

'PLACE TO WORK' INDEX: A STUDY OF WORKPLACE ATTRIBUTES

A Thesis presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Masters of Science

by
AMANDA L. ANDRADE

Ronald Phillips, Thesis Supervisor

MAY 2012

© Copyright by Amanda L. Andrade 2012

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the Dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

'PLACE TO WORK' INDEX:
A STUDY OF WORKPLACE ATTRIBUTES

Presented by Amanda L. Andrade

A candidate for the degree of Master of Science

And hereby certify that in their opinion it is worthy of acceptance.

Ronald Phillips, ArchD

Michael Goldschmidt, MArch

Deanna L. Sharpe, PhD

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Phillips for his patience and guidance as I have worked through the research process. He provided many hours of consultation, instruction, and education with regard to the academic method and the work of environment-behavior professionals. Through his academic and experiential lens, and the instructional materials the coursework provided, I was able to see first-hand the impact of EB studies in all aspects of the human experience.

I would also like to extend my sincere gratitude to Dr. Sharpe and Michael Goldschmidt for their willingness to be on my Committee and to provide support and review of this thesis work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	iv
Chapter	
1. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	1
2. METHODS.....	30
3. ANALYSIS.....	39
4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....	94
5. BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	109
6. APPENDIX.....	113
1. Letter of Informed Consent	
2. Introduction	
3. Workplace Attributes Survey	

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. 'Survey of Organizational Excellence' Dimension and Construct Items.....	33
2. 'Seven Habits Benchmark' Dimension and Construct Items.....	34
3. Sample Mean Ordered Responses for 'Place to Work' Survey Items.....	42
4. Banking/Finance/Insurance/Real Estate Industry 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	44
5. Charity 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	46
6. Construction Industry 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	48
7. Government/Military Services 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	50
8. Education 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	52
9. Manufacturing 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	54
10. Necessities 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	56
11. Pharmaceutical/Medical/Healthcare 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	58
12. Retail/Sales/Wholesaler/Distributor 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	60
13. Technology 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	62
14. Single-State Operations 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	64

15. Multi-State Operations ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	66
16. National Operations ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	68
17. International Operations ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	70
18. For Profit ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	72
19. Not For Profit ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	74
20. State or Federal Government Agency ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	76
21. ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items and Factor Loadings.....	78
22. ‘Place to Work’ Factor Groupings.....	80
23. Highest Mean Factor Groupings by Type of Industry.....	82
24. Highest Mean Factor Groupings by Type of Company/Organization.....	84
25. Highest Mean Factor Groupings by Operating Territory.....	86
26. Factor One ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	87
27. Factor Two ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	88
28. Factor Three ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	89
29. Factor Four ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	89
30. Factor Five ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score.....	90

31. 'Place to Work' Dimensions and Constructs (SIRCA).....	90
32. Highest Overall Mean for Dimensions by Company Demographic Characteristics.....	92
33. Lowest Overall Mean for Dimensions by Company Demographic Characteristics.....	92

Chapter One

LITERATURE REVIEW

The review of literature in this chapter is intended to provide a historical overview of some of the major building blocks and evolution of the following social sciences:

- (a) Organizational Behavior
- (b) Organizational Development
- (c) Environment and Behavior

“An Organization is not like an animal, an end in itself, and successful by the mere act of perpetuating the species. An organization is an organ of society and fulfills itself by the contribution it makes to the outside environment.”

(Peter Drucker (1909-2005), *The Effective Executive*, 1967)

Historical Background

The work of Peter Drucker, commonly referred to as the “Father of Modern Management” (Wartzman, 2011) has had a significantly influential footprint on the work of organizational management, human motivation, and behavior. As a researcher, professor, management consultant, and self proclaimed “social-ecologist”, his writings contain instruction about how workers can find a sense of community and dignity in a society that is organized around modern (work related) institutions, and how if managed in a dignified and humane way, organizations can bring out the best in people (Wartzman, 2011). Drucker wrote that Management at its core, “Deals with people, their values, their growth and

development, and this makes it a humanity. So does its concern with, and impact on, social structure and the community. Indeed, as everyone has learned who....has been working with managers of all kinds of institutions for long years, management is deeply involved in moral concerns-the nature of man, good, and evil” (Wartzman, p4, 2012). His work paved the way for societal recognition that, “Managing oneself is a revolution in human affairs. The shift from manual workers who do as they are being told, either by the task or by the Boss – to knowledge workers who have to manage themselves profoundly, challenges the social structure”(Drucker Institute, 2011) The Drucker perspective further generated the growth of interdisciplinary workplace research which has become a vital part of the knowledge and direction on which modern businesses rely.

