability to predict employee engagement by researching a comparable development programme to that used in Study 1 and Study 2 from the same participating organisation. Data from the European Graduate Programme demonstrated Busy Bee's ability to effectively predict the engagement of employees (Hypothesis 9) for a second time. The amount of fit graduates experienced on the programme strongly predicted their Total Engagement, as well as the amount of Energy, Absorption, Alignment, and Identification they felt in the workplace. It is interesting to note that Study 3 discovered a negative relationship between fit and engagement, specifically graduates who felt that their workplace was meeting their expectations in Organisational Integrity reported lower Absorption in their job. This finding indicates that engaged graduates may be driven in part by the competition they have with other programme members or the individual recognition they receive as leaders.

Despite key structural differences between the two programmes, employees on the European Graduate Programme were found to share a number of preferences and experiences in common with those on the Management Trainee Programme. From the data captured about workplace preferences, applicants to both programmes are attracted to workplaces that

offer a high amount of career progression, professional development, and personal income. These preferences are consistent with the literature on the Millennial Generation (as discussed in Chapter 1) and may be validating themes specific to this age group, rather than finding preferences unique to Builders' employees. In terms of their experiences, the descriptions of the programmes are highly consistent, focusing on the provision of development opportunities, fairness in employee treatment, and positive social interactions. Employees on both programmes also feel largely fulfilled in the amount of pressure placed upon them from their industry and job role. However both programmes leave their employees unfilled in how much responsibility, influence, and status they hold in Builders, as well as how much income and immediate recognition they receive.

Interestingly, the areas of greatest misfit do not influence engagement the same way for graduates and trainees. In Study 2, trainees' misfit in how much Personal Growth they received and their Personal Contribution in the organisation held direct effects on engagement and performance. In contrast, only Personal Contribution (and not Personal Growth) held a direct effect upon the engagement of European Graduates. This finding demonstrates that the importance of motivator categories for predicting engagement (and possibly performance) is not determined by the extent of fit alone. The separation between importance and fulfilment should be explored by future studies of graduates. Research by Yang, Inceoglu, and Silvester (2010) indicates that capturing information about the importance ascribed to different motivators alongside fulfilment can add substantially to predictions of engagement and performance.

One possible explanation for graduates' tolerance of the misfit they experienced in Personal Growth may lie in their expectations of Builders following the programme. All throughout the European Graduate Programme, the graduates are reminded that they are part of a leadership group. They gain experience in high profile projects, are exposed to senior leaders in the business, and explore placements in a variety of roles beyond the Branch Manager role targeted by the Management Trainee Programme. As a result, graduates may prevent their dissatisfaction in Personal Growth from affecting

their engagement, with the understanding that these workplace features will be fulfilled in time. If proven, this implied psychological contract places a burden on Builders to fulfil graduates' desires for career progression and income once placed into permanent roles. If left unfilled, engagement and performance would be expected to wane.

Study 3 provides both empirical and practitioner contributions to the understanding of motivation, similar to Study 2. From an empirical standpoint, Study 3 validated the motivators valued most by graduates. An emphasis on development, progression, and income was found across programmes and could be indicating generational effects. Alternatively, these issues may be present for employees early within their career as a form of an ageing effect. In either case, programme sponsors and recruiters are better informed that these motivators are important and require active management. If they cannot be fulfilled directly within the development programme, they should be addressed either during selection onto the programme (if they will be left unfulfilled) or at the programme's completion. For practitioners, Study 3 confirms that the Busy Bee measure effectively identifies the fit between employee preferences and workplace realities. Through statistical analyses, key motivators can be identified for their influence on engagement and performance. From the research conducted, Busy Bee appears adept at capturing subtle differences between employee groups within the same organisation, which can aid practitioners in understanding best practices and encouraging learning across divisions. A limitation of the present study was the lack of available performance data for the graduates. As such, a full replication of Busy Bee's usefulness is yet to be accomplished and should be a topic for future research.

Implications for Builders

The information captured in Study 3 provides Builders with insight into the effectiveness of the programme, especially in comparison to the Management Trainee Programme. The rotation of graduates through international placements was recognised as a strong characteristic of the programme. Due to this feature's relationship to Absorption as a form of

engagement, variety in experience should be maintained and possibly adopted in a scaled-down version by the Management Trainee Programme. Graduates also reported that their goals are clear and non-competing, possibly reflecting the high degree of structure in the role and support provided through regular meetings with programme sponsors and mentors. As mentioned in Study 2, inconsistency in work experience and supervisory support was highly evident in the Management Trainee Programme and therefore, this aspect of the European Graduate Programme should be exported to the trainee programme.

The research conducted here unearthed two areas of improvement for the European Graduate Programme. First, a greater range of social interactions should be allowed for in the training calendar to improve engagement. Specifically, social interactions that are purely for entertainment or that provide greater task variety have the potential to boost engagement beyond current levels. Second, graduates reported a need for greater Influence and Autonomy in the work that they perform. Although the programme sponsors may be ultimately limited in how much they can satisfy these needs, small improvements can be made to the programme. For example, greater attention can be paid to the projects completed by graduates that aim to improve how work is done at Builders. Commitment by Builders to enact the recommendations made by graduates and to report back on their effectiveness can help fulfil the graduates' need for Influence. Alternatively, creating more choice in the programme content through optional modules has the potential to fulfil the need for Autonomy as expressed by the graduates.

In the General Discussion below, emphasis will be placed on the strengths and limitations of the Busy Bee measure of motivation, followed by feedback from Builders about how the measure contributed to their understanding and improvement of the Management Trainee Programme. The chapter ends by reviewing how a motivational paradigm based upon person-environment fit can help improve the recruitment and selection of employees.

Quantitative Chapter General Discussion

In this chapter, a motivational paradigm was adopted to identify workplace characteristics that have the potential to influence the selection, engagement, and performance of employees. Specifically, a new form of psychometric based upon person-environment fit was evaluated for its construct validity and ability to predict performance and engagement. The Busy Bee measure originates from the literature on need theories, where the external environment is thought to satisfy worker desires in driving engagement and performance (Latham and Pinder, 2005). Busy Bee differs from existent personality and motivation psychometrics by accounting for both the specific workplace context experienced by employees and their individual preferences to determine fit. It is important to note that Busy Bee represents only one version of person-environment fit, specifically that of complementary, needs-supplies job fit with scores derived by respondent perceptions (Edwards and Shipp, 2007; Ostroff and Schalte, 2007; Hoffman and Woehr, 2005; Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman and Johnson, 2005; Cable and Edwards, 2004; Kristof, 1996). As such, the results discovered in this chapter may not apply to other measures of person-environment fit, such as those focused on the organisational level or fulfilment of mutual values.

In the discussion section from each study, empirical and practitioner contributions were highlighted. Specifically, the studies provide a view into the motivators valued most by applicants and employees on development programmes. This information can be used by recruiters and sponsors to change the marketing and content of programmes, as well as by researchers to determine what types of programmes best fulfil the needs of graduates. Two other questions are raised by the studies' findings that may aid researchers in building a fuller understanding of employee motivation. First, preferences were found to change within the first year of an employee's career with a company. This rapid change suggests that research on ageing fails to adequately address changes in motivation that occur during critical periods of employment or over short timeframes. Second, the studies revealed that motivational preferences are affected by employee

demographics. In the present research, older employees reported greater misfit in their workplace. Future research has the potential for identifying other influential demographics (such as education level or income) and exploring methods for improving the employment relationship for vulnerable groups without destroying equality in the workplace.

In this general discussion, reflections are made on the implications the research holds for both the launch of Busy Bee measure as a commercial offering by SHL and the improvement of the Management Trainee Programme at Builders. Regarding SHL's interest, Busy Bee was found to demonstrate good construct validity within dimensions and therefore, the items appear well-written. However, the positive skew for preferences discovered in previous trials was not completely alleviated by the nine-point rating scale introduced here and therefore, skew appears to be a permanent feature of this form of psychometric. To improve the differentiation between high and low dimensions, an ipsative (forced-choice) version of Busy Bee could be developed by SHL, similar to that offered for the SHL Occupational Personality Questionnaire. By presenting dimensions in blocks of four with respondents choosing the highest and lowest dimensions, differentiation in preferences can be gained.

Two other complications were discovered involving how participants responded to scale items. First, a generic structure of motivator categories (such as that used by the other psychometrics) does not appear possible for Busy Bee. Motivation themes seem to arise out of shared experiences amongst employees from a specific workplace environment. As a result, the interpretation of results requires a significant amount of effort if done at the motivation category level. Alternatively, specific hypotheses could be tested using one or more of the measure's 38 dimensions (for example do highlights or lowlights of the workplace influence engagement or performance). In either case, the launch of Busy Bee as a commercial offering will require trained professionals to oversee the project. Results from Busy Bee are more complex to interpret than preference-only measures. The added complexity of workplace realities, degrees of fit, and direction (either too much or too little of a workplace feature as compared to preferences) requires a high level of

analytical ability and an understanding of the organisational context that may prove challenging to practitioners without support or training on how to use Busy Bee.

In regards to Busy Bee's ability to predict employee behaviour, the measure was found to predict both engagement and performance. In comparison to the other psychometrics investigated, the Busy Bee measure appears to be a stronger predictor of both engagement and performance, as a result of its consideration of actual workplace features alongside individual preferences. Unfortunately, the results presented here do not indicate whether the Busy Bee measure is a valid form of psychometric for use in hiring. Its utility appears to depend highly upon an understanding of the workplace environment by recruiters and an assessment strategy that is closely aligned to it. Future studies should thus explore how the Busy Bee measure contributes to selection decisions and the induction of employees by bringing to light areas of fit and misfit.

To conclude the current chapter, a different perspective on the utility of the Busy Bee is presented, from the vantage-point of the Management Trainee Programme sponsors. At the completion of Study 2, the programme sponsors were presented with the key findings and recommendations as reported above. They were asked about their immediate reactions to the findings and what aspects of the research they were likely to act upon. When asked about the value of the information arising from the Busy Bee measure, a programme sponsor stated that the measure was "...very helpful and informative. It confirms our feelings and gives us hope that the changes we are making are sound." As insinuated in this quote, changes had started to be made even before the results were fully known. Thus the value of the Busy Bee measure extends to the activity itself, in questioning what aspects about the workplace are encouraging employee engagement and performance.

When presented with the choice about reframing the Management Trainee Programme as either a leadership or apprenticeship programme, the sponsors acknowledged that the expectations of recruits were built too high by current recruitment campaigns. The programme could not be touted as preparing recruits for corporate leadership roles like the European Graduate

Programme. A more realistic preview of the programme qualities, as well as a tailored assessment process, was agreed by all sponsors. Moreover, the sponsors agreed to assign a single person as responsible for overseeing the placement of trainees to ensure consistency and fairness. However, disagreement was evident amongst the sponsors in how much structure was required in the programme's content. Although recognising the crucial importance the Branch Manager role holds for the business, one sponsor in particular believed that multiple career paths were beneficial, as an average turnover of 30% allows placement of trainees into many head office roles. In contrast, another sponsor contended that the lack of clarity on the trainees' career path hinders the effective development of specific branch management skills and therefore, career progression should be initially limited.

Evident in this discussion amongst programme sponsors was that no single solution for the Management Trainee Programme could resolve the problems experienced in the selection, engagement, and performance of trainees. Difficult choices in the content of the programme would be required, after a careful examination of business needs, trainee perceptions, and budgetary constraints. As such, the strengths of Busy Bee lie in its ability to raise insightful questions and encourage discussion about the quality of the workplace. The solutions themselves are discovered and acted upon by those responsible for shaping the workplace environment.

As demonstrated in the research above, a motivational paradigm based upon person-environment fit uncovers elements of the workplace that are valued by both employees (potential or established) and their employers. Where congruence occurs, a healthy employment relationship is established to the benefit of both parties, in the form of satisfaction and well-being for employees and higher engagement and performance for employers. To take advantage of these benefits, recruitment and selection activities should focus on making the degree of fit easily apparent. During the recruitment phase, hiring organisations should communicate the benefits and drawbacks of a role, both in its advertisement and the discussions held by recruiters with potential employees. With this knowledge, applicants can evaluate for

themselves their degree of fit to the opportunity and whether they should progress with their applications.

This form of self-selection is far from perfect, as other factors affect whether applicants will pursue employment when the fit is poor. Prominently, the availability of other job opportunities in the labour market and the employee's level of self-awareness about their motivational preferences can moderate applicant choices to pursue employment with a given organisation. As a result, employers have a responsibility to evaluate fit when selecting candidates. Including psychometrics that focus on motivation (such as the Busy Bee measure discussed here) with established assessment practices on skill or ability can provide a complementary perspective about the candidate's long-term fulfilment of role requirements. Not only will the hiring organisation gain information about whether a candidate can perform the job (through tests of ability), but they will glean an understanding of whether the candidate will exert themselves fully or burn out over time (via measures of motivation). Similar to applicants, organisations will vary in how aware they are of the true benefits of a given job, as well as how much applicant choice they have in a given labour market.

If organisations and applicants explore and apply the concept of person-environment fit when making their respective decisions, the research presented here indicates that the employment relationship will be established on a firm foundation. In the next chapter, the discussion shifts to a consideration of how the intricacies of a new employment relationship are worked out between a manager and direct report. Emphasis will be placed on whether the motivators identified during recruitment and selection are fulfilled and the resulting effects upon the employment relationship.

CHAPTER 3: CASE STUDY

Sustaining Employee Motivation through Alignment In the Psychological Contract

Once an employee has been successfully recruited and selected into an organisation, a process of induction takes place. Over the coming weeks and months, employees gain an understanding of whether the benefits and responsibilities spoken about at interview are reflected in the reality of the job. The hiring organisation too undergoes a similar process, exploring whether the new hire is able to deliver the skills and abilities promised in their CV. The psychological contract formed from these early encounters between applicants and the hiring organisation, which is then validated with further on-the-job experience, establishes the criteria by which both parties hold the other to account in the employment relationship. When alignment occurs, typically defined as a strong psychological contract, employees are increasingly motivated to remain in the organisation and contribute with work outside their normal remit (Rousseau, 2004; Millward-Purvis and Cropley, 2003; Schein, 1989). In addition, the security provided by aligned psychological contracts can heighten innovation (Herriot and Pemberton, 1996), reduce uncertainty, and provide direction and predictability (Sutton and Griffin, 2004; McFarlane Shore and Tetrick, 1994). The symptoms of a misaligned psychological contract, when employee and organisational expectations differ, can include withdrawal, destruction, and turnover (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000; McFarlane Shore and Tetrick, 1994).

The following chapter adopts the paradigm of the psychological contract to explore how motivation evolves during the early phases of employment or when a significant job change occurs, for example when an employee is transferred or promoted. The case study demonstrates how a failure to effectively manage the psychological contract can lead to dissatisfaction and the unexpected turnover of staff, with insight into professional practice for how motivation can be sustained through induction and beyond. The case study provides a contribution to practitioners by identifying how exploring obligations not explicitly discussed during hiring,

providing a realistic description of work requirements, and promising only what the organisation can deliver all have the potential to preserve employee motivation. Similar to the previous chapter on person-environment fit, the discussion argues for capturing the organisational perspective in addition to the employee perspective when considering the psychological contract, a viewpoint not universally adopted in the psychological contract literature. Such an approach provides a second area of practitioner contribution, whereby a fuller picture of the psychological contract is gained as a means of informing how the employment relationship can be improved. The discussion will now turn to a brief review of the literature on psychological contracts before providing background on the participating organisation.

Defining the Psychological Contract

The psychological contract provides a useful structure for describing the early interactions between the employee and organisation. Within these exchanges, an individual's motivations are expressed and compared to what the organisation can provide through employment. Definitions of the psychological contract emerged formally in the 1960s, taking into account both the content of the contract and the process from which it was formed. This distinction is used to structure the discussion below, which first focuses on the content of psychological contracts before moving on to discuss the processes involved in their formation, maintenance, and breach.