The success of any organization is in large part accomplished through the ability of resources to come together for a common cause and to be motivated to continue progressing in a unified direction. Because business success and commerce is at the core of all thriving societies, it is a much discussed and researched global topic. From the products that people buy, the psychology and motivation of the worker, the qualities of successful leaders, the space and pace of the business, and organizational dynamics, scholars and business alike seek to understand the sustaining ingredients of successful ventures. In particular, the study of Organizational Behavior (OB), Organization Development (OD), and Environment and Behavior (EB) have become critical to the evolution of the understanding of business, work, and the worker.

Andrew Ore (1835) planted some of the first OB, OD, and EB seeds through his effort to incorporate and write about the human factor within the work environment. In his book, *The Philosophy of Manufactures*, he wrote about the commonly accepted mechanical and commercial parts of manufacturing, but he also thrust the initial concept of social science forward by incorporating a third component, human behavior. Initially, Ore's contemporaries did not embrace the concept, but eventually the human component began to develop into the strands of what would become modern organizational studies.

Organizational Behavior

Organizational Behavior (OB) is defined as, "The actions and attitudes of individuals and groups toward one another and toward the organization as a whole, and its effect on the organization's functioning and performance" (BusinessDictionary.com, 2011). From an academic perspective, it has been defined as, "The study of individuals and their behavior within the context of the organization in a workplace setting. It is an interdisciplinary field that includes sociology, psychology, communication, and management" (Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations, 2011). Both definitions point to the intertwining relationships of people and behavior in the work environment. The objective of OB is to research and apply information about how individuals and groups behave in organizations. We understand that the modern workplace is in constant flux. It is evolving and changing depending on a host of variables within the organization (e.g. technology, products, people) and in the external environment (e.g. legislation, economics, consumer demographics). The goal of

Organizational Behavior research is to help explain, predict, and shape aspects of the organizational environment. The foundation of OB is based on the vision, values, mission, and philosophy of the organization's leaders. This foundation manifests itself as the culture within the organization. Within business, the manifestation of OB can be both *formal* (i.e. policies, procedures) and *informal* (i.e. social environment, decision making). It drives environmental components, also referred to as "norms", like the selection of leaders, the preferred style of communication and engagement, and the dynamics of working groups to name a few. These workplace norms directly impact the individual employee's perceived work life quality and their corresponding level of motivation and desire (Covey, 2006). It is amount, or level of, motivational experiences that the individual engages in that propels their personal level of performance, job satisfaction, and development. Deriving itself from the experience of many individuals there is a collective norm that forms and in turn either destabilizes or reinforces the overall organizational foundation. This is the process by which the organization continues to evolve and operate.

Douglas McGregor (1957) developed Theory X and Theory Y to explain two opposing approaches to viewing human behavior within the workplace and organizations. He theorized that organizations and their corresponding managers followed one of the two approaches. Theory X contends that management's role is to coerce and control employees because individuals 1) have an inherent dislike for work and will avoid it if at all possible, 2) must be coerced, controlled, directed, or threatened with punishment in order to get them to follow business

objectives, 3) prefer to be directed, have little or no ambition, and withdraw from personal responsibility, 4) seek security above all else. Theory Y contends that management's role is to lead, motivate, and inspire. Under this theory individuals 1) view work as an integral part of being human, just like play and rest, 2) have potential, 3) exercise self-direction if they are committed to the objectives, 4) seek responsibility and learn to accept change and flux, 5) are capable of using creativity, ingenuity, and imagination to solve organizational problems and dilemmas, and 6) experience a strong sense of personal reward when they achieve. It is in part from McGregor's Theories that four primary models of Organizational Behavior evolved.

Within the OB discipline there are four commonly recognized models (Autocratic, Custodial, Supportive, and Collegial) that encompass the behavior tendencies of an organization. These models are not individually exclusive within the work setting, but rather, organizations predominantly align with one model as primary with secondary traits stemming from the remaining models. A brief description of the characteristics of the four models is described as follows (Heill, Bennis & Stephens, 2000).