Levinson et al. (1962) provides an early definition (as cited in Millward and Cropley, 2003, p. 215) of the psychological contract, describing it as "a series of mutual (reciprocal) expectations of which the parties to the relationship may not themselves be even dimly aware but which none the less govern their relationship with each other... reciprocation... understood as the way of which the contract is affirmed, altered or denied in the day-to-day work experience." Schein (1980) agrees largely with the above definition, however places emphasis on the interactive, mutually influential nature of psychological contracts. From Schein's viewpoint, each party has the ability to define what is included in the contract and thereby, alters the other party's response about what will be reciprocated in the employment relationship.

A contemporary definition is provided by Rousseau (1995), who stresses the cognitive basis of psychological contracts, defining them as "individual beliefs, shaped by the organization, regarding terms of an exchange between individuals and their organization" (p.9). Rousseau (2004) modifies this definition slightly by stating that psychological contracts are "beliefs, based upon promises expressed or implied, regarding an exchange agreement between an individual and, in organizations, the employing firm and its agents" (p.120). Central to Rousseau's work is the placement of the psychological contract solely in the mind of the employee, as 'shaped by their organization.' The psychological contract is thus a cognitive construct owned by the employee and thereby, governed by the rules of cognitive psychology. This cognitive viewpoint is explored by Rousseau (2001), wherein the formation and maintenance of the psychological contract is likened to schemas.

Rousseau's employee-centric, cognitive viewpoint has been criticised as reductionist by many contemporary researchers, beginning with Arnold (1996). On the one hand, a cognitive definition provides ease in measurement, whereby the content of the contract can be analysed from a singular viewpoint on the employment relationship. Yet, contracts imply mutuality and agreement between parties (Millward and Cropley, 2003; Millward and Brewerton, 2000; Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000). It is arguable that discounting the employer's perspective only captures a portion of how a contract is formed and maintained. As such, studying psychological contracts from both employee and organisational perspectives can provide a more holistic view of how elements of the contract are chosen and ascribed importance by employees.

Exploring the psychological contract from multiple viewpoints increases complexity in the research by bringing into question who represents the organisation in the employment relationship (Millward and Cropley, 2003; Herriot, Manning and Kidd, 1997; Herriot and Pemberton, 1996; McFarlane Shore and Tetrick, 1994). The organisation can be represented by the owner, hiring manager, recruiter, HR representative, or variety of other agents acting on behalf of the organisation in the early stages of contract formation

(Rousseau, 1995). Rousseau (2004) recognises this difficulty in her definition when describing the 'employing firm and its agents,' but alleviates a need to explore who these might be by focusing solely on the 'individual's beliefs' about the contract.

Despite the challenges of accurately capturing multiple perspectives of the psychological contract, the case study presented here includes both the employee's and organisation's viewpoints. The clarity gained in understanding the misalignment between the employee's and organisation's views was thought to outweigh the risk of not accurately identifying the key contract holder in the organisation. The consequences of this decision, in terms of its contribution to professional practice, and its limitations are discussed in the conclusion.

Regardless of the definitions adopted by researchers, psychological contracts are broadly accepted to differ from traditional employee contracts in that they are unwritten, contain both implicit and explicit features, have no legal bearing, and can extend beyond the immediate job (Sutton and Griffin, 2004; Millward and Cropley, 2003; Herriot, Manning and Kidd, 1997; McFarlane Shore and Tetrick, 1994). The formation of psychological contracts can be particularly challenging for an organisation to control (in comparison to typical employee contracts), as employees enter a workplace with specific career goals and preferred styles of working (Millward and Brewerton, 2000), as well as expectations of what they are to accomplish in their jobs (Rousseau, 2004; Millward and Cropley, 2003; Millward and Hopkins, 1998; McFarlane Shore and Tetrick, 1994). The expectations held by employees prior to employment differ from what is eventually contained in the psychological contract, as components of the psychological contract hold a promissory connotation that arises from the interaction between the employee and organisation (Sutton and Griffin, 2004; Millward and Brewerton, 2000; Arnold, 1996).

The content of the psychological contract has been researched significantly during the last decade. Of the major trends emerging from the literature, broad support has been gained for the distinction between transactional and relational types of psychological contracts (Rousseau, 2004;

Millward and Cropley, 2003; Millward and Hopkins, 1998; McFarlane Shore and Tetrick, 1994). Transactional contracts are dominated by obligations that are economic in nature, have inflexible and formalised terms, allow for little personal development, rely on existing skill sets, focus on the short-term, and are made explicit to both parties during the hiring process (Millward and Brewerton, 2000; Rousseau, 1995). In contrast, relational contracts are based on trust in the employment relationship (Millward and Hopkins, 1998) and take on an emotional, development-oriented, long-term, implicit, and flexible tone. Organisational variables and individual differences both contribute to the type of psychological contract dominating a particular employment relationship (Coyle-Shapiro and Neuman, 2004). For example, permanent staff members tend to be more relational in focus (Millward and Hopkins, 1998), as are employees high in conscientiousness and self-esteem (Raja, Johns, and Ntalianis, 2004).

Some researchers have argued that the distinction between transactional and relational contracts is not mutually exclusive, but rather provides a useful mechanism for describing the actual obligations contained in any employment relationship (Millward and Brewerton, 2000; Arnold, 1996). It is from this perspective that 'balanced' (high transactional and high relational) and 'transitional' (weak transactional and weak relational) types of psychological contracts emerge, containing either a mixture or deficit of features traditionally categorised as either transactional or relational (Rousseau, 2004; Rousseau, 1995). An illustration by Rousseau (1995, p. 98) is reproduced to clarify the types of psychological contracts defined by the distinction between transactional and relational.

Duration	*Performance Terms* Specified	Not Specified
Short Term	**Transactional** ○ Low ambiguity ○ Easy exit / high turnover ○ Low member commitment ○ Freedom to enter new contracts ○ Little learning ○ Weak integration / identification	**Transitional** ○ Ambiguity / uncertainty ○ High turnover / termination ○ Instability
Long Term	**Balanced** ○ High member commitment ○ High integration / identification ○ Ongoing development ○ Mutual support ○ Dynamic	**Relational** ○ High member commitment ○ High affective commitment ○ High integration / identification ○ Stability

Figure 1: Rousseau's (1995) illustration of psychological contract types.

Work by Janssens, Sels, and Van den Brande (2003) has taken the transactional and relational distinction one step further by including a third dimension from Social Exchange Theory (Shore and Barksdale, 1998) to define six main types of psychological contracts. Their model focuses on the level of equality experienced in the relationship between the employee and organisation in defining the instrumental, weak, loyal, strong, unattached, and investing types of contracts. Adding the third dimension of equality creates difficulty in how misalignments are recognised (the authors do not clarify how the six contract types specifically relate to each other) and therefore, is not utilised in the discussion of this chapter's case study.

Research by Herriot, Manning, and Kidd (1997) complements the above distinction between relational and transactional contract types by providing a more granular view of the employment relationship that will aid in the discussion of the following case study. The authors studied the basic types of obligations that can form part of the psychological contract. In terms of organisational obligations, employees expect organisations to provide training, fairness in HR systems, balance in work and home demands, consultation in times of change, discretion about when to interfere in assignments, respect for employees as individuals, recognition for

performance, a safe and congenial environment, organisational fairness, remuneration, employee benefits, and job security. In exchange, organisations request employees to provide the contracted hours of work, good quality workmanship, honesty in internal and external interactions, loyalty, respect in the treatment of organisational property, tidy self-presentation, and flexibility to do jobs outside of an employee's normal role. As an outcome of their research, Herriot, Manning, and Kidd (1997) discovered that employees and organisations often have misperceptions about what the other party values. Employees focused on the transactional elements of the psychological contract (e.g. personal appearance in exchange for a safe and congenial environment), whilst organisations stressed a relational perspective (e.g. employee loyalty in exchange for recognition of a job well done).

In the following case study, the psychological contracts will be discussed using both the distinction between transactional and relational contract types and the granular view of obligations discussed by Herriot, Manning, and Kidd (1997). This combination provides a useful mechanism for discussing where potential breach in the psychological contract occurred or whether the employees' and organisation's views were misaligned from the outset. Commentary about the value of these distinctions is presented at the end of the chapter.

From Formation to Contract Breach

The above discussion focused on the definition and typical content of the psychological contract. In this section, the discussion explores the processes of contraction formation, maintenance, and breach. A model by Herriot and Pemberton (1996) is helpful in this regard by describing the primary stages of an employee's relationship with an organisation. Early in the employment relationship, individuals seek out information about what they can expect from their workplaces. In many cases, the information is self-confirming of the employee's biases held prior to hiring (McFarlane Shore and Tetrick, 1994). The sources that contribute to this phase in the contract's formation can vary greatly, including interactions with existing employees,

interpretations of their own experiences as customers, and overt promises made in advertisements or by recruiters (Millward and Brewerton, 1999). The next stage in the contract's formation involves active negotiation with the employer where reciprocal obligations are set. Interaction between parties and explicit conversations about obligations are key to establishing similar perceptions between parties, thereby lessening the chance of misunderstanding and premature ending of the employment relationship (Rousseau, 2001; Herriot and Pemberton, 1996). Experienced staff (who have worked for other employers) tend to discuss mutual obligations, as well as the relational aspects of the psychological contract, to a greater extent than less experienced employees (Millward and Cropley, 2003). As a result, greater responsibility is placed upon the organisation to ensure mutuality in the pre-employment psychological contract with inexperienced new hires.

The next two stages of the model occur after an individual is hired for a job. From their first day, employees monitor the psychological contract to assess whether obligations are being met. Monitoring has a tendency to reduce over time as the psychological contract becomes more complex and stable in structure (Rousseau, 2001). The fourth stage in Herriot and Pemberton's (1996) model involves the end of psychological contract, wherein either the needs of the individual or organisation change fundamentally (Schein, 1980), resulting in renegotiation of the contract or an employee's exit from the organisation. It is this last stage where special attention is given, due to the premature ending of the psychological contracts presented in the current case study.

During the employment relationship, a variety of violations can occur to the psychological contract, resulting in a range of outcomes from resignation to renegotiation depending upon the type and severity of violation (McFarlane Shore and Tetrick, 1994). Common to all violations is a break in obligation; the promises made as part of the psychological contract (Millward and Brewerton, 2000). The expectations employees hold prior to being hired are compared to their actual experiences in determining whether a breach has occurred (Sutton and Griffin, 2004). Violations are thus defined as the

emotional response employees' experience following the cognitive realisation of a breach (Morrison and Robinson, 1997).

Violations usually occur either directly when managers renege on their obligations or through incongruence, when a gap exists between the manager's and employee's perspectives upon what has been agreed in the psychological contract (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2007; Sutton and Griffin, 2004). Managers are often aware of when they cause a violation, but report that they have little control in resolving the situation (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2007; Rousseau, 1995), finding it difficult to adjust their staff's psychological contracts to meet current organisational needs (Millward and Cropley, 2003).

Violations are most likely to occur in a troubled employment relationship. For example, employees and organisations with a history of conflict, high social distance between parties, and incentives to end the relationship are prone to violation (Millward and Brewerton, 2000). Arnold (1996) suggests that the components of psychological contracts most susceptible to violation involve training and development, compensation, and promotion. Organisations with a track-record of violations across their employees are thought to suffer a host of negative side-effects, including employee mistrust, dissatisfaction, low commitment, increased turnover intentions, and poor performance (Zhao et al., 2007).

How any given employee will respond to violation depends upon the makeup of their psychological contract. Employees holding a predominately relational psychological contract are generally more resistant to violations than those having contracts of a transactional makeup. Relational employees frequently attempt to voice their concerns and renegotiate their psychological contract (Rousseau, 2004), instead of retaliating against the organisation. However, when violations are of a severe nature, relational and transactional employees react similarly to the violation by withdrawing, causing destruction, or exiting from the organisation (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000; McFarlane Shore, and Tetrick, 1994).

To avoid the negative implications of violations in the psychological contract, it is in the organisation's best interest to attempt to resolve unmet

obligations or renegotiate psychological contracts with employees. Rousseau (1995) identifies three primary ways that psychological contracts can change, including contract drift, accommodation, or transformation. Contract drift relates to a change in the contract components and the importance ascribed to them by both the individual and organisation. Drift creates flexibility in the relationship to meet individual or organisational needs, but can also lead to violation if the psychological contract drifts too far from what individual parties are prepared to accommodate.

The other types of change identified by Rousseau (1995) result from external pressures, leading either to accommodation in the existent psychological contract or transformation into a new agreement between parties. Successful accommodation is likely to occur when change is interpreted in the context of the existing contract, with a positive relationship, and active participation between parties. Similarly, successful transformation occurs with well-articulated reasons for change, acknowledgement of the old contract, and a clear communication and implementation strategy. In the following case study, the two psychological contracts discussed will be analysed in respect to contract drift, accommodation, and transformation. In both cases, the psychological contracts failed to change in response to internal and organisational needs, resulting in the premature resignation of the staff members.

The Organisation and Participants

The participating organisation in the following case study was experiencing an unsustainable level of turnover and thus was interested in understanding more about the alignment between employee motivational needs and what the organisation was prepared to provide. The organisation, renamed here as 'OccPsych,' formed 28 years ago as a private UK partnership specialising in Occupational Psychology consulting that now publishes over 250 psychological instruments and employs 700 staff members in 40 countries, inclusive of 250 psychologists (company brochure, 2007). Traditionally, OccPsych was able to attract and retain leading practitioners, gaining a reputation as one of the most desirables firms to work

for in its industry. However, the loyalty of staff has faltered lately, especially within the UK Consultancy division, wherein a turnover of 55% was witnessed over the last couple of years.

To gain an understanding of the themes underlying Consultancy's high turnover, the division's Vice President agreed to participate in the following case study, providing access to two employees who left within a short time of their hiring. By understanding the employees' expectations at hiring, what they experienced during their short time at OccPsych, and the reasons behind their departure, it is hoped that practical changes can be made to how employees are recruited and inducted into the organisation. Research on the psychological contract suggests that alignment is dependent on the quality of discussion between employees and their organisation. Features such as honesty, openness, trust, reciprocity, and mutual understanding weigh heavily on the contracting process (Millward and Hopkins, 1998; Hendry and Jenkins, 1996; Herriot and Pemberton, 1996; Rousseau, 2004; Millward and Cropley, 2003). As such, the following case study will question OccPsych's practices at establishing and maintaining alignment in the psychological contract by investigating the quality of its employee relationships and how these contracted features were breached.

The two participants employed by the Consultancy division at OccPsych were involved in developing and delivering assessment strategies for recruitment, promotion, and redundancy (through executive assessment and assessment centre methodology), as well as creating and delivering skill-based training (e.g. communications or negotiation), facilitating personal awareness through psychometrics (e.g. 360 degree feedback), and designing performance management and succession planning systems (e.g. role profiles and performance evaluations). Despite similarity in the type of work they were engaged in, the two employees differed in title and remit. Jay (names have been changed to protect anonymity) was employed as a Managing Consultant in the Northern UK team, whilst Sue was employed as a Junior Consultant at the head office in London. Both Jay and Sue joined OccPsych in mid-2006 and ended their employment contracts in late 2007. Due to the similarity in Jay and Sue's hiring and resignation dates, their

individual experiences provide a snapshot of psychological contract breach at different levels in the Consultancy hierarchy, resulting in the identification of a range of recommendations for OccPsych. The specific differences in their job responsibilities will be discussed in relation to their individual accounts of their psychological contracts.

Interview Methodology

Four separate interviews were conducted to record the factors and events leading to psychological contract breach amongst the case study participants. Sue and Jay were interviewed for inclusion in the case study in November 2007, just prior to their resignation dates. The employees' line managers were also interviewed as part of the research to provide a fuller account of the psychological contracts. All four interviews were conducted in private and lasted approximately two hours in duration. Interviewees were informed that the conversations were held in confidence and that the information would be used solely for creating the following case study. Organisational recommendations would be provided to OccPsych, however the detail of the conversations would only be disclosed with the explicit consent of Jay and Sue.

The interviews themselves followed a similar structure for both the employees and line managers. For Jay and Sue, the interviews began by asking about their general perceptions (positive and negative) about their roles and responsibilities, followed by questions probing the makeup of their psychological contracts (i.e. reciprocal obligations held by the employees and organisation). Next, Jay and Sue were asked about whether their expectations were met or whether their expectations changed over time. After discussing the cause for their resignation, the employees were asked whether the organisation could have done anything different to preserve their psychological contracts. For the hiring managers, the interviews began by addressing Jay and Sue's performance and their fit to the organisation. The questioning then turned to address the reciprocal obligations held by OccPsych and the employees, followed by a conversation about where breach occurred in the psychological contracts. Notes were taken throughout

the interviews and later analysed. Due to the biographical structure of the interviews, which recorded the career histories of Jay and Sue with OccPsych from hiring through to resignation, underlying themes were identified based upon the principles of discourse analysis. Notes from the interviews were read and interpreted through a variety of vantage-points. For example, the motives of employees and managers that drove specific behaviours were identified, as well as gaps in the stories omitted by either the managers or employees. Both commonalities and differences between the accounts of Jay, Sue, and their managers were analysed, with reference to theoretical research on psychological contract types, typical obligations, and methods for dealing with violation. In the following discussion, the themes underlying the psychological contracts for Jay and Sue will be presented, with specific attention paid to the implications their experiences hold for employment practices at OccPsych.

Jay's Psychological Contract

Prior to joining OccPsych, Jay worked as a Human Resources Manager for a major high street bank. Jay was not formally trained in Occupational Psychology, but had gained significant Human Resources experience in the recruitment and development of staff, especially those identified as having high leadership potential. The complementary skill set that Jay brought to OccPsych dominated the formation of his psychological contract. Jay joined the Consultancy practice to gain formal training and exposure to the field of Occupational Psychology, in exchange for his own experience as a client that could challenge and improve practices at OccPsych. Over time, Jay believed that this particular combination of Human Resources and Occupational Psychology knowledge would enable him to become a thought leader in the organisation and attain a promotion from Managing Consultant to the role of Principal Consultant. Jay was particularly attracted to OccPsych for its reputation as an industry leader in Occupational Psychology and therefore felt that the organisation and position could serve his long-term career interests better than remaining in the bank or taking a role with another consulting firm.

Jay's line manager held a similar understanding of Jay's interests when he joined OccPsych, believing that the role of Managing Consultant would broaden his perspective through interactions with a range of companies and a variety of business issues. In exchange, Jay was perceived as offering OccPsych a view of clients' interests and expectations that could be used to improve internal practices. On a personal basis, Jay's line manager believed that Jay would be credible with clients and could conduct conversations about Human Resources practices at greater depth than existing consultants at OccPsych. The only reservation held by Jay's line manager at hiring involved Jay's responsibilities for sales and business development, requiring skills and motivations outside of his experience as a Human Resources Manager. Ultimately, Jay was determined as capable of fulfilling his sales responsibilities and special support was provided to ensure a smooth transition into his client-facing role.

When viewed against the literature, Jay's psychological contract could be described as 'balanced.' Rousseau (1995) describes the balanced contract as equally high on transactional and relational elements, whereby the duration of the relationship is long-term and performance expectations are known. Rousseau's description of a balanced contract fits Jay's situation, whereby both parties would be committed to the relationship, mutually supportive, development focused, and flexible. The obligations contained in the contract, as set against the research by Herriot, Manning, and Kidd (1997), initially focused upon Jay's professional development in exchange for organisational commitment. As will be discussed below, other obligations not explicitly discussed at hiring contributed to breach in Jay's psychological contract. If the importance of these obligations were known, the prospect of breach may have been avoided.

Upon entering OccPsych, Jay discovered that his expectations to learn Occupational Psychology in exchange for sharing his expertise in Human Resources would not be fulfilled in his role as Managing Consultant. In his 18 months on the job, Jay could identify only two existing clients where his Human Resources skills were used to improve the client offering. Moreover, Jay found it difficult to find projects that could benefit from his Human

Resources expertise. Instead, much of his time was taken up by work that could be accomplished by a junior consultant, making him question whether his job was "a good use of his time or expertise." In addition, Jay did not anticipate the amount of time required for sales and administrative activities (e.g. invoicing and record keeping). Jay believed that the focus of the job was not on providing superior service for clients, requiring high levels of proficiency in Occupational Psychology, but rather on selling to new clients and maintaining internal processes, the latter of which could be performed by junior staff members.

This misalignment in workload was compounded by the makeup of Jay's immediate workgroup. Jay was able to identify only three individuals from a group of approximately 20 consultants that exceeded his own level of experience or formal training. Moreover, the time available to learn from these individuals was limited, due to the organisation's pressure on generating sales. Jay turned to self-study of the Occupational Psychology literature and started to question whether he would gain the skill-set required to become a Principal Consultant. Jay confronted his line manager on the topic and was disappointed to learn that he would not be considered for promotion in the near future. This ran contrary to what Jay was told at hiring, specifically that his role as Managing Consultant would provide "breathing room" until promotion at his first year appraisal. Consistent with Arnold (1996), violation in Jay's psychological contract was emerging with issues involving development and promotion.

A fundamental change in business operations added to Jay's unfulfilled expectations about development and promotion, causing a breach in his psychological contract. Jay was hired into the Northern UK team on the assumption that he would expand the team's skill set and work towards improving the local client offering. In June 2007, OccPsych announced that the Manchester office would close and that existing consultants would work as a virtual team. Jay's opportunity to learn from his peers and influence the work undertaken by OccPsych was placed at risk through this decision and as a result, Jay decided to resign. Consistent with the literature, Jay viewed the office closure as a reneging by OccPsych on its commitment to support Jay's

professional development (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2007; Sutton and Griffin, 2004).

In the case study interview, Jay described the breakdown of his psychological contract as a "process of erosion that climaxed with the closure of the Manchester office." Jay believed that the staff were not adequately consulted in the decision and that the organisation demonstrated a lack of commitment to employees. Obligations not explicitly discussed at hiring took on increased importance to justify his perception of breach, specifically consultation in times of change and respect for employees as individuals (Herriot, Manning, and Kidd, 1997). Jay's reaction to the closure was self-described as emotional, demonstrating violation of the psychological contract and turnover intention as predicted by the literature (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2000; McFarlane Shore, and Tetrick, 1994).

Jay's line manager was aware that the closure of the Manchester office could cause difficulty in his relationship with Jay, but stated that he misjudged the extent of Jay's disappointment. The decision to close the office was based upon cost and therefore, he felt he could do little to avoid conflict with Jay, consistent with findings by Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler (2007) and Millward and Cropley (2003) about management's inability to avoid contract breach. Jay's line manager reported that he had attempted to restore Jay's commitment to the organisation by sponsoring his enrolment in a MBA programme. Tellingly, Jay did not mention the MBA during his case study interview, implying that sponsorship did little to restore the violation in his psychological contract.

When viewed against the literature, Jay's line manager attempted to transform the psychological contract (Rousseau, 1995), however the specific type of development offered by the MBA was incongruent (Coyle-Shapiro and Kessler, 2007; Sutton and Griffin, 2004) with Jay's expectations for practical experience in Occupational Psychology. The breach in Jay's psychological contract had led to his turnover intention and little could be done to mend the relationship after the closure of the Manchester office. The implications for failing to address implicit obligations (e.g. consultation in times of change and respect for employees as individuals) and to promise obligations that the

organisation could not realistically fulfil (e.g. professional development) will be further explored in the discussion section.

Sue's Psychological Contract

The desire to learn and develop new skills was a common motivator shared between Jay and Sue. Prior to joining OccPsych, Sue successfully completed a Masters in Occupational Psychology and accepted a job in a competing consultancy firm as a researcher. Sue tired of this position quickly, as the job involved limited exposure to clients and was restricted in the type of work undertaken. To expand her skill set and build upon her Occupational Psychology degree, Sue accepted a job with OccPsych as a Junior Consultant. Sue was attracted by OccPsych's reputation and was keen to learn how to be a well-rounded practitioner from the senior consultants at the firm. From her initial conversations during the hiring process, Sue believed that OccPsych was committed to its employees' development and would provide continuous feedback about her progression through structured job roles and appraisals. Sue was particularly concerned about progression, as the career path in her previous company was ambiguous and riddled with internal politics. Sue's psychological contract at hiring was thus dominated by her pursuit of a stable career with ongoing personal development and strong organisational support.

Sue's line manager shared a similar understanding of her psychological contract, with emphasis on how to become a skilled practitioner. However, Sue's line manager extended this learning beyond Occupational Psychology, stressing sales and project management experience that would also be a part of Sue's consulting role. Sue's expected progression through the organisation was likewise aligned, with promotion expected within 2-3 years from hiring. In exchange for on-the-job training, Sue was expected to provide work of a consistently high standard, support sales activities, and protect the brand's reputation.

Unlike Jay's balanced psychological contract, Sue's contract is best described as 'relational.' Rousseau (1995) describes the relational contract as long-term in duration, however lacking in specific performance

expectations. Sue's affective commitment, identification with the firm, and wish for stability is consistent with Rousseau's description of a relational contract. Moreover, Sue's primary objective of building competence in her role lacks the detailed performance expectations that would result in her contract being described as balanced. In regards to the specific obligations contained in her contract as viewed against research by Herriot, Manning, and Kidd (1997), several differences in the psychological contract can be identified as compared to Jay. Although sharing the motivation of professional development, Sue's contract involved the obligations of fairness in HR systems and job security in exchange for quality workmanship and preservation of brand reputation. As will be discussed below, emphasis was placed on development and progression in Sue's interactions with her line manager, at the expense of explicit conversations about fairness in HR systems and job security. This gap in understanding was particularly important in causing breach in Sue's psychological contract.

When Sue entered OccPsych, she felt that much of her psychological contract would be fulfilled in her role as a Junior Consultant. Working as the only Junior Consultant in the London office, Sue found herself engaged in a variety of high profile client projects that elevated both her confidence and skills as a practitioner. She described the learning curve as "very steep at the outset," however was provided with a great deal of support by her work colleagues who she described as "truly skilled and motivated individuals." Sue's line manager agreed that Sue's psychological contract appeared to be initially fulfilled, with OccPsych providing Sue with the opportunity to learn through close interaction with senior staff. Moreover, Sue received financial support and time-off to pursue Chartership with the British Psychological Society, a qualification she attained prior to leaving the Consultancy division. In terms of Sue's obligations to OccPsych, Sue was perceived as providing quality workmanship that helped build a favourable brand image with clients.

Over time, Sue became increasingly unhappy at OccPsych. Although she initially found her work challenging, Sue stated that her professional development stagnated after she became competent in her role. Exposure to different types of work, especially management development and succession

planning, were reserved for senior consultants in the firm. Moreover, the day-rate structure advertised to clients contributed to Sue's perception of being "reminded of hierarchy in all that you do." The structure that initially attracted Sue to OccPsych became a point of contention, whereby Sue felt increasingly trapped in her role as a Junior Consultant and lacking the opportunity to progress her learning or career. When Sue confronted her line manager about the stagnation in her development, Sue was informed that she "was on track for promotion," but no commitment was given regarding time frame or what her new role could look like. Sue reacted negatively to this conversation and began looking for other opportunities in OccPsych. Sue approached her line manager for a second time about a transfer to the Product and Training division, a choice that her line manager described as "a career mistake." As before, no commitment was given to Sue about when or how her job could be changed and as a result, Sue transferred into the Product and Training division at OccPsych.

Unlike Jay, Sue's psychological contract breach is best described as contract drift (Rousseau, 1995), whereby early fulfilment unhinges over the course of an individual's career. In Sue's situation, the composition of her work assignments initially provided structure and valuable experience, but were eventually incongruent with her desire for continued professional development and career progression, needs that often lead to violation in the psychological contract (Arnold, 1996). As with most relational contracts, Sue attempted to voice her concerns and renegotiate the terms of her psychological contract (Rousseau, 2004), instead of retaliating against the organisation. After realising there was a gap in understanding about OccPsych's obligations and an unwillingness by her line manager to support her development and progression, Sue decided to resign from the Consultancy division.

Influential in this choice was a perceived violation in the obligations of organisational fairness and commitment to employees, which were not explicitly discussed in Sue's interactions with her line manager. Explicit conversation (Rousseau, 2001; Herriot and Pemberton, 1996) about these key motivators had the potential to influence how her line manager reacted to

Sue's concerns over development and progression. Instead of addressing the topics of development and progression outright, her line manager could have reassured Sue that fair procedures would be applied when the opportunity for promotion presented itself. Likewise, commitment could have been demonstrated by an open conversation about how Sue's job could be altered (e.g. placement onto challenging projects or rotation into a different office or division). If change in responsibilities was not possible in OccPsych, an explicit conversation about the repetitive nature of the job and the process for promotion should have occurred when Sue was hired, thus avoiding premature contract breach. The importance of addressing implicit obligations and setting realistic expectations of job requirements will be discussed in the following section.

Implications for OccPsych

The above case study identified similar obligations in the psychological contracts of employees at OccPsych, despite differences in job responsibilities and titles. Specifically, both Jay and Sue held high expectations for professional development and progression when they joined the company. Jay wished to gain an understanding of Occupational Psychology that would complement his extensive Human Resources experience, whilst Sue was interested in learning how to put her formal training into practice. However, other obligations not explicitly discussed at hiring also played a role in the eventual breach of their psychological contracts. For Jay, consultation in times of change and respect for employees as individuals were placed in jeopardy with the closure of the Manchester office. Sue's focus on fairness in HR processes and job security surfaced when her workload stagnated. The violation experienced by Jay and Sue on these explicit and implicit obligations draws attention to three organisational implications for how OccPsych establishes and maintains psychological contracts amongst its staff. In the discussion below, recommendations for understanding what the organisation can truly deliver, establishing realistic expectations amongst applicants, and allowing for more explicit conversations about obligations will be presented in turn.

When Jay began his conversations with OccPsych, he expected that his extensive Human Resources experience would be put into practice in exchange for exposure to Occupational Psychology techniques. In reality, Jay discovered that his experience was influential only on a limited number of projects and that his interaction with other practitioners was superficial. The gap in Jay's expectations and the realities of his role may have been influenced by the structure of the OccPsych hiring process. Jay was interviewed and hired by the Vice President of Consultancy (London based) and was not introduced to his line manager until his first day on the job. The transition in responsibility between the Vice President and his line manager may have led to ambiguity as to who represented the organisation in establishing his psychological contract (Millward and Cropley, 2003; Herriot, Manning and Kidd, 1997; Herriot and Pemberton, 1996; McFarlane Shore and Tetrick, 1994), as well as to what had been explicitly promised. The Vice President may not have been able to provide an accurate description of Jay's likely workload or team interactions, thereby creating a gap in Jay's psychological contract. To remedy this situation from occurring in the future, it is recommended that OccPsych involve the line manager earlier in the hiring process, establishing the line manager as the primary organisational contract holder. This positioning will also enable effective renegotiation of the psychological contract over time, by maintaining consistency and mutual understanding of obligations.