Autocratic Model - Authority is positioned exclusively with management. Employees act out of obedience and dependence. Performance results are baseline minimal and the employee is rewarded through continued subsistence. This model stemmed from the industrial revolution and is associated with Theory X.

Custodial Model - Authority is positioned with management. Primary management motivation is money. Employees are oriented toward financial

security and benefits. Performance results are baseline passive cooperation and the employee is rewarded through security. This model is associated with Theory Y.

Supportive Model – Authority is positioned with management, but it is oriented toward supportive leadership. Employees act in a participatory manner and are motivated to perform. Performance results are met through individual motivation and the employee is rewarded through recognition and appreciation. This model is associated with Theory Y.

Collegial Model – Authority is positioned as a partnership and is oriented toward teamwork. Employees act in a manner that is based on personal responsibility, self-motivation, and self-discipline. Performance results are met through relationship interdependence and enthusiasm. The employee is rewarded through self-actualization. This model is also associated with Theory Y and is thought to be the model with the most evolutionary potential as business and societal expectations continue to change.

In complement to McGregor's Theory Y, but in sharp contrast to other psychological research of his time, Abraham Maslow's theoretical work on human needs focused on the idea that when needs were met people were inherently driven toward creativity and would enlist all of their talents and capabilities to meet their full potential (Bootzin, Loftus, Zajonc & Hill, 1983). He developed a Hierarchy of Needs wherein the drivers of human behavior were categorized into two areas: basic human needs and higher order needs (called meta-needs). Basic needs encompass the physiological and psychological dimensions of the human experience, meaning the physical survival items such as food, water, sleep, and

sex, and emotional survival items like security, self-esteem, and affection. These physical and emotional items make up the level of basic needs. Maslow (1970) referred to meta-needs as a human's growth needs that included more esoteric items like beauty, order, unity, goodness, and a state of wellbeing.

According to the Hierarchy, basic needs take priority over meta-needs. To illustrate the ordering of human needs, Maslow slotted them in the form of a pyramid, starting with the most basic instinctual human need, the Physiological, followed upward by Safety, then Belongingness and Love, Esteem, and finally transcending to Self-Actualization. In the later years of his career, Maslow focused primarily on the meta-needs in an effort to further delineate the higher order. He posited that the ultimate goal of one's life is to reach Self-Actualization, and although according to Maslow it is never entirely achieved, the sheer action of striving toward the goal provides a greatly enriched human experience. As Maslow finalized his pyramid of needs, he moved beyond Self-Actualization into what he considered the ultimate peak of the needs pyramid, Self-Transcendence. This need component transports the individual to the level of spiritual existence (Maslow Summary, 2011).

Maslow's work has been criticized for over generalizing human needs and individual evolution patterns. His work is considered a major building block from which the study of OB, OD, and EB has been influenced. Perhaps Maslow's most influential premise is that humans inherently strive to meet goals, and accordingly, if their base needs or goals are met the individual is freed up, so to speak, to have the mental and emotional capacity to strive for higher level developmental goals.

This work paved the way for advanced thought on human motivation. As it was applied to the work environment, it provided an opportunity to make the connection that individuals who have their basic needs met have the physical and psychological ability to become better workers; they have the capacity to focus on more goal oriented work and stretch opportunities, developing their own potential, rather than constantly struggling with existence and subsistence issues.

Development of Motivational Theories

Building on the tenets of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Frederick Herzberg (1966) was regarded as one of the most influential subject matter experts of his time with regard to the working environment. His body of research is most notably recognized through his focus on hygiene and motivation. What Herzberg termed Hygiene Factors were considered potential 'dissatisfiers' in the workplace. Herzberg posited if the hygiene factors (basic work related needs) are not met then the employee is unable to respond to higher-level workplace motivators. The Hygiene Factors are: 1) Working Conditions, 2) Policies and Administrative Practices 3) Salary and Benefits, 4) Supervision, 5) Status, 6) Job Security, 7) Co-Workers, and 8) Personal Life. If these factors are met, an employee can be motivated by new and somewhat evolutionary opportunities. These motivating factors are: 1) Recognition, 2) Achievement, 3) Advancement, 4) Growth, 5) Responsibility, and 6) Job Challenge. Herzberg created the term "job enrichment", which is described as the process of redesigning work in order to build in motivators by increasing both the number of tasks that an individual performs and the control that he has over the specific tasks (autonomy).