Consistent between Jay's and Sue's contract breach was a misperception of workload and responsibilities. For Jay, more time was dedicated to sales and administrative duties than initially anticipated, whilst Sue's role as Junior Consultant involved repetitive elements that ran contrary to her expectations for continuous learning. Although it is difficult to understand from the interviews whether the roles were accurately described by OccPsych, further analysis could be conducted on the organisation's hiring practices. It is notable that both Jay and Sue were surprised to learn how much importance OccPsych placed on sales activities. Neither Jay nor Sue identified sales as a primary motivator and therefore, this job responsibility could have become a cause for breach. Rousseau (1995) recommends that

organisations adopt realistic recruiting practices to reduce the possibility of misunderstanding about what a job entails. Specifically, she recommends that organisations perform a detailed analysis of the role prior to hiring, acquaint the candidate with specific job responsibilities, realistically describe career opportunities, and use work samples to determine fit. Due to the misalignment experienced by Jay and Sue, it is recommended that OccPsych review its hiring procedures to ensure that roles are accurately described, and preferably experienced, prior to hiring.

During the course of their careers with OccPsych, implicit obligations not addressed during hiring took on increased importance for Jay and Sue. When the Manchester office closed, Jay was concerned over the lack of employee consultation and consideration for individual circumstances exhibited by OccPsych. For Sue, transparency in progression and commitment for the development of staff took on increased importance when her workload stagnated. In both cases, OccPsych was unaware of the importance placed on these obligations by Jay and Sue. If these obligations were made explicit during the hiring process, as recommended by Herriot and Pemberton (1996) and Rousseau (2001), the line managers may have reacted differently when confronted about the office closure and workload stagnation. For Jay, his psychological contract had the potential for transformation if his line manager clearly articulated the reasons for change, acknowledged the breach in contract, accurately assessed the ramifications of change, and actively sought Jay's input about how to create a new contract (Rousseau, 1995). In Sue's case, the psychological contract drift she experienced could have been avoided through periodic conferences addressing the status of her development and an open exploration of opportunities. The preventive measures described above for Jay and Sue are dependent on OccPsych's understanding of the implicit obligations held by its staff, which can only occur through a fuller exploration of applicants' expectations at hiring and a restatement of needs by the organisation to ensure a common view (Rousseau, 1995). In light of the current case study, it is recommended that OccPsych develop line managers' skills to accurately assess the needs of applicants and their ability to monitor how obligations

change over time. Equally, line managers should be provided with the time and resources necessary to ensure that the psychological contracts of staff are effectively maintained.

Commentary on the Psychological Contract

To conclude this chapter, a short commentary on the psychological contract is provided about its utility in sustaining motivation amongst new hires or employees who have experienced significant job change. The strengths of the psychological contract paradigm for practitioners, limitations of the current case study, and unanswered questions that are topics for future research will each be considered. The following commentary will argue that the psychological contract paradigm is useful for exploring issues of staff motivation, but is currently limited in specific recommendations for how organisations can improve the alignment experienced amongst staff.

By adopting the paradigm of the psychological contract, underlying trends in employee motivation were discovered in the participating organisation that were likely causing high turnover amongst staff. Based upon a qualitative analysis of interviews conducted with both employees and managers, professional practice around meeting obligations, settings realistic expectations, and holding explicit conversations were identified as central to the effective maintenance of the employment relationship. As such, the case study contributes to an understanding of how motivation amongst employees can be sustained after hiring or when significant change occurs. The case study also demonstrated how capturing both sides of the psychological contract (employee and organisational perspectives) allows for a more detailed view of key motivators and potential areas of breach, such that better recommendations can be made. This second contribution to professional practice challenges the view held by Rousseau and her contemporaries about the cognitive nature of the psychological contract, but is aligned to trends of person-environment fit as described in Chapter 2.

Limitations inherent to both the case study and the literature on the psychological contract restrict a full understanding of the paradigm's value for practitioners. Regarding the case study, bias may have occurred as a result

of the participants' pre-existing knowledge of the concept and their work in the field of Occupational Psychology. The framing of their career history and how it was related within the interview may differ considerably from employees outside of the field. Moreover, the evidence gathered from Jay and Sue was based upon autobiographical memory and after they resigned from their positions, potentially creating bias. As an improvement on the current methodology, future case studies should capture information at multiple stages across an employee's career to alleviate hindsight. Moreover, by exploring employee relationships outside of the UK, questions can be answered about whether the psychological contract applies equally in cultures where career changes are infrequent or where a greater power distance is witnessed between employers and staff. Such information can help practitioners understand whether the recommendations captured here are appropriate across contexts.

Although the practices of meeting obligations, settings realistic expectations, and holding explicit conversations were recommended by the case study, how these suggestions link onto specific selection or development techniques is unclear and not addressed by previous research. For example, it is unclear what interview methodology is most successful at making obligations explicit or what role psychometrics (e.g. personality or motivation questionnaires) play in recording employee expectations during the contracting phase. Future research should thus investigate the link between the psychological contract and specific selection and development techniques used by practitioners. In the case of OccPsych, tools for accurately capturing implicit expectations held by Jay and Sue at hiring could have allowed for a stronger management of their psychological contracts. Likewise, a structured audit of what OccPsych was willing to offer recruits would have provided an indication of potential alignment between applicant expectations and the reality experienced in the organisation. In the following chapter, the link between the psychological contact and practitioner techniques is partially addressed by exploring how a development programme based upon 360 Degree Feedback can renew the psychological contracts held amongst a group of long-term employees.

CHAPTER 4: INTERVENTION

Motivating Employees for Change through a Development Programme

As demonstrated in previous chapters, the literature on motivation has focused largely on employees experiencing either high or low levels of motivation. For example, the literature discusses the high energy new recruits bring to the workplace and the withdrawal of employees whose psychological contract has been broken. Relatively less focus has been placed on the motivation of long-term employees who have worked in the same jobs or organisations without radical movement in their careers. Unlike the fluctuating motivation of new recruits or job leavers, long-term employees' motivation has reached a level that sustains the employment relationship, but may not be optimal for driving performance. At times, organisational pressures may disturb the balance in the employment relationship, requiring greater amounts of performance, innovation, or commitment than what is normally required. As a result, organisations may turn towards development interventions amongst other techniques as a means of renewing the psychological contact and motivating employees for change.

The particular organisational challenge discussed in this chapter involves the establishment of a new corporate identity for a semi-state company recently partitioned from the government. Responsible for this transformation was a team of highly experienced executives who had worked in the government entity for a considerable length of time (three of the executives had never worked outside their current employer). The executives' collective task was to identify values and behaviours aligned to the corporate strategy and promote them internally. As a means of motivating the executives and encouraging greater cohesion within the team, an executive development programme was devised around the challenge of creating a new, separate organisational culture.

The Director of Human Resources was the commissioning client responsible for developing the executives' capability to transform the organisation, a task that none of them have previously faced in their careers.

Although aware that the executives would require developmental support, how this could be accomplished was unclear to the client. The Human Resources Director contacted outside consultancies early in this process to seek their advice, eventually choosing to work with me due to my track record with the company and previous success in developing the organisation's competency framework. Because I was involved in the initial phases of the project, I was able to shape the implementation of the programme collaboratively with the Human Resources Director. The agreed solution built on the foundations set by the new behavioural competencies, targeting the self-awareness of executives about their fit to the new culture. The executives were involved in the construction of the competency framework (a levelled behavioural model that accounted for shared organisational values alongside job demands), providing assessment criteria that was both agreed and familiar. A 360 Degree Feedback assessment featured strongly in the solution, sitting alongside psychometrics of personality and motivation, to determine where potential strengths and development needs existed for the executives, followed by individualised development plans.

My choice to focus on assessment as a means of raising self-awareness was influenced heavily by my current employer, which promotes behavioural competencies as the primary job feature where change can occur. By assessing individuals against competency definitions, the capability of employees to take on new job responsibilities can be evaluated and incorporated into personal development plans. Although I believe that assessment before development makes objective sense, the transition between the two phases can be difficult to manage, as my company does not specialise in on-going professional development beyond the initial feedback session. Assessment in isolation is not anticipated to motivate employees, but rather arises from the development conversations that occur because of heightened self-awareness. When different facilitators take part in a development programme (e.g. a behavioural coach providing feedback and a line manager supporting on-going development), the link between assessment and development can be lost. As will be shown in the literature review below, the link can also be broken due to issues of personal control

over the future, the importance ascribed to change, and threats to self-esteem, placing in jeopardy any positive effects an assessment before development approach has on employee motivation.

The intervention presented in this chapter makes a contribution to professional practice by identifying how development programmes can renew the psychological contracts held amongst experienced employees. Specifically, the strengths and limitations of development programmes that focus on behavioural self-awareness are explored, with implications for practitioners tasked with helping employees through organisational change. The discussion begins by addressing how development feedback can be used to align employees to desired behavioural norms. This is followed by a detailed account of the intervention context, how the client's needs were analysed, and the specific solution used as an intervention. The final section of this chapter will evaluate the success and limitations of the intervention, using both the client's needs and previous research on development programmes as a guide. The intervention described here will demonstrate that development programmes, despite their limitations, can be effective at motivating long-term employees and renewing the psychological contracts they hold with their employers.

Feedback Seeking

Feedback about one's performance can take a variety of formats, depending upon the direction of the feedback (for example upwards feedback from direct reports or downwards feedback from a line manager) and how formalised the feedback process is (for example whether feedback occurs as part of an annual appraisal). The literature on self-awareness generally differentiates between two types of feedback seeking. Active feedback seeking is described as eliciting opinions from others in the workplace, with the individual controlling the timing of when feedback occurs (Tuckey, Brewer and Williamson, 2002). Alternatively, indirect feedback seeking is characterised by monitoring the workplace environment for indications about performance, but not actively asking for others' opinions (Roberson et al., 2003). The value placed upon these two modes of feedback seeking is not

equal, as the quality of information gained by active feedback seeking is thought to surpass that of indirect feedback seeking (Tuckey, Brewer and Williamson, 2002).

However, many employees avoid active feedback seeking due to the stigma associated with the activity. Active feedback seeking is generally viewed as indicative of incompetence, insecurity, or low ability (Williams et al., 1999). In reality, the stigma holds only for employees who seek positive feedback from their workmates, whereas those who actively seek critical feedback have been found to gain the respect of supervisors, peers, and subordinates (Ashford and Tsui, 1991). Critical feedback seekers are likely driven by motives to learn about their performance, especially when they see the information as both useful towards accomplishing personal goals and arising from a credible source (Tuckey, Brewer and Williamson, 2002; Fedor, Rensvold and Adams, 1992).

Individual differences and the workplace environment also contribute to the amount and type of feedback sought by employees. Employees who expect praise and have biases for self-enhancement tend to seek out positive feedback (London and Smither, 1995). Alternatively, individuals who have a high tolerance for ambiguity, strong self-esteem, and engage frequently in social interactions are likely to avoid feedback seeking entirely (Fedor, Rensvold and Adams, 1992; Korman, 1976). Where homogeneous environments are experienced (e.g. age, gender, ethnicity, or education), employees from a minority group can feel threatened and therefore avoid feedback. Minority members are likely to engage only in indirect feedback seeking and to ignore performance related feedback (Roberson et al., 2003). A consistent finding from the literature suggests the greatest determinant of active feedback seeking is when job performance has been rated poorly (Fedor, Rensvold and Adams, 1992). More about this finding will be discussed in the following section regarding the link between feedback and performance.

In regards to the workplace environment, organisations have the ability to promote active feedback seeking amongst their staff members by changing the social environment. Employees who describe their workplace as tolerant

of mistakes and supportive tend to seek out a greater amount of feedback and to take corrective action (Tuckey, Brewer and Williamson, 2002; Williams et al., 1999). Where time is short and drastic organisation change is required, a more drastic approach to feedback is sometimes adopted. Organisations can take the onus off of employees and initiate a formalised process for gathering and dispersing performance related feedback. The information gathered resembles that attained by active feedback seeking, but individual control over timing and content is abandoned. The reasons why organisations initiate feedback programmes, their effects upon motivation, and critiques of their effectiveness will be reviewed in the following section.

360 Degree Feedback

Gathering and delivering personal feedback from multiple individuals across of a range of relationships (such as a line manager, peers, direct reports, and outside parties) is commonly referred to as 360 Degree Feedback. This intervention technique represents a combination of occupational practice in collecting information via employee surveys and the philosophy underlying performance appraisals (London and Smither, 1995). With the emergence of stable IT platforms, it is estimated that since 1992, $152 million is spent annually on 360 Degree Feedback programmes, with nearly universal support for the technique in Fortune 500 companies (Garavan, Marley and Flynn, 1997; London and Smither, 1995).

Organisations adopt 360 Degree Feedback primarily to embed the corporate culture, transfer skills, and drive personal performance. The first stages of a 360 Degree Feedback programme involve the identification of behaviours that are most likely to drive future organisational success within a given job role (Bailey and Fletcher, 2002; Garavan, Marley and Flynn, 1997; Bracken, 1994). By initiating a 360 Degree Feedback programme, the organisation sends a clear message to its employees about what is valued in the culture and provides an opportunity for staff to demonstrate their ability to meet organisational demands (Smither et al., 1995). A study by London and Smither (1995) discovered that 70% of organisations primarily use 360 Degree Feedback as a vehicle for embedding a new corporate culture.

Once key behaviours are identified and personal data captured, a training needs analysis can take place to ensure that individuals have the skills necessary to perform their job requirements (Fedor, Rensvold and Adams, 1992). For the individual, 360 Degree Feedback can also help raise self-awareness about how others perceive their leadership style and interpersonal skills, such that changes can be made to their work relationships (Maurer and Palmer, 1999; Ashford and Tsui, 1991). In the review by London and Smither (1995) cited earlier, 85% of organisations stated that the output from their 360 interventions focused on development, with 40% of respondents linking 360 Degree Feedback results to a formalised training programme.

Beyond stressing the cultural importance of certain workplace behaviours or identifying skill gaps, 360 Degree Feedback can be used to track alignment to the corporate culture over time and drive personal performance. Increasingly, organisations are including 360 results into the formalised appraisal process (Garavan, Marley and Flynn, 1997; Smither et al., 1995; Bracken, 1994) or using them as a means of tracking the attainment of objectives set by line managers (London and Smither, 1995; Ashford and Tsui, 1991). The literature supports this move, demonstrating that 360 Degree Feedback has the potential to increase performance as measured in appraisals and formalised assessments (Smither, London and Reilly, 2005; Bailey and Fletcher, 2002), decrease the number of development needs required by staff (Bailey and Fletcher, 2002), and improve customer service ratings (Renn and Fedor, 2001).

However, the link between 360 Degree Feedback and personal performance is not guaranteed, as the relationship is riddled with a range of moderating variables (Smither, London and Reilly, 2005; London and Smither, 1995). For example, in a meta-analysis of 360 Degree Feedback interventions, Kluger and DeNisi (1996) discovered that a third of interventions actually resulted in lower personal performance. The key variable identified by the researchers was the nature of the feedback, either task-based or of a personal nature. When individuals felt that the feedback

threatened their self-esteem or was outside their personal control, performance dropped relative to pre-intervention levels.

This emphasis on personal control is consistent with goal setting and control theories. The theories state that discrepancies between self and others' ratings on performance generally spurn activity to close the gap, especially when an individual strongly identifies with the organisation, shares in its values, and believes that they have the ability to affect work outcomes (Smither et al., 1995; London and Smither, 1995; Ashford and Tsui, 1991; Korman, 1976; Korman, 1970). Goals play an important role in improving performance, whereby an appropriate standard of behaviour is identified from the 360 Degree Feedback and worked towards (Reilly, Smither and Vasilopoulos, 1996; Locke, Cartledge and Koeppel, 1968). When goal-setting, individuals are thought to envisage specific ways to improve their work relationships and to better meet the demands of the workplace (Carver and Scheier, 1982), which can be captured formally in a Personal Development Plan. Through continuous feedback following the 360 intervention, the individual can evaluate how close they are to accomplishing their goals and adjust their behaviours accordingly (Nelson, 1993).