Clayton Alderfer also built upon Maslow's foundation creating a theoretical position that he coined the Existence/Relationships/Growth (ERG) Theory of Needs (1969). He postulates that three core human needs exist. Physical and safety requirements called *Existence* needs encompass basic provisions needed for material existence. These needs are satisfied through the use of money which most people obtain in exchange for providing work related services. The second component, *Relationships*, centers on the innate desire to seek out and maintain personal relationships. Individuals normally spend a large portion of their adult life in a work setting, which naturally leads to the pursuit of at least partial satisfaction of this core need within the workplace with co-workers and colleagues. The final core area, according to Alderfer is *Growth*. This need is met through individual development. Again, because of the significant amount of time that most adults spend in the work environment, and individual's job, profession, or career, is a key source for providing the opportunity to meet this core need. In contrast to Maslow's Hierarchical Needs Theory, Alderfer's Theory posits that more than one need at a time may be influencing an individual, causing the core needs to exist more on a continuum rather than a hierarchy.

Although Maslow and Alderfer disagree over their application of human need, they share the same theoretical perspective that individuals will tend to work to achieve basic and safety needs first and foremost before they experience motivation to work toward meeting other needs. A recent study (Tay & Diener, 2011) also confirmed that individuals seek to satisfy basic needs before moving toward addressing subsequent needs. But, the researchers further identified that

the act of satisfying the various needs provides an almost independent effect on the individual's "subjective well being" (both biological and emotional). The researchers posited that the act of need satisfaction is arranged more like a box. Instead of the previous theories like Maslow's pyramid or Alderder's continuum, Tay and Diener describe basic human needs as scattered within the box and depending on the environment or the situation that is presented; different needs push to the top to compensate for areas where other needs have become deficient.

As research in the sciences continued to evolve it became clear that within the emerging disciplines of OB, OD, and EB, individual motivation was being presented as a driving force for all behavior traits. Motivational theories that also emerged in addition to Herzberg's began to populate the social and psychological sciences. Although there are numerous motivational theories to date, the majority can be categorized into three general theories. They are: 1) Content Theories that energize behavior, 2) Process Theories that direct behavior, and 3) Behavioral Theories that sustain behavior. The three categories are not seen as competing explanations of the same construct, but rather each is operating as part of a continuum, much like the continuum process described by Alderfer. *Energizing Behavior Theories* seek to understand what initiates the behavior, behavior pattern, or changes to one's behavior. *Directing Behavior Theories* seek to explain what factors determine which behavior an individual selects. The focus is on the question of choice and conflict within competing behavioral options. *Sustaining Behavior Theories* seek to quantify what factors determine an

individual's level of persistence with respect to behavioral patterns and to understand how behavior is sustained or ended. All areas have direct interest from, and relevance to, the work environment. Today, it is commonly recognized that understanding employee motivation is a key to unlocking human potential and workplace productivity.

In modern application, businesses and academia have foundational research that stems from three well known theories of human motivation: 1) Vroom's Expectancy Theory, 2) Adam's Equity Theory, and 3) Locke's Goal Setting Theory. Although all three theories have experienced sustaining application, their theoretical work is not always in compliment of one another. Victor H. Vroom's work through the Yale School of Management emerged as early research on human behavior and motivation that had application in the development of OB, OD, and EB. Vroom defines motivation as a process governing choices among alternative forms of voluntary activities, a process controlled by the individual. The individual makes choices based on estimates of how well the expected results of a given behavior are going to match up with, or eventually lead to the desired results (Vroom, 1964).

From Vroom's perspective, people will be motivated to act in a specific way based on the belief that once they perform the action it will be subsequently followed by a given outcome. Their motivation to perform the act is in large part based on how attractive the expected outcome is to the individual. Vroom listed his theory as a formula: $\text{Valence} \times \text{Expectancy} \times \text{Instrumentality} = \text{Motivation}$. The model has been updated, most notably by Porter and Lawler (1968) to reflect

a more refined approach. The formula was further delineated into *Motivational Force* (MF)=Expectancy (Expectancy to Probability) x Instrumentality (Probability to Reward) x Valance (Reward) or (MF=E, P x P, R x V(R)). *Expectancy* is a personal conclusion that one's effort will result in the attainment of desired goals. *Instrumentality* is the understanding that if one meets the performance expectations, they will receive a greater reward (i.e. job promotion, merit increase, sense of accomplishment). *Valence* stems from the actual value the individual places on the identified reward. All three components work in tandem to help define what behavioral options are available to the individual. Under this theory, the individual will pursue the option that possesses the strongest *Motivational Force*.