Beyond issues of control, views about the importance or necessity of behavioural change can affect the effort individuals exert following 360 Degree Feedback. When behavioural change is deemed necessary, individuals tend to view the feedback positively, listen attentively to its messages, view change as feasible, and set tangible goals (Smither, London and Reilly, 2005). Individual differences in self-confidence and attitudes about both receiving feedback and change can also play a moderating role between 360 interventions and performance (Renn and Fedor, 2001; DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Maurer and Palmer, 1999). Lastly, how favourable or unfavourable the feedback itself is can affect subsequent actions to improve performance. The greatest amount of change occurs with those employees rated as poor to moderate performers (Walker and Smither, 1999; Reilly, Smither and Vasilopoulos, 1996; Smither et al., 1995) or in other words, those with the greatest amount of work to do to improve their performance.

Best Practice In 360 Degree Feedback

In an attempt to improve how 360 interventions are designed and implemented, the literature on 360 Degree Feedback has identified a variety of best practices that can be used to ensure interventions are a success. The best practices outlined below were influential in shaping the specific intervention presented here and will provide a basis for evaluating the overall success of the intervention later in this chapter. As mentioned earlier, an assessment before development approach is promoted by my employer and as a result, limited the scope of potential interventions recommended to the client. Choice still existed within the approach for how the assessment was constructed and implemented and it is in this way that best practice from the literature was particularly helpful.

Before any data is captured and delivered to the participant, best practice dictates that practitioners ensure that the questionnaire content meets the specific organisational needs. The most effective forms of 360 Degree Feedback are closely related to the tasks employees undertake in the workplace and where clear performance expectations can be identified (DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Kluger and DeNisi, 1996). The behavioural competencies chosen for the questionnaire should also be appropriate for the employees' level in the organisation (Garavan, Marley and Flynn, 1997). The timing of the intervention should be carefully considered, to ensure that the emotional well-being of employees is preserved (DeNisi and Kluger, 2000), as some forms of feedback can damage self-confidence. Decisions will also have to made about who participates in the 360 intervention, both as participants and as feedback providers. Even if a programme is voluntary, indirect pressures may influence a participant's choice to undergo the intervention (Maurer and Palmer, 1999). A clear communication strategy that discusses both the purpose of the 360 intervention and how it links to the organisational strategy can help alleviate some of the anxiety participants experience and ensure that feedback providers decide on fair ratings of performance (Bracken, 1994). Lastly, a project manager can improve the quality of data, by officiating the choice of feedback providers (those who have a unique perspective and who will provide honest, constructive

feedback) and ensuring all feedback providers complete the questionnaire (Garavan, Marley and Flynn, 1997).

Once the data is collected, decisions are required about the method and delivery of the feedback to the participant. A number of authors in the 360 Degree Feedback literature stress the importance of having a trained professional provide the feedback in a one-to-one session (Seifert, Yukl and McDonald, 2003; DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Garavan, Marley and Flynn, 1997; Bracken, 1994), to deal with any emotional reactions arising from the feedback. In the session itself, the conversation is considered most effective if it addresses the participant's objectives in receiving the feedback, their current role and frustrations, trends emerging from the data, and the identification of specific goals and actions (DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Walker and Smither, 1999). After the feedback, accountability amongst participants should be fostered by encouraging participants to share their development plans with their line managers, introducing incentive schemes, or conducting follow-up 360 interventions (Seifert, Yukl and McDonald, 2003; Walker and Smither, 1999; Reilly, Smither and Vasilopoulos, 1996).

Identification of Need and the Intervention Context

As mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, the participating company was undergoing a change in corporate identity from a government controlled to a semi-state organisation. The company, renamed here as 'Electrics,' became independent on 1st July 2006 with the responsibility of developing, maintaining, and operating the electricity transmission system in Ireland. Electrics' role is to facilitate a competitive market between large industries who use electricity and those who generate and supply it. The company's corporate strategy has three main components. First, Electrics strives to become a world class Transmission System Operator by creating efficiency in the market. Central to this goal is the establishment of a reputable brand identity that is viewed as independent from the government and successful at managing a diverse range of constituencies (i.e. private industry, government regulators, and international interests). Second, Electrics strives to create a sustainable future for Ireland's energy needs.

Projects are underway to connect additional resources both internally in the republic and across the border with Northern Ireland and Wales. Lastly, Electrics aims to develop its organisational capability by growing the professionalism of its staff. Electrics wishes to attract, retain, and develop staff who can deliver on Electrics' vision to be "a great company, a great place to work, great to do business with and an authoritative independent voice in the industry" (company brochure, 2008).

Underpinning the corporate strategy is a set of values that have been defined by the executive team and encouraged for all staff to adhere to. Electrics aims to be customer focused, have open communications, value knowledge and learning, encourage innovation and problem-solving, have a 'can do' attitude, work in partnership, hold the highest business ethics, never compromise safety, and remain commercially focussed (company brochure, 2008). This list of corporate values was particularly important for the development of a levelled behavioural competency framework that became the basis for the intervention described below.

Two years after the establishment of Electrics as an independent entity, the executive team sought information about how well they were promoting the values and behaviours that would drive the corporate strategy forward. The executives were aware of how much of their time had previously focused on articulating the strategic vision, values, and competencies of the new corporate culture. After two years, this work was complete and the executives were now moving into the implementation phase of their project. After recognising this need to move into implementation, the Human Resources Director was charged with the responsibility of formulating a strategy to build the capability of the executive team, ensuring that they collectively had the skills and confidence to transform the business.

My involvement in the project began after the executive team decided to investigate whether they had the capability to transform the business. Like many projects undertaken by SHL consultants, I was engaged by Electrics to implement a project that already had a defined scope and been given financial resources. If I was engaged earlier in the conversation or held an internal position within Electrics, I could have challenged assumptions about skill

deficiency and a perceived lack of confidence amongst the executives. The assessment centric approach adopted by Electrics suffers from two characteristics that potentially limits its ability to improve motivation. First, assessment carries a negative connotation through its emphasis on deficiency, with implications for threatening the self-esteem of participants. Second, assessment can be perceived as imposed by the organisation (especially when participation is not voluntary) and therefore can send mixed messages about personal control over development. As spoken about in the literature review, issues of control and threat weigh heavily on the success of development interventions. Another entry point for improving motivation could have been found, for example by changing the allocation of responsibilities to improve trait alignment or fulfilling a greater amount of motivational needs. The solution detailed here thus represents only one form of intervention to renew the psychological contract and improve motivation, which was thought best aligned to the particular demands of the client.

Through active consultation with the Human Resources Director, we agreed on an executive development programme that focused on capturing a snapshot of each executive's current ability and potential to successfully lead the transformation. I supported the Human Resources Director's belief that an assessment before development approach was a sensible form of intervention to target capability, as it was unclear where the development gaps existed for the executive team. Due to the diversity of the executives (each representing a different division or function) and the change in role requirements, assumptions around where gaps existed would likely prove inaccurate. Moreover, an assessment approach allowed for the creation of detailed development plans that would be difficult to write without a snapshot of each individual's capability and potential to lead the transformation. As mentioned earlier, a drawback of an assessment before development approach is the transition between the two phases, where momentum for change can be lost if participants view development as unimportant or when a handover occurs between the feedback provider and line manager. These issues will be addressed later in the chapter for their impact upon motivation.

The vocabulary used in the corporate values and behavioural competency framework provided a common set of criteria that could be used to evaluate the executives. I was involved in the drafting of the levelled competency framework and as a result, was confident that the link between the behaviours, values, and corporate strategy were strong. Moreover, each of the executives was consulted during its construction, thus ensuring buy-in that these were the behaviours that all individuals in the company should aspire towards. In the current intervention design, the executives were evaluated against the competency definitions at their level in the organisation as a means of accurately recording their current capability to lead the transformation. Information about their potential was also captured via psychometrics of personality and motivation. The executive's self-awareness would be heightened through an individual feedback session, whilst a team session would highlight trends across the executives on their collective ability to promote the desired corporate culture. In the following section, a detailed account is provided about the design and implementation of the intervention undertaken in the Autumn of 2008.

Formulation and Implementation of the Solution

The content of the intervention was holistic in its approach by taking account of whether the executives had experienced self-awareness development in the past, how they and others viewed their current behaviours, and what they identified as their personality preferences and motivations. Each of these intervention facets were assessed through separate means. To assess the executives' interest in participating in the current intervention, each participant was asked to complete a questionnaire that first asked about whether they had completed psychometrics (i.e. personality, motivation, or 360 Degree Feedback) or coaching in the past. They were then asked to rate on a five-point scale their general interest in receiving feedback (1 = not at all interested and 5 = very interested), the level of their anxiety about the programme (1 = not at all anxious and 5 = very anxious), and whether the timing of the feedback was appropriate (1 = very bad timing and 5 = very good timing). Lastly, the executives were asked to list

a maximum of three expectations about the programme and three concerns. Together, this information provided a view of how the executives perceived the intervention, such that any issues could be addressed by the coach, as well as providing criteria for measuring the success of the programme in meeting the individual needs of participants.

A 360 Degree Feedback questionnaire was built specifically for Electrics based upon the organisation's levelled competency framework. Individual questions were chosen from a bank of items developed and validated by SHL that mapped onto the seven Electrics' Executive Competencies of Reputation Management, Builds Effective Relationships, Industry and Commercial Focus, Provides Leadership and Strategic Focus, Manages Performance, Initiates Action and Delivers Results, and Champions Electrics' Values. The Executive Competencies were built during a consulting exercise earlier in 2008 that involved the executive team, line managers, low level staff, and the Board of Directors to identify competencies and behavioural indicators required by the executive team to deliver the corporate strategy. To distribute the 360 Degree Feedback questionnaire, each executive was asked to nominate at least two respondents for the categories of direct reports and external parties. Additionally, each member of the executive team (including the CEO) completed a 360 response for all the other executives. Each behavioural indicator was rated by the respondent on a five point scale (1 = not at all effective and 5 = extremely effective), whilst space was provided at the end of the questionnaire for comments about what the responder saw as the executive's most effective behaviour, least effective behaviour, and what the executive could do differently.

The participants also completed the SHL Motivation Questionnaire and the Myers Briggs Type Indicator personality questionnaire as a means of exploring how their preferences might influence their workplace behaviour. The SHL Motivation Questionnaire assesses preferences across 18 main dimensions, using a normative five-point scale that ranges from 'greatly reduces my motivation to work' to 'greatly increases my motivation to work.' The 18 dimensions fall into four categories of motivators, specifically Energy and Dynamism, Synergy, Intrinsic Motivation, and Extrinsic Motivation. An

individual's responses are compared against a norm group to determine the likely drivers of motivation for a given job. The Myers Briggs Type Indicator personality questionnaire assesses participant's preferences in their working style. Sixteen types are defined by the measure, wherein an individual is seen to be Extroverted or Introverted, Intuitive or Sensing, Thinking or Feeling, and Judging or Perceiving. The participant's responses to the questionnaire identify their four-letter type (e.g. ESTJ) as a means of exploring possible strengths and limitations of their style in the workplace.

The intervention progressed through three main phases. The first phase involved communications about the programme and data collection. Once the scope of the project was agreed with the Human Resources Director, the executives were briefed on the programme during one of their weekly meetings. This communication was particularly important for setting expectations about what information would be captured and alleviating concerns about who would see individual gaps in capability (raw 360 data was only seen by the participant). The executives where then sent an e-mail asking them to complete the introductory questionnaire about their past experience with psychometrics and coaching, followed by an invitation to complete the Myers Briggs Type Indicator personality questionnaire and the SHL Motivation Questionnaire online. The executives were then asked to nominate their respondents to the 360 Degree Feedback questionnaire, which was launched electronically when all nominees were collected.

The second phase of the intervention involved a one-to-one feedback session with each of the executives. An SHL colleague, who is an experienced and qualified coach, was chosen to provide a three hour session for each participant that would explore their expectations and concerns about the programme, preferences from the Myers Briggs Type Indicator personality questionnaire and the SHL Motivation Questionnaire, and themes arising from the 360 Degree Feedback questionnaire. The coach was also instructed to explore the executive's career goals and to identify specific actions that could be pursued during the next calendar year. Following the one-to-one feedback session, a report was drafted by the coach and agreed by the participant, which was subsequently presented to the CEO. Through this process, the

participant was in full control over what information from the 360 Degree Feedback questionnaire was communicated to the CEO, counteracting potential anxieties about the public disclosure of weaknesses. The CEO was asked not to judge the content of the report, but to focus on the types of support that would be provided by the organisation to help fulfil the participant's development goals. A key tenet of the programme was that the executives were collectively responsible for driving the new corporate culture and as such, they were responsible for their own personal development following the assessment.

The third phase of the intervention involved an away-day for the whole of the executive team. During the session, the group was presented with each other's key motivators and Myers Briggs Indicator Types, to better understand where the commonalities and differences lie. The goal of this review was to identify how interactions across the executive team could be improved, as well as to consider the division of responsibilities. The group was next presented with high level themes from the 360 Degree Feedback, as a means of understanding what the team as a whole could do to promote the desired culture. Special attention was placed on ensuring that gaps in capability could not be linked to a specific team member. The day concluded with the identification of actions that the team could implement over the next calendar year. One of the key actions identified was to review individual and group progress at the six month mark, providing the basis for the following section on evaluating the success of the intervention.

Across the three intervention phases, special attention was placed on designing and implementing best practice as identified in the literature on 360 Degree Feedback. From the start of the programme, a dedicated project manager was identified to ensure that communications were clear to participants and respondents alike, as well as to validate the quality of information gathered across all respondents (Garavan, Marley and Flynn, 1997; Bracken, 1994). The competencies selected for the 360 Degree Feedback were designed specifically for the executive population (Garavan, Marley and Flynn, 1997) and the timing of the programme allowed the participants to settle into their roles before taking part in the intervention

(DeNisi and Kluger, 2000), occurring two years after the establishment of the new corporate structure. For the feedback discussions, a professional coach was used to provide emotional support for the participants (Seifert, Yukl and McDonald, 2003; DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Garavan, Marley and Flynn, 1997; Bracken, 1994), with the discussion covering both the participant's objectives in receiving the feedback and emergent trends in the data (DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Walker and Smither, 1999). Following the feedback, the executives shared their development plans with the CEO to promote personal accountability and gain organisational support (Seifert, Yukl and McDonald, 2003; Walker and Smither, 1999; Reilly, Smither and Vasilopoulos, 1996).

Two areas of the intervention however did not fully comply with the best practice identified in the literature review. First, participation on the development programme was mandatory, despite the potential for the executives to feel personally threatened by the assessment (Maurer and Palmer, 1999). Assessment carries a negative connotation amongst many employees due to the exposure of deficiencies, which is compounded by organisations mandating participation on development programmes. Without control over their development, participants can feel threatened, to the detriment of motivation. To partially mediate this issue, the introductory questionnaire specifically asked the participants about their level of anxiety and the concerns they had about the development programme. Information captured by this questionnaire was addressed by the coach during the feedback session. Moreover, clear standards were set about who would see the 360 Degree Feedback data (only the participant), whilst the public exposure of weaknesses was controlled for both at the team away-day and through the reporting process with the CEO.

As a second break with best practice, the intervention did not take account of the specific responsibilities undertaken by the executives, but rather focused on the competencies identified for their level in the organisation (DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Kluger and DeNisi, 1996). As a partial remedy, both the coach and CEO endeavoured to bridge the gap between competency feedback and role responsibilities when drafting and implementing the executives' development action plans. Yet, the separation

between assessment and development was still evident in the design. After the completion of each participant's feedback session, my own involvement on the intervention ended. Without a formalised process and minimal oversight by the HR Director, the executives were left to implement their own action plans, with mixed results as discussed below.

Evaluation of the Intervention's Success

The intervention discussed above was intended to deliver a mixture of individual and organisational benefits. For the individual, the programme sought to raise self-awareness of strengths and limitations, providing an opportunity for further personalised development (e.g. training, job rotation, new experiences, or coaching). For the organisation, the intervention aimed to align the executives to the new corporate culture, through the identification of individual and team actions.