Behavioral and workplace psychologist John Stacey Adams developed a job motivation theory in 1963 called Adams Equity Theory. His work posits that a fair balance needs to be present between the work efforts of the employee (called "inputs") and the employer efforts (called "outputs"). Inputs include intangible items like: Effort, Loyalty, Hard Work, Commitment, Skill, Ability, Adaptability, Flexibility, Tolerance, Determination, Enthusiasm, Trust in Superiors, Support of Colleagues, and Personal Sacrifice. Employer outputs include tangible items like Salary, Benefits, and Perks. Intangible employer items include Recognition, Praise, Responsibility, Reputation, Stimulus, Sense of Advancement, and Job Security. Adam's Theory explains that where there is perceived balance between employee inputs and employer outputs, an optimal environment is created. This environmental opportunity provides for a strong and productive relationship

between both employer and employee, and a place in which content and motivated employees exist and thrive (Spector, 2008).

Edwin Locke pioneered research in the late 1960's on goal setting and human motivation. His writing, "Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives" (1968) created a new paradigm from which to observe and evaluate employee motivation. Locke's research demonstrated that employees were motivated by clear goals and appropriate feedback, and that having the ability to work toward a specific goal, gave the employee significant source of motivation to push toward goal attainment and resulted in improved performance on the job. Gary Latham, a Professor of Organizational Effectiveness at the University of Toronto, also joined Locke in the study of motivation and goal setting. Their work together found that specific, difficult goal setting directly leads to significant increases in employee productivity (Locke & Latham, 1984). In 1990 the two researchers published "A Theory of Goal Setting and Task Performance" in which they reinforced the need to set specific and difficult goals. They also set forth five principles of effective goal setting: 1) Clarity, 2) Challenge, 3) Commitment, 4) Feedback, and 5) Task Complexity.

Organizational Development

Organizational Behavior (OB) and Organization Development (OD) are similar in that their applied science is to understand and influence the dynamics and behavior of individuals and their corresponding environments. However, each takes a somewhat different approach in how they view and value the different influencers within a given environment. OD is defined as the "theory and

practice of planned, systematic change in the attitudes, beliefs, and values of the employees through creation and reinforcement of long-term training programs. OD is action oriented. It starts with a careful organization-wide analysis of the current situation and of the future requirements, and employs techniques of behavioral sciences such as behavior modeling, sensitivity training, and transactional analysis. Its objective is to enable the organization to improve adaption to the fast-changing external environment of new markets, regulations, and technologies” (BusinessDictionary.com, 2011). It has also been described as the systematic application of knowledge of behavioral science at different levels, such as group, inter-group, organization, etc., to bring about planned change with the objective being enhanced quality of work-life, adaptability, productivity, and effectiveness (Newstrom & Davis 2007). Bradford and Burke (2005) explain that the way in which the quality of the environment and corresponding work is altered and enhanced is through the act of influencing and changing behaviors, attitudes, values, strategies, procedures and structures in order to maintain an organization that is adaptable and pliable enough to keep pace with the demands for change in any given work environment.

Kurt Lewin developed four elements that became part of the impetus work of Organizational Development. Field Theory, Group Dynamics, the 3-Step Process for Successful Change and an influential process coined “Action Research”, became early building blocks for OD. Although it has been disputed as to whether it was actually Lewin or one of his research partners, John Collier, who invented action research (Cooke, 1999), what is clearly known is that the steps to action-

oriented change presented a unique opportunity for new research possibilities in the budding social science. Lewin described Action Research as a method of comparative research that incorporated the conditions and effects of all types of social action and research. The process was considered to be a “spiral of steps”, with each part of the process consisting of planning, action, and fact-finding about the outcome, or results of the action (Lewin, 1946).

In part because of Lewin’s work, and as a result of quickly evolving post World War II cultural, business and societal changes, OD emerged from multiple disciplines. Cummings and Huse (1989) point to four major activities that propelled OD into existence, three of which Lewin either originated or greatly influenced before his death in 1947. They are, 1) Action Research, 2) Survey Research Feedback, 3) Laboratory Training, and 4) Quality-of-Work-Life (QWL). John Collier, Kurt Lewin, and William White found that organizational research needed to be linked closely to a quantifiable action if members of a given organization were going to use the research to manage and effect change (Marrow, Bowers & Seashore, 1970). Survey Research Feedback came from the work of the Research Center for Group Dynamics that Lewin formed at MIT in 1945. The Center was later moved to the University of Michigan to join the Survey Research Institute as part of the Institute for Social Research. The work of the Center while at Michigan also influenced the emerging development of Environment and Behavior Research. The National Training Laboratories (NTL) worked with the Research Center for Group Dynamics to develop training groups called *sensitivity groups* or *T-groups*. Lewin had been asked by the Connect

Interracial Commission and the Committee on Community Interrelations of the Jewish American Congress to assist in training of community leaders. Lewin's group observed the behaviors of individuals and group dynamics and then discussed the behaviors with fellow researchers at the end of the day. The community leaders requested that they be allowed to be present at the feedback sessions.

This new dynamic allowed for individuals to hear and react to information about their own behavior, from the vantage point of others, creating the glide path for OD work. Quality-of-Work-Life (QWL) research came to the United States from Europe in the 1950's and was based in large part on the work of Eric Trist from the Tavistock Institute on Human Relations in London. The work examined both the technical and human aspects of organizations and work environments and how the two areas are interrelated and interdependent (Cummings & Huse, 1989).

Lewin's work has often been criticized primarily because of his assumption that organizations operated in a stable state. This premise could not be widely applied to large scale change projects, it was considered a top down change management approach that eventually lost its mainstream appeal, and his "stable state" approach did not acknowledge the presence or influence of organizational power and politics (Burnes, 2004). His work did, however, create a far-reaching research foundation on which others could build. He was, "a humanitarian who believed that only by resolving social conflict, whether it be religious, racial, marital, or industrial, could the human condition be improved, Lewin believed

that the key to resolving social conflict was to facilitate learning and so enable individuals to understand and restructure their perceptions of the world around them” (Burnes, p981, 2004). This approach created opportunity for many advances in the OD world.

John French, a noted OD researcher, also listed the work of a human relations group at the ESSO Company as a catalyst for OD evolution. Rather than working as a traditional Research and Report Writing Unit, the human relations group at ESSO created an internal consulting unit to offer systematic review and assistance to field managers. Additionally, the rapid technological developments of the 1960’s and 1970’s further accelerated the need for OD. Project groups, task forces, and change management processes required new and innovative approaches to managing business requirements and emerging technologies (French, 1982).

Notable researchers, like Peter Vaill and Craig Lundberg, have continued efforts to further develop OD as a practical science. Vaill has been cited as, “One of the Country’s top 10 organizational development specialists; Vaill is known for his ideas on what he’s termed ‘permanent white water’, the turbulent social and organizational conditions that managerial leaders face today” (Harvard Business School, 1999). Lundberg has introduced a theoretical perspective termed *Social Rules Theory* to assist in reframing and redefining organizational change and development. It may be redefining OD as a special type of: “Project system in organizations which facilitates change by surfacing, assessing, and modifying as needed, the rules and rule systems within or linking organizational components”

(Lundberg, 2000). Their work, although targeted to the OD specialty, continues to be influential in the evolution of OB and EB practices.

Environment-Behavior

The third connector point in the triangle of human behavior and environment study is Environment-Behavior (EB) research. Again, EB research is similar to OB and OD in the applied sciences, but different in its approach to viewing and valuing the different influencers within a given environment. When seeking to understand the Environment-Behavior (EB) connection and how EB study is becoming paramount in the modern workplace, it is also helpful to understand its origins, distinctions, and underlying influence. EB research focuses on the, “study of the mutual relations between human beings and the physical environment at all scales and application of this knowledge thus gained to improving the quality of life through better environmental policy, planning, design, and education” (Moore, p12, 1985). In its most basic form, behavior is seen as the way in which a person, organism, or group responds to a specific set of conditions or their environment. In turn, the term environment references a specific set of external conditions and often acts as a stimulus for the way people experience their environment and subsequently react and behave within and toward it. The relationship between the two can present as both straightforward and entirely complex, making the EB study and research well suited for multiple disciplinary approaches serving as an evolutionary tool for workplace development.