To evaluate the relative success of the programme, information from the introductory questionnaire about the executives' expectations was considered alongside the action plans that were written following the feedback sessions. The analysis undertaken on these sources of qualitative research involved discourse analysis to uncover themes between the executives' development priorities and Electric's competency model. Individual actions listed on the development reports were labeled according to competency to uncover whether development priorities were clustered or spread equally across the model. In addition, content analysis was used to establish how often specific development priorities and concerns were evident amongst the executives. Expectations listed on the introductory questionnaire and actions from the reports were both counted for their prevalence.

As an additional source of qualitative research, each of the executives was interviewed six months after the intervention in July 2009, to establish what types of follow-up activity occurred after the development programme. Notes were taken during these interviews and later reviewed according to the principles of discourse analysis to identify themes in the executives' motivation to carry out actions following the programme. For example, unfulfilled action plans were explored for their relationship to reservations

about the programme as stated on the introductory questionnaire. By comparing the individual and group goals with information captured from the introductory questionnaire, the action plans, and follow-up interviews, the successes and limitations of the development programme is explored.

This evaluation of the development programme's success is broadly aligned with the literature. Of the most frequently used models, Kirkpatrick (1994) proposes four levels of evaluation, specifically reaction (initial feeling about the experience), learning (increase in knowledge), behaviour (applied learning or implementation), and results (effect on the business environment). Although researchers have challenged the assumptions underlying the relationship between evaluation levels (Alliger and Janak, 1994), the model has wide support due to the ease by which its vocabulary can be applied to development programmes and therefore, is helpful in grounding the current intervention in the literature. As recommended by contemporary literature on evaluation, both individual and organisational goals were considered as evaluative criteria (Bates, 2004). Moreover, a variety of methods were used to gather evaluative data (Foxon, 1989), including a pre-intervention questionnaire, analysis of action plans, and interviews with participants. Together, this information allowed for evaluation on three levels of Kirkpatrick's model, specifically the participants' reaction to the programme, the learning they gained about their fit to the organisation, and whether behavioural change occurred. The design of the programme, which focused on the executives' behavioural alignment, did not allow for an evaluation at the fourth level in Kirkpatrick's model, as it was unclear where specific organisational results would be witnessed.

In the introductory questionnaire, the executives were asked about their experience in personality and motivation assessments, 360 Degree Feedback, and coaching. All but one of the executives had undergone personality or motivation assessments before, whereas only three of the seven executives had experienced 360 Degree Feedback or coaching. Despite these differences in experience, the executives universally rated themselves as 'very interested' in the development programme. The timing of the programme was equally well rated, with the executives identifying the

timing as either 'good' (four participants) or 'very good' (three participants). In terms of their level of anxiety, only one executive rated themselves as 'moderately anxious,' with the remainder reporting themselves as 'slightly anxious' (four participants) or 'not at all anxious' (two participants). The particularly anxious executive spoke about her anxiety in the open response section, stating that she feared a loss in confidence following the programme. If the programme was voluntary rather than mandatory, this individual may have not participated in the programme and thus illustrates the limitation of the current design discussed above in the section on best practice. The coach was notified of this participant's concern, such that any damage in self-confidence could be effectively managed.

From the open-response questions, the executives' key expectations and concerns were identified. The executives stated that they wished to gain a clear view of their limitations (four participants), understand what their peers required of them (four participants), gain focus in their job (two participants), and improve interactions within the team (two participants). Four of the executives also stated that they wished to gain a clear understanding of how they could improve their performance. As will be noted below, the ability of the coach to identify tangible actions for the participants may have fallen short of this expectation. In terms of concerns, the executives stated that they were concerned about whether they would have enough time to focus on their development (three participants), if the information would be relevant for their jobs (three participants), and whether the 360 Feedback would be an accurate reflection of their job performance (two participants). The expectations and concerns listed above will be considered alongside the organisational goal of behavioural alignment in the intervention's evaluation.

Based upon the feedback session with their coach, an action plan was drafted for each of the executives. Across the team, ten distinct types of actions were identified for improvement, which will be discussed according the Electrics' competency framework. In regards to the competency of Builds Effective Relationships, the participants identified that they wished to work on their influencing skills (six participants), the amount of networking they do outside of Electrics (three participants), how to adopt a more consultative

approach in their work (three participants), and to increase the amount of active listening they do (two participants). The executives also focused on actions relating to the Provides Leadership and Strategic Focus competency, where they sought to improve their visibility to staff (six participants), variety in the leadership styles they adopt (three participants), and to contribute more to the corporate strategy (one participant). Two actions were relevant for the Manages Performance competency, specifically improvement in their delegation skills (three participants) and increasing staff accountability for poor performance (two participants). Lastly, one action related to the Industry and Commercial Focus competency, specifically improvement in financial skills (three participants). The three competencies of Reputation Management, Initiates Action and Delivers Results, and Champions Electrics' Values held no development actions for the executive team, inferring that all parties taking part in the intervention (executives, staff, and the CEO) believe that they are fulfilling these elements of the new corporate culture.

When discussed as a group in the team away-day, five of the individual actions highlighted above were also adopted as team actions, validating that these were key areas where the executives' behaviour could be more aligned to the new culture. Specifically, the executives sought to collectively improve their influencing skills, visibility to staff, flexibility in approach, consulting across departments, and the amount of active listening they perform.

In sum, the executives invested considerable energy identifying areas for improvement and defining actions for both themselves and their team. The assessment before development approach pinpointed those areas in most need of development, allowing for a more efficient investment of time and organisational resources. As such, it appears that the invention was successful for fulfilling the organisational goal of aligning the executives' behaviour to a distinct corporate culture, as defined by the Electrics' competency model. In the follow-up interview that took place six months after the intervention, five of the seven participants stated that the link between their development plans and the competency model provided a clear picture of how they could see themselves in the new culture.

The follow-up interviews also provide insight about whether the participants believed that their individual expectations were met by the intervention. A key expectation raised in the introductory questionnaire was to gain self-awareness about personal strengths and development needs. From the interview data, it appears that this expectation was fulfilled by the intervention. When asked generally about their reflections of the programme, three executives stated that the tools contributed to their self awareness, which was heightened greatly by the coach who helped them identify trends in the responses. However, the development report drafted by the coach was reported by two of the participants as losing focus and not capturing the key themes from the feedback discussion. As an alternative design, the participant themselves might have been held accountable for drafting their own report and action plan, however this change in design might have had a negative effect on the time requirements of the programme (which was originally raised as a concern by the participants).

In terms of the participants' expectations for greater awareness of their peer's requirements, data from the follow-up interviews indicate that this was fulfilled. Five individuals stated that the intervention led to an understanding of each other's needs, as well as their unique contributions to the executive team. Three of the executives stated that this increased awareness has led to marked improvement in the amount of teamwork experienced, which was another expectation of the programme. The executives stated that the development programme has made the team more cohesive, especially in the image it projects to other staff members. Two participants specifically addressed the value of the away-day for increasing teamwork, with one executive stating, "The team away-day brought it all together and made cultural change tangible."

Another expectation of the intervention was to gain a better understanding of the requirements of the job. Following the programme, all executives held a one-to-one meeting with the CEO to discuss their personal reflections of the programme. During the follow-up interview, five of the participants reported that the programme has led to more open discussions with the CEO and continued feedback about how they are fulfilling role

requirements. However, only two of the executives reported that they have made progress on their action plans after six months. From those who had failed to take action, two participants explained that the actions defined at the feedback session were not tangible enough and required further definition before enactment. This finding breaks the final expectation expressed by the executives in the introductory questionnaire, specifically the identification of clear ways to improve performance.

The failure of the intervention to motivate action might have resulted from a design failure, with focus placed on behavioural competencies rather than on specific work responsibilities (DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Kluger and DeNisi, 1996). Alternatively, the assessment before development approach could have itself been responsible for the loss of momentum between the feedback session and action. A different type of intervention, away from the identification of deficiency, might have fared better in motivating the executives. Motivating the executives directly, such as allowing for the expression of traits through a change in workplace responsibilities or fulfilling motivational needs, were not evaluated prior to the client deciding on an assessment before development approach. Whether or not these alternative interventions would have motivated executives to improve their alignment to the new organisational strategy remains unknown. The lack of opportunity to explore alternatives is thus a major limitation of the present intervention. Although the outcome of the present design is modest, with only two executives making progress on their action plans at the time of the follow-up interview, there is hope that others will be motivated for change. Four of the executives expressed genuine interest in driving their development forward, stating that the follow-up interview itself would spur future activity.

Commentary on the Intervention for Motivating Staff

The intervention presented in this chapter was aimed at motivating staff to improve their alignment to the corporate culture. By increasing self-awareness, a set of actions was identified for the executives (both as individuals and as a team) that had the potential to promote a new and independent way of working. Unlike other studies of motivation where the

employment relationship is in flux (i.e. with new recruits or job leavers), the participants in this intervention were long-term employees of the organisation. Their psychological contracts were well established and healthy, however their performance may not have been optimal for leading the transition underway in their organisation.

From an organisational perspective, the intervention successfully drew attention to the competencies most in need of development. Misalignment was primarily identified with the two competencies of Builds Effective Relationships and Provides Leadership and Strategic Focus (some executives also required development in the competencies of Manages Performance and Industry and Commercial Focus). The intervention was also successful in fulfilling the needs of participants, by heightening their self-awareness, fostering an understanding of their teammates, and improving their focus on key responsibilities. In sum, the intervention appears to have increased awareness for both the participants and the organisation about what types of change need to occur.

However, this awareness did not always result in motivated behaviour. After six months following the intervention, only two participants reported that they had made progress on their action plans, although four others stated that they were committed to change. Two possibilities for this disconnect will be considered below, depending upon whether the approach or implementation was likely responsible. Regarding the approach taken in the intervention, assessment can carry a negative connotation amongst employees (Renn and Fedor, 2001; DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Maurer and Palmer, 1999), especially when participation on the development programme is mandatory (Maurer and Palmer, 1999). When told about the organisation's intention to use 360 Degree Feedback, participants can feel both threatened and exposed by their lack of control. Questions about whether they will be personally attacked or how the information will be used in the future can take attention away from the benefit of more detailed and individualised development plans. Although many executives indicated that they were interested in receiving the feedback, the negativity surrounding assessment may have interfered in motivating change. In addition, the design did not allow for a smooth transition between

assessment and development. The participants were left to action their own development plans following the feedback session with the coach. Although personal accountability is generally encouraged in the 360 Degree Feedback literature, evidence from the follow-up interviews indicates that a single session was not enough to translate the assessment outcomes into action. Additional sessions with the coach may have helped ensure that change occurred, as well as support the CEO in managing the development process. In the present design, the CEO's ability for developing his staff was not addressed and thus could represent another factor that may explain the inaction witnessed amongst the executives.

Instead of the approach being solely responsible for the disconnect between the intervention and motivated change, issues in the implementation may have been at fault. One possibility is the way the intervention was communicated to the participants. The executives may have questioned whether the change was necessary (Smither, London and Reilly, 2005), as their previous work practices had led to a strong company track record. In addition, the 360 feedback itself was largely positive across the participants, which could have reinforced that change was unnecessary (Walker and Smither, 1999; Reilly, Smither and Vasilopoulos, 1996; Smither et al., 1995). Alternatively, behavioural competencies were the subject of the 360 Degree Feedback rather than specific job responsibilities, which may have impeded the translation between self-awareness and tangible actions (DeNisi and Kluger, 2000; Kluger and DeNisi, 1996). With my own engagement in the project occurring after the general approach was decided upon by the client, it is difficult to know whether other characteristics of the executive team may have interfered with the implementation. For example, the decision to focus on capability might not have been unanimous amongst the executives and therefore, could bias how seriously the participants took their feedback.

Any of the above factors regarding the approach or implementation may have contributed to inaction amongst the executives taking part in the development programme. From this intervention, it appears that an assessment before development approach such as that adopted here can successfully raise self-awareness amongst participants, however is not

entirely effective at motivating participants to change. Organisations play only a partial role in the motivation of long-term employees, by providing the support, resources, and opportunities for individuals to learn and develop. Motivation depends on the internal drives of the individual and the context surrounding the change. If the individual is attracted to the opportunity for change and experiences a great deal of fit in what they desire from the organisation, motivated action can be expected. Alternatively, if the change is unwanted and the individual's needs are no longer addressed by the organisation, violation can occur in the psychological contract, resulting in withdrawal, poor performance, and eventual exit from the organisation.

This chapter's intervention makes a contribution to professional practice by providing a technique for renewing the psychological contracts of long-term employees. When change is required due to external pressures, renegotiating the employment relationship may be unavoidable. A development programme, such as that described in the current chapter, demonstrates how accommodation can be established in the psychological contracts of long-term employees. Unlike other development approaches that focus on motivational needs or the expression of traits, the current approach focuses on behaviours that drive transformation, identifying strengths and limitations in employee capability. By raising self-awareness about the participant's fit to a new way of working, changes can be agreed in the employment relationship. However, the approach does have its limitations for motivating behaviour amongst staff. Notably, some participants can react negatively to the intervention if they feel threatened or forced into development. Moreover, the participants must believe that change is important and desirable. As a topic of future research, different types of development interventions could be compared for their effectiveness on motivating behaviour in times of organisational change. Matching the best form of intervention to the specific organisational needs will contribute further to professional practice, as well inform whether the approach taken here was the most effective at establishing a new corporate culture in Electrics.

EPILOGUE

In this dissertation, the topic of motivation was explored across the employee life cycle. As mentioned in the prologue, I chose the topic of motivation to explore other perspectives and approaches not typically experienced in my work as a Human Resources consultant. The perspective adopted by my current employer and many of my clients overemphasise individual ability and leadership potential, at the expense of understanding the staff perceptions of the employment relationship and the influence of the workplace environment on engagement and performance. By concentrating on the topic of motivation, I was able to explore the interaction between employees and their workplace, to identify how the employee relationship can be established on firm footing, managed through change, and restored when obligations go unfilled. The research conducted (inclusive of a literature review, series of quantitative studies, case study, and intervention) contributed to an understanding of employee motivation with implications for practitioners, researchers, and the participating organisations. In this epilogue, a brief summary of the dissertation is provided, which outlines the major findings, contributions, and limitations of each chapter. The dissertation will conclude by addressing how the professional doctorate has contributed to my own professional development, by improving my professional practice and guiding my future career ambitions.

In Chapter 1, a literature review was conducted on the topic of employee motivation, wherein three primary forms of motivators (i.e. needs, traits, and values) were considered alongside ageing and generational cohort effects. Although ageing and generations were recognised as important in the Occupational Psychology literature, the variables were not previously juxtaposed against motivational theories. The analysis conducted provides a theoretical contribution by identifying where research gaps exist on ageing and generations, as well as how change in motivation can occur. However, this analysis is only a first step for summarising ageing and generational effects on motivation, as the quality of the generational literature specific to workplaces is poor and largely based on American subjects. As a result,

literature outside Occupational Psychology should be considered to strengthen the model (e.g. Sociology for generations and Clinical Psychology for ageing), as well as considering cross-cultural differences. With a fuller model in place, conflicts between employees and their workplaces can be better understood to inform what types of interventions should be chosen. For example, if a value-based trend is discovered for an incoming generation rather than as a natural feature of ageing, entire industries may have to adapt their strategies to effectively attract workers. In contrast, the effects of natural ageing on values may be adequately addressed by the organisation without large scale changes in the industry, through an adjustment to the workplace environment, opportunities for aligning values, and assignment of responsibilities for employees of varying ages.