From human's earliest origins, people have demonstrated, "a distinctive pattern of adaptations that reflected the requirements of the particular environment from which they emerged" (Kaplan, 1972). Humans worked to facilitate a way of meeting their needs and moving their way of life toward a more soothing and comfortable condition. Their purposive behaviors were, and remain, stimulated by needs that require fulfillment. This pursuit is an intrinsic and nurturing property of the human experience, and therefore common to all behavioral traits. Behavior, as a trait, is an overt action that is not only controlled by needs but also by various subsystems such as physiological, social, cultural, and personality dimensions of the human experience (Porteous, 1977).

When examining the environment-behavior interaction, it is evident that EB is one of the most reliable touch points of man's relationship to self, to each other, and to one's universe. Simply stated, "The history of life on earth has been a history of interaction between living things and their surroundings" (Carson, p4, 1962). As a result, human response, anticipation, and planning (as it relates to the environment) have altered both physical life and the environment, and has changed reality accordingly. Environmental Psychologist, Robert Bechtel refers to this concept as the "Rich Response Repertoire" (RRR), which involves developing many different responses or reactions to a single situation. He states that, "The richness to responses is the key to evolutionary success, and collecting them into a repertoire provides the kit for survival" (Bechtel, p49, 1997).

It is conceivable that RRR may also be seen as the impetus for two areas of workplace study and research: Emotional Intelligence (EI), and Cultural

Intelligence (CI). Emotional intelligence focuses on the criticality of dealing effectively with human emotions in varied settings. It recognizes that human brains are hard-wired to give way to base emotional responses. Everything that is seen, smelled, heard, touched, or tasted comes into the body through the primary senses and travels through the biological pathways in the form of electro-chemical signals. Before the signals can move through and into the frontal lobe of the brain where rational thought prevails, these impulses must migrate up the spinal cord and through the limbic system within the brain where core emotions are experienced by the individual. As a result, there is a constant biological and mental struggle to manage or succumb to the fierce interplay between felt emotions and rationale reaction. Emotional Intelligence was a term coined to help explain this human sensitivity, or lack thereof, in observed and demonstrated behavior within environmental settings. Highly successful EI traits include displaying substantive levels of sophistication, discipline, and forethought in an individual's management of the internal relationship between the brain's emotional and rationale processes and outwardly demonstrative behavior. The more confirmed control one has over his/her emotional response, the higher the observed level of emotional intelligence and, consequently, one's level of predictable success in relationships and in the workplace (Earley, 2004). Cultural Intelligence is, "related to Emotional Intelligence, but it picks up where Emotional Intelligence leaves off. A person with high EI grasps what makes us human and at the same time, what makes each of us different from one another.

A person with high Cultural Intelligence can somehow tease out of a person's or group's behavior those features that would be true of all people and all groups, those peculiar to this person or this group, and those that are neither universal nor idiosyncratic" (Bradberry, p1, 2004). Both perspectives are applicable to the modern workplace and important elements in understanding the environment and behavior connections; but they are not new. One only need be reminded of the words of Aristotle (322 B.C.) to see that the application of suitable behaviors to a given situation is more than quick observation and delineation; it is truly an art form, layered in calculated sophistication. "Anyone can become angry, that is easy. But to be angry with the right person, to the right degree, at the right time, for the right purpose and in the right way – this is not easy"(Aristotle in Emotional Intelligence 2.0).

It is becoming increasingly clear that an organization's ability to direct apposite behavior to an intended audience, with skill and precision at the actual time it is needed, is perhaps the most promising frontier of next generation business. As work environments create increasing space for innovation and intellectual capitalism, the subtleties of advanced Emotional and Cultural Intelligence will undoubtedly provide the economic edge.

To understand how EB has evolved to the present, some of the early influencers of human-nature relationships should be examined. Human-nature relationships have often evolved on a parallel track. On one level the relationship stems from geographic and biological needs and responses; on a parallel level the human-nature relationship evolves along a continuum of spiritual and ethereal

philosophies through to scientific theories. To assist in illustrating the parallel track, one can look to evolutionary patterns. Human survival is predicated on environmental adaptability. For example, in order to survive in geographic areas that were hot, arid regions, humans developed predatory hunter skill sets in order to satisfy biological requirements; in dense, lush, tropical environments, survival was predicated in part on the development of “gatherer” skill sets.

From a spiritual perspective, the idea of harmony between man and nature has been a core component of environmental adaptability in many cultures. Societies like ancient China and Native America, although vastly different cultures, shared a reverence for the earth and man’s relationship to it. There was a core belief and understanding that land was the primary source of all living products and it should be honored. These early ancestors were keenly aware of the cycles of the land, the subtleties of the seasons, the growth cycle of crops and live stock, and possessed a systemic belief that all things sacrificed for the good of man should be revered through the use of all elements of earth or animal that was sacrificed. The bond of the human-environment dependency was a very spiritual relationship that was manifested in all rituals and beliefs. This EB system had far reaching influence on the evolution of man.

Not all cultures, however, shared the same reverence for the delicate balance required of human behavior in relationship to the environment. Western Anthropocentric tradition, which was mainly influenced by Judeo-Christianity, exercised a philosophical belief in dominion. Specifically, man was viewed as the creation of a God who was believed to be the omnipotent Creator of both the

heavens and earth and had endowed his creation the right to handle, conquer, and manage the world (White, 1969). As this cultural belief system moved through time and geography, it continued to reinforce the notion that everything on the earth was generated by God specifically for the consumption of man.

This cultural system was eventually carried onto the prairies of the American Frontier. At its center, the system reinforced the power, and seemingly inherent right of man, to conquer and subdue the wild new world. Pioneers viewed the unknown wilderness and all of its inhabitants as the enemy (Niehardt, 1972). This belief system has continued to influence Western tradition and has had a marked influence on many of our contemporary behaviors including the utilization and subsequent exploitation of natural resources, civilization, urbanization, etc.

Competing with the “Pioneer” movement, Transcendentalism emerged as a blending of multiple philosophies that proposed to discover the nature of reality by researching the process associated with thought rather than the objects of sense experience (Webster’s, 2011). Henry David Thoreau, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Margaret Fuller and many of their colleagues introduced the premise for Transcendentalism. In addition to the writings, spirituality, and societal perspectives they pursued, their work also embraced an eco-centric tradition that sprouted the idea of preservation and pastoral design. By the mid-1800’s, many supporting the Transcendentalist movement were advocating the preservation of wild life areas. John Muir founded the Sierra Club, which became one of the most influential environmental preservation organizations in all of North America. The

Sierra Club worked to leverage the use of natural and cultural resources without instilling damage to the physical environment. The first national park was established in 1864, mainly as a result of the unyielding efforts of Frederick Law Olmstead, a leading American landscape architect and planner. This lobbied preservation of land offered an influential building block for EB work. Later, Olmstead's eco-centric work led to the development of New York's Central Park as well as incorporating the use of green space at many university campuses around the United States. Olmstead and greatly influenced the work of Benton MacKaye who, in turn, had a significant influence on elevating the importance of environment and behavior work through his efforts to create conservation, environmentalism, recreational and regional planning (Anderson, 2002). Although oppositional in their approach, Pioneerism and Transcendentalism influenced the evolution of environment-behavior thought and the manner in which North American land use, design, commerce, and public policy began to emerge.

During World War II, the creation of the Civilian Public Service (CPS) left an unintended, but substantial, footprint on soon-to-be emerging EB studies. CPS provided religious conscientious objectors from groups including Mennonites, Amish, and Quakers the ability to serve their country without engaging in military activity. From 1941 to 1947, almost 12,000 men joined the CPS and worked in forestry, soil conservation, fire fighting, agriculture, social services, and mental health. Their non-violent pacifist behavior also promoted an organic, eco-centric, humanitarian approach to the development of the professions in which they served. A key contribution to the early beginnings of the EB movement was their

work in psychiatric hospitals. By the end of 1945, more than 2,000 CPS men worked in 41 institutions in 20 states (Gingerich, 1949). They experienced first-hand the horrendous conditions to which patients were subjected. Their strong objections to patient mistreatment fueled their determination to improve the conditions of psychiatric wards. They directed