The identification of key motivators for the recruitment and selection of employees was the subject of the quantitative studies presented in Chapter 2. In the research, an approach based upon employee-environment fit was compared against preference-only assessments of motivation and personality. Although studies on similar person-environment fit measures have been conducted in the past, the present research provides a replication with a younger population and direct comparison to established preference-only tools. The research demonstrated that the fit between what is valued by employees and the likelihood of organisational fulfilment is influential for employee engagement and performance. The research contributes to professional practice by providing a new technique for measuring motivation. Moreover, an empirical contribution is made through the documentation of key motivators amongst graduates, as well as a change in preferences that occurs just after hiring. The research was limited however by failing to demonstrate the usefulness of the technique for assessing candidates, due to the selection criteria used by the participating company. Moreover, the technique was discovered as particularly difficult to administer and interpret, which limits its future use as a commercial offering. With these limitations in mind, an approach based upon person-environment fit has the potential to illuminate how the workplace environment can be altered to meet the needs of employees and select candidates into roles where a higher amount of fit is

anticipated. As a topic for future research, different methods for communicating workplace features to applicants should be compared for their effectiveness (for example realistic job previews compared to meetings with the line manager), as well as practices for integrating a full range of assessment data (beyond the motivation measure) to evaluate fit. A second area for future research involves an exploration of demographics that affect fit and practices that can be used to adjust to the needs of vulnerable groups without jeopardising organisational fairness.

The case study presented in Chapter 3 transitioned between identifying key motivators, as done in the literature review and the quantitative research, to the management of motivators through the psychological contract. Violation was evident in the case study's participants due to how elements of the psychological contract were discussed and agreed. Three core principles were identified for the management of the psychological contract, specifically exploring implicit obligations, describing work realistically, and promising only what is possible, contributing to professional practice. As a second contribution for practitioners, the case study highlights the benefit of considering the reciprocal obligations held by both employees and their employers, as previous research concentrated only on the employee's perspective. The recommendations uncovered here are tentative due to a limitation in how the case study was conducted. The participants may not be representative of typical workers due to their employment in a Human Resources consultancy. In addition, the employees' accounts were based upon autobiographical memory after they had resigned their positions, potentially leading to bias. Future studies should measure the psychological contact at multiple points during the employment relationship, recording the incidents that lead to breach as they occur. Moreover, links could be established between the three principles discovered in the case study and managerial practices aimed at engaging staff.

The intervention presented in Chapter 4 explored one technique for renewing the psychological contracts held by long-term employees. The assessment before development approach was found to effectively raise self-awareness amongst participants, as well as provide the support, resources,

and opportunities required for behavioural change. The intervention contributes to professional practice by identifying how a technique based upon self-awareness can renew psychological contracts, however the extent of the change was dependent on the internal drives of participants and the perceived necessity for improvement. Participants' perceptions of threat and their lack of control over the process appears to limit whether change occurs. Other limitations that may have interfered with an accurate evaluation of the intervention include a disconnect between the coach and line manager following the feedback session and an emphasis on behavioural competencies (rather than job requirements) in the 360 Degree Feedback questionnaire. Future research should attempt to resolve these limitations with alternative designs, as well as explore how the self-awareness approach compares to interventions based on the provision of employee needs or the expression of traits for motivating staff.

In the literature review, a summary matrix was developed to capture the effects of age and generational cohort on the three primary types of motivators. The chapters in this dissertation have spoken towards many of the themes captured in Table 1.

	Needs	Traits	Values
Age	Young Workers Career Progression, Work Variety, & Socialisation Older Workers Physical Security, Predictability, & Managerial Support	Decreases with Age - Extroversion - Neuroticism - Openness to Experience	Young Workers Instrumentality of Hard Work (with reward and self-worth linked to achievement) Older Workers High Work Ethic, Pride in Craft, & Intrinsic Value of Work
Generation	Baby Boomer Status & Prestige Generation X Loose Structure & Discretion in Work Organisation Millennial Generation Progression, Self Expression, Variety, & Managerial Support	Baby Boomer Introspected & Self-Absorbed Generation X Pragmatic & Flexible Millennial Generation Confident, Optimistic, Trusting, & Risk Adverse	Baby Boomer Material Success, Self Sufficiency, & Tradition Generation X Logic, Meritocracy, & Distribution of Power Millennial Generation Diversity & Entitlement to Personal Gratification

Table 1: Ageing and generational effects on motivation.

The graduates from Chapter 2 indicated motivational needs that represent both the Millennial Generation and their age. The graduates expressed

preferences for Career Progression, Development, Safety, and Voice which relate to the Millennial Generation's focus on Progression, Self Expression, and Managerial Support. In regards to their age, the graduates expressed preferences for the Quality of Social Contact, which is aligned to Socialisation in the model. For the more experienced employees from Chapter 3, tension in the psychological contract resulted from a miscommunication about discretion in work responsibilities (e.g. strict sales and administrative duties) and a lack of recognition for their personal contributions. These themes are consistent with the needs and values identified in Table 1 for Generation X. The long-standing employees from Chapter 4 likewise displayed characteristics of their age and generational cohort. Through the development programme, the executives recognised that change was needed in how they related to others and their advocacy for organisational change. The actions identified in their development plans counteract the Baby Boomer traits of Introspection and Self-Absorption, as well as the generation's inherent valuing of tradition. Moreover, the large-scale organisational change challenged their age related needs of Physical Security and Predictability, as well as their preferences against Openness to Experience.

Together, the participants from this dissertation's research reflect many of the age and generational themes identified by the Occupational Psychology literature, providing a snapshot into how motivation changes across an employee's career. As a member of Generation X and being in my mid-30s, I see many of my own motivators represented in Table 1 (especially around Discretion in Work, Flexibility, Meritocracy, and Socialisation) and have reflected upon this model to further drive my personal development throughout the professional doctorate. Not only have I gained a host of new techniques (e.g. person-environment fit for assessment, psychological contract for renewing employment relationships, and 360 degree feedback for self-awareness before change), but I have been able to assess whether my key motivators are being addressed by my current employer and the status of my psychological contract. Specifically, I have taken the opportunity to reflect on whether I should continue my career as a consultant or return to an internal role in Human Resources. What I discovered through the

professional doctorate is that I enjoy working for employers who provide a great deal of autonomy, voice, and influence in the work that I do. Moreover, I enjoy tasks that provide variety in the responsibilities assigned and the ability to innovate products, services, or internal processes. From a traits perspective, I feel frustrated by roles where I am unable to be express my extroversion, as characterised by both my activity level and the number of individuals I interact with. I am equally driven by my personal values, whereby I must feel that my employer's practices are ethical and contribute to the well-being of its employees.

With these motivators in mind, I have evaluated my own person-environment fit across the levels of vocation, organisation, group, supervisor and job. The strengths of the relationship lie in my alignment to the vocation of Occupational Psychology and my immediate peer group, whereas my degree of fit has weakened across the levels of job, supervisor, and organisation. Over the past two years, I have experienced a great deal of change, including a new line manager, emphasis on metric based management, transfer in employment from Dublin to London, and increased responsibilities for sales, as opposed to delivery of consultancy services. These changes have challenged the psychological contract I hold with my employer, in many ways violating its central components. Although several of the needs and traits I value most are currently fulfilled, the changes in my employment relationship have caused an incongruence of values. I no longer believe that I am aligned to the way the organisation consults its clients or treats its employees. This violation has resulted in a shift away from a relational psychological contract to one that is transactional.

Through the professional doctorate, I have determined that the conflict I currently feel is not due to my vocation, but instead caused by my immediate workplace environment and the psychological contract I hold with my employer. I have thus decided to seek out a change of employment. I have also determined that consultancy and internal Human Resources roles are more similar than initially thought. Both roles have the potential to fulfil my key motivators and to create alignment over the different levels of person-environment fit. I have learned that I have the responsibility for exploring my

fit with potential employers and to discuss my expectations openly, as a means of establishing a strong psychological contract. Where choice of employers is available, I should resist the temptation offered by greater pay or status and instead focus on the motivators that I value the most. Through the personal learning gained by pursuing the professional doctorate, I find that my self-awareness has improved and that I am now empowered to find a role that will lead to long-term personal well-being. From a personal standpoint, this is the strongest contribution of the dissertation.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, P. and Beier, M. (2003). Intelligence, personality and interests in the career choice process. Journal of Career Assessment, 11, 205 – 218.

Adkins, C., Russell, C., and Werbel, J. (1994). Judgements of fit in the selection process: The role of work value congruence. Personnel Psychology, 47, 605-623.

Alliger, G. and Janak, E. (1994). Kirkpatrick's levels of training criteria: Thirty years later (p. 219-227). In C. Schneier, C. Russell, R. Beatty and L. Baird (eds.) The Training and Development Sourcebook. HRD Press.

Arnold, J. (1996). The psychological contract: A concept in need of closer scrutiny. European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 5, 511-520.

Ashford, S. and Tsui, A. (1991). Self-regulation for managerial effectiveness: The role of active feedback seeking. Academy of Management Journal, 34, 251 – 280.

Bailey, C. and Fletcher, C. (2002). The impact of multi-source feedback on management development: Findings from a longitudinal study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23, 853 – 867.

Barrick, M., Piatrowski, M., and Stewart, G. (2002). Personality and job performance: Test of the mediating effects among sales representatives. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 43 – 51.

Bates, R. (2004). A critical analysis of evaluative practice: The Kirkpatrick model and the principle of beneficence. Evaluation and Planning, 27, 341 – 347.

Becker, T., Billings, R., Eveleth, D., and Gilbert, N. (1996). Foci and bases of employee commitment: Implications for job performance. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 464 – 482.

Billsberry, J., Ambrosino, V., Moss-Jones, J., and Marsh, P. (2005). Some suggestions for mapping organizational members' sense of fit. Journal of Business and Psychology, 19, 555-570.

Boxx, W., Odom, R., and Dunn, M. (1991). Organizational values and value congruency and their impact on satisfaction, commitment, and cohesion: An empirical examination within the public sector. Public Personnel Management, 20, 195-205.

BPS Publication (2005). Division of Occupational Psychology Guidelines.

Bracken, D. (1994). Straight talk about multi-rater feedback. Training and Development, Sept, 44 – 51.

Cable, D. and DeRue, D. (2002). The convergent and discriminant validity of subjective fit perceptions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 875-884.

Cable, D. and Edwards, J. (2004). Complementary and supplementary fit: A theoretical and empirical integration. Journal of Applied Psychology, 89, 822-834.

Cable, D. and Yu, K. (2007). How selection and recruitment practices develop the beliefs used to assess fit (p. 155-181). In C. Ostroff and T. Judge (eds.) Perspectives on Organizational Fit. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Carver, C. and Scheier, M. (1982). Control theory: A useful conceptual framework for personality-social, clinical, and health psychology. Psychological Bulletin, 92, 111 – 135.

Chatman, J (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. Academy of Management Review, 14, 333-349.

Cherrington, D., Condie, S., and England, J. (1979). Age and work values. Academy of Management Journal, 22, 617 – 623.

Chuang, A. and Sackett, P. (2005). The perceived importance of person-job fit and person-organization fit between and within interview stages. Social Behavior and Personality, 33, 209-226.

Conroy, D. and Elliot, A. (2004). Fear of failure and achievement goals in sport: Addressing the issue of the chicken and the egg. Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 17, 271 – 285.

Cortina, J. (1993). What is coefficient Alpha? An examination of theory and applications. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 98-104.

Costello, A. and Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 10, 1 – 9.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. and Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: A large scale study. Journal of Management Studies, 37, 903-930.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. and Neuman, J. (2004). The psychological contract and individual differences: The role of exchange and creditor ideologies. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64, 150–164.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1975). Beyond boredom and anxiety. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

De Jonge, J. and Schaufeli, W. (1998). Job characteristics and employee well-being: A test of Warr's Vitamin Model in health care workers using structural equation modelling. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 19, 387 – 407.

Deci, E. (1992). Motivation research in industry / organizational Psychology (p. 167-175). In V. Vroom and E. Deci (eds.) Management and Motivation (2nd Edition). London: Penguin.

Deci, E., Connell, J. and Ryan, R. (1989). Self-determination in a work organization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 74, 580 – 590.

Deci, E., Koestner, R., and Ryan, R. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. Psychological Bulletin, 125, 627 – 668.

Deci, E. and Ryan, R. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. Psychological Inquiry, 11, 227 – 268.

DeNisi, A. and Kluger, A. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360 appraisals be improved? Academy of Management Executive, 14, 129 – 139.

Dineen, B., Vandewalle, D., and Noe, R. (2005). Job seeker goal orientation and the relative weighing of P-O and demands-abilities fit perceptions in making applicant decisions. SIOP Annual Conference.

Doidge, N. (2008). The brain that changes itself. London: Penguin.

Drucker, P. (1973). Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices. New York, NY: Harper and Row.

Eby, L., Freeman, D., Rush, M., and Lance, C. (1999). Motivational bases of affective organizational commitment: A partial test of an integrative theoretical model. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72, 463 – 483.

Edwards, J. (2001). Ten difference score myths. Organizational Research Methods, 4, 265-287.

Edwards, J. (1996). An examination of competing versions of the person-environment fit approach to stress. Academy of Management Journal, 39, 292-339.

Edwards, J. (1993). Problems with the use of profile similarity indices in the study of congruence in organizational research. Personnel Psychology, 46, 641-665.

Edwards, J. and Cooper, C. (1990). The person-environment fit approach to stress and recurring problems and some suggested solutions. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 3, 293-307.

Edwards, J. and Shipp, A. (2007). The relationship between person-environment fit and outcomes: An integrative theoretical framework (p. 209-258). In C. Ostroff and T. Judge (eds.) Perspectives on Organizational Fit. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

EirGrid Company Publication (2008). Company Profile.

Fedor, D., Rensvold, R., and Adams, S. (1992). An investigation of factors expected to affect feedback seeking: A longitudinal field study. Personnel Psychology, 45, 779 – 805.

Finegan, J. (2000). The impact of person and organizational values on organizational commitment. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73, 149-169.

Foxon, M. (1989). Evaluation of training and development programs: A review of the literature. Australian Journal of Educational Technology, 5, 89 – 104.

Gagne, M. and Deci, E. (2005). Self-determination Theory and work motivation. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26, 331 – 362.

Garavan, T., Marley, M., and Flynn, M. (1997). 360 degree feedback: Its role in employee development. Journal of Management Development, 16, 134 – 147.

Goldberg, E. (2005). The Wisdom Paradox. London: Free Press.

Grant, A. (1997). Relational job design and the motivation to make a pro-social difference. Academy of Management Review, 32, 393 – 417.

Harrison, D. (2007). Pitching fits in applied psychological research: Making fit methods fit theory (p. 389-416). In C. Ostroff and T. Judge (eds.) Perspectives on Organizational Fit. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Harter, J., Schmidt, F., and Hayes, T. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 208 – 279.

Hendry, C. and Jenkins, R. (1996). Psychological contracts and new deals. Human Resource Management, 7, 38-44.

Herriot, P., Manning, W., and Kidd, J. (1997). The content of the psychological contract. British Journal of Management, 8, 151-162.

Herriot, P. and Pemberton, C. (1996). Facilitating new deals. Human Resource Management Journal, 7, 45-56.

Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? Harvard Business Review, Jan – Feb, 53 – 62.

Hoffman, B. and Woehr, D. (2005). A quantitative review of the relationship between person-organization fit and behavioral outcomes. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 68, 389-399.

Howe, N. and Strauss, W. (2008). The next 20 years: How customer and workforce attitudes will evolve. Harvard Business Review, July – Aug, 41 – 52.

Inceoglu, I., Warr, P., and Bartram, D. (2007). Personality and dispositional motivation at work. Presented at the 8th European Congress of Work and Organizational Psychology, 9 – 12 May 2007, Stockholm.

Janssens, M., Sels, L., and Van den Brande, I. (2003). Multiple types of psychological contracts: A six-cluster solution. Human Relations, 56, 1349-1378.

Jeurissen, T. and Nyklicek, I. (2001). Testing the Vitamin Model of job stress in Dutch health care workers. Work and Stress, 15, 254 – 264.

Judge, T. (2007). The future of person-organization fit research: Comments, observation and a few suggestions (p. 419-445). In C. Ostroff and T. Judge (eds.) Perspectives on Organizational Fit. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Judge, T. and Cable, D. (1997). Applicant personality, organizational culture, and organizational attraction. Personnel Psychology, 50, 359-394.

Judge, T., Thoresen, C., Bono, J., and Patton, G. (2001). The job satisfaction – job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. Psychological Bulletin, 127, 376 – 407.

Kahn, W. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. Academy of Management Journal, 33, 692-724.

Kammeyer-Mueller, J. (2007). The dynamics of newcomer adjustments: Dispositions, context, interaction and fit (p. 99-122). In C. Ostroff and T. Judge (eds.) Perspectives on Organizational Fit. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kanfer, R. (1994). Work motivation: New directions in theory and research (p. 1 – 53). In C. Cooper and I. Robertson (eds.) Key Reviews in Managerial Psychology. Chichester, England: John Wiley.

Kanfer, R. and Ackerman, P. (2004). Aging, adult development, and work motivation. Academy of Management Review, 29, 440 – 458.

Kasser, T. and Ryan, R. (1993). A dark side of the American dream: Correlates of financial success as a central life aspiration. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 410 – 422.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R. (1978). The Social Psychology of Organizations. New York: Wiley.

Kehr, H. (2004). Integrating implicit motives, explicit motives, and perceived ability: The compensatory model of work motivation and volition. Academy of Management Review, 29, 1 – 21.

Kennedy, M. and Huff, J. (2005). An empirical investigation of subjective person-environment fit perceptions. SIOP Annual Conference.

Kirkpatrick, D. (1994). Evaluating Training Programs: The Four Levels. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Klehe, U. and Anderson, N. (2007). Working hard and working smart: Motivation and ability during typical and maximum performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, 978 – 992.

Kluger, A. and DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, a meta-analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. Psychological Bulletin, 119, 254 – 284.

Korman, A. (1976). Hypothesis of work behaviour revisited and an extension. Academy of Management Review, Jan, 50 – 63.

Korman, A. (1970). Toward an hypothesis of work behaviour. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 31 – 41.

Kristof, A. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. Personnel Psychology, 49, 1-49.

Kristof-Brown, A. (2000). Perceived applicant fit: Distinguishing between recruiters' perceptions of person-job and person-organization fit. Personnel Psychology, 53, 643-671.

Kristof-Brown, A., Jansen, K., and Colbert, A. (2002). A policy-capturing study of the simultaneous effects of fit with jobs, groups, and organizations. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87, 985-993.

Kristof-Brown, A., Zimmerman, R., and Johnson, E. (2005). Consequences of individuals' fit at work: A meta-analysis of person-job, person-organization, person-group, and person-supervisor fit. Personnel Psychology, 58, 281-342.

Latham, G. (2007). Work Motivation. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Latham, G. and Locke, E. (1979). Goal setting: A motivational technique that works. Organizational Dynamics, 8, 68 – 80.

Latham, G. and Pinder, C. (2005). Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. Annual Review of Psychology, 56, 485 – 516.

Lawler, E. and Hall, D. (1970). Relationship of job characteristics to job involvement, satisfaction and intrinsic motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 305 – 312.

Lee, T. and Mowday, R. (1987). Voluntary leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steers and Mowday's model of turnover. Academy of Management Journal, 30, 721-743.

Li-Ping Tang, T. and Yann Tzeng, J. (1991). Demographic correlates of the Protestant work ethic. The Journal of Psychology, 126, 163 – 170.

Locke, E., Cartledge, N., and Koeppel, J. (1968). Motivational effects of knowledge of results: A goal-setting phenomenon. Psychological Bulletin, 70, 474 – 485.

London, M. and Smither, J. (1995). Can multi-source feedback change perceptions of goal accomplishment, self-evaluations, and performance-related outcomes? Theory-based applications and directions for research. Personnel Psychology, 48, 803-839.

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

Maurer, T. and Palmer, J. (1999). Managing development intentions following feedback. The Journal of Management Development, 18, 733 – 751.

McCulloch, M. and Turban, D. (2007). Using person-organization fit to select employees for high-turnover jobs. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 15, 63-71.

McFarlane Shore, L. and Tetrick, L. (1994). The psychological contract as an explanatory framework in the employment relationship (p. 91–109). In C. Cooper and D. Rousseau (eds.) Trends in Organizational Behaviour. New York, NY: Wiley.

McGregor, D. (1957). The human side of enterprise in adventures in thought and action. Proceedings of the Fifth Anniversary Convocation of the School of Industrial Management, MIT.

Meyer, J. and Allen, N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. Human Resource Management Review, 1, 61-89.

Meyer, J., Allen, N., and Smith, C. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 538-551.

Millward, L. and Brewerton, P. (2000). Psychological contracts: Employee relations for the twenty-first century (p. 1-53)? In C. Cooper and I. Robertson (eds.) International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. New York, NY: Wiley.

Millward, L. and Brewerton, P. (1999). Contractors and their psychological contracts. British Journal of Management, 10, 253–274.

Millward, L. and Hopkins, L. (1998). Psychological contracts, organizational and job commitment. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28, 1530-1556.

Millward-Purvis, L. and Cropley, M. (2003). Psychological contracting: Processes of contract formation during interviews between nannies and their 'employers.' Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 76, 213-241.

NAS Insights (2006). Generation Y: The Millennials.

Nelson, T. (1993). The hierarchical organizational of behaviour: A useful feedback model of self-regulation. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 2, 121 – 126.

Neuberg, S. and Newsom, J. (1993). Personal need for structure: Individual differences in the desire for simple structure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 65, 113 – 131.

Nix, G., Ryan, R., Manly, J., and Deci, E. (1999). Revitalization through self-regulation: The effects of autonomous and controlled motivation on happiness and vitality. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 35, 266 – 284.

O'Reilly, C. and Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effects of compliance, identification, and internalization on pro-social behaviour. Journal of Applied Psychology, 71, 492-499.

Organ, D. and Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organisational citizenship behaviour. Personnel Psychology, 48, 775-802.

Ostroff, C., Caldwell, D., Chatman, J., O'Reilly, C., Edwards, J., Harrison, D., Sin, H., Mumford, M., and Espejo, J. (2007). Methodological and analytical techniques in fit research (p. 351-387). In C. Ostroff and T. Judge (eds.) Perspectives on Organizational Fit. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ostroff, C. and Schalte, M. (2007). Multiple perspectives of fit in organizations across levels of analysis (p. 1–69). In C. Ostroff and T. Judge (eds.) Perspectives on Organizational Fit. New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Piasentin, K. and Chapman, D. (2007). Perceived similarity and complementarity as predictors of subjective person-organization fit. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80, 341-354.

Pinder, C. (1998). Work Motivation in Organizational Behaviour. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Pinder, C. (1984). Work Motivation. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Posner, B. (1992). Person-organization values congruence: No support for individual differences as a moderating influence. Human Relations, 45, 351-361.

Raj, U., Johns, G., and Ntalianis, F. (2004). The impact of personality on psychological contracts. Academy of Management Journal, 47, 350-367.

Reilly, R., Smither, J., and Vasilopoulos, N. (1996). A longitudinal study of upward feedback, Personnel Psychology, 49, 599 – 612.

Renn, R. and Fedor, D. (2001). Development and field tests of a feedback seeking, self-efficacy, and goal setting model of work performance. Journal of Management, 27, 563 – 583.

Rhodes, S. (1983). Age-related differences in work attitudes and behaviour: A review and conceptual analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 93, 328 – 367.

Rich, B. and LePine, J. (2007). Job engagement: Construct validation and relationships with job satisfaction, job involvement, and intrinsic motivation. Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, New York.

Roberson, L., Deitch, E., Brief, A., and Block, C. (2003). Stereotype threat and feedback seeking in the workplace. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 62, 176 – 188.

Romaswami, A. (2007). Going beyond current conceptualizations of P-E fit and presenting a status report on the literature. Academy of Management Annual Conference.

Rousseau, D. (2004). Psychological contracts in the workplace: Understanding the ties that motivate. Academy of Management Executive, 18, 120-127.

Rousseau, D. (2001). Schema, promise and mutuality: The building blocks of the psychological contract. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 74, 511-541.

Rousseau, D. (1995). Psychological Contracts in Organizations. London: Sage.

Ryan, R. and Deci, E. (2000). Self-determination Theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. American Psychologist, 55, 68 – 78.

Rynes S. and Gerhart, B. (1990). Interviewer assessments of applicant 'fit': An exploratory investigation. Personnel Psychology, 43, 13-35.

Salancik, G. and Pfeffer, J. (1977). An examination of need-satisfaction models of job attitudes. Administrative Science Quarterly, 22, 427 – 456.

Scarpello, V. and Campbell, J. (1983). Job satisfaction and the fit between individual needs and organizational rewards. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 56, 315 – 328.

Schaufeli, W., Bakker, A., and Salanova, M. (2006). The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire: A cross-national study. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 20, 1-16.

Schein, E. (1980). Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. Personnel Psychology, 40, 47-453.

Schneider, B., Goldstein, H., and Smith, D. (1995). The ASA framework: An update. Personnel Psychology, 48, 747-773.

Schneider, B., Smith, D., Taylor, S., and Fleenor, J. (1998). Personality and organizations: A test of the homogeneity of personality hypothesis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 83, 462-470.

Seifert, C., Yukl, G., and McDonald, R. (2003). Effects of multi-source feedback and a feedback facilitator on the influence behaviour of managers toward subordinates. Journal of Applied Psychology, 88, 561 – 569.

Shapira, Z. (1976). Expectancy determinants of intrinsically motivated behaviour. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34, 235 – 244.

Shaw, J. and Gupta, N. (2004). Job complexity, performance, and well-being: When does supplies-values fit matter? Personnel Psychology, 57, 847-879.

SHL (2008). Busy Bee Technical Specification.

SHL (2007). Age Differences in Work Motivation.

SHL (2006). 360 Facilitation Course Notes.

SHL (2005). Motivation Questionnaire Assessors Guide.

SHL (2005). Occupational Personality Questionnaire Assessors Guide.

SHL Company Publication (2007). Company Profile.

Skinner, B. (1974). About Behaviorism. New York: Knopf.

Slocombe, T. and Bluedorn, A. (1999). Organizational behaviour implications of the congruence between preferred polychronicity and experienced work-unit polychronicity. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 20, 75-99.

Smither, J., London, M., and Reilly, R. (2005). Does performance improve following multisource feedback? A theoretical model, meta-analysis and review of empirical findings. Personnel Psychology, 58, 33 – 66.

Smither, J., London, M., Vasilopoulos, N., Reilly, R., Millsap, R., and Salvemini, N. (1995). An examination of the effects of an upward feedback program over time. Personnel Psychology, 48, 1 – 34.

Smola, K. and Sutton, C. (2002). Generational differences: Revisiting generational work values for the new millennium. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 23, 363, 382.

Steel, P. and Konig, C. (2006). Integrating theories of motivation. Academy of Management Review, 31, 889 – 913.

Sutton, G. and Griffin, M. (2004). Integrating expectations, experiences, and psychological contract violations: A longitudinal study of new professionals. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 77, 493–514.

Taris, R. and Feij, J. (2001). Longitudinal examination of the relationship between supplies-values fit and work outcomes. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 50, 52-80.

Tosi, H. and Carroll, S. (1970). Management by objectives. Personnel Administration, 33, 44 – 48.

Tuckey, M., Brewer, N., and Williamson, P. (2002). The influence of motives and goal orientation on feedback seeking. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 75, 195 – 216.

Twenge, J. (2006). Generation Me. New York: Free Press.

Van Dyne, L., Graham, J., and R. Dienesch, R. (1994). Organizational citizenship behaviour: Construct redefinition, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 37, 765-802.

Van Eerde, W. and Thierry, H. (1996). Vroom's expectancy models and work-related criteria: A meta-analysis. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 575 – 586.

Van Scotter, J. and Motowidlo, S. (1996). Interpersonal facilitation and job dedication as separate facets of contextual performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81, 525-531.

Van Vianen, A. (2005). A review of person-environment fit research: Prospects for personnel selection (p. 419-439). In A. Evers, N. Anderson, and O. Voskuijl (eds.) Person-Environment Fit. Oxford: Blackwell.

Van Vianen, A. (2000). Person-organization fit: The match between new comers' and recruiters' preferences for organizational cultures. Personnel Psychology, 53, 113-149.

Vancouver, J. and Schmitt, N. (1991). An exploratory examination of person-organization ft: Organizational goal congruence. Personnel Psychology, 44, 333-352.

Vansteenkiste, M. and Deci, E. (2003). Competitively contingent rewards and intrinsic motivation: Can losers remain motivated? Motivation and Emotion, 27, 273 – 299.

Vroom, V. (1992). Management theories and their motivational bases (p. 341-353). In V. Vroom and E. Deci (eds.) Management and Motivation (2nd Edition). London: Penguin.

Walker, A. and Smither, J. (1999). A five-year study of upward feedback: What managers do with their results matters. Personnel Psychology, 52, 393 – 423.

Warr, P. (2007). Work, Happiness, and Unhappiness. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Warr, P. (1999). Logical and judgemental moderators of the criterion-related validity of personality scales. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 72, 187-204.

Warr, P. (1986). A vitamin model of jobs and mental health (p. 157 –164). In G. Debus and H. Schroiffs (eds.) The Psychology of Work and Organization. North Holland: Elsevier Science Publishers B.V.

Warr, P., Butcher, V., Robertson, I., and Callinan, M. (2004). Older people's well-being as a function of employment, retirement, environmental characteristics, and role preference. British Journal of Psychology, 95, 297 – 324.

Warr, P. and Pearce, A. (2004). Preferences for careers and organisational cultures as a function of logically related personality traits. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 53, 423-435.

Wegge, J., Schmidt, K., Parkes, C., and Van Dick, R. (2007). Taking a sickie: Job satisfaction and job involvement as interactive predictors of absenteeism in a public organization. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80, 77 – 89.

Wentworth, D. and Chell, R. (1997). American college students and the Protestant work ethic. The Journal of Social Psychology, 137, 284 – 296.

Werbel, J., Landau, J., and DeCarlo, T. (2001). The relationship of pre-entry variables to early employment organizational commitment. Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 16, 25-36.

Westerman, J. and Cyr, L. (2004). An integrative analysis of person-organization fit theories. International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 12, 252-261.

Wheeler, A., Brouer, R., and Sablynski, C. (2007). Outcomes of multidimensional misfit: An empirical test of a theoretical model. Academy of Management Annual Conference.

Wheeler, A., Buckley, R., Halbesleben, J., Brouer, R., and Ferris, G. (2005). The elusive criterion of fit revisited: Toward an integrative theory of multidimensional fit. Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management, 24, 265-304.

White, R. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. Psychological Review, 66, 297 – 333.

Williams, R. (2004). Analytic strategies: Simultaneous, hierarchical, and stepwise regression. University of Notre Dame Sociology Department Online Resources, 1 - 18.

Williams, J., Miller, C., Steelman, L., and Levy, P. (1999). Increasing feedback seeking in public contexts: It takes two (or more) to tango. Journal of Applied Psychology, 84, 969 – 976.

Wittman, W. (2002). Work motivation and level of performance: A disappointing relationship? Presented at the 21st International Congress of Applied Psychology, 6 – 12 July 2002, Singapore.

Wolseley Plc Company Publication (2006). Company Profile.

Wolseley UK Company Publication (2006). Company Profile.

Wolseley UK Company Publication (2005). Name to Build On.

Yang, M., Inceoglu, I, and Silvester, J. (2010). Exploring ways of measuring person-job fit to predict engagement. Presented at the BPS Division of Occupational Psychology Annual Conference, 13 - 15 January 2010, Brighton, UK.

Zhao, H., Wayne, S., Glibkowski, B., and Bravo, J. (2007). The impact of psychological contract breach on work-related outcomes: A meta-analysis. Personnel Psychology, 60, 647-680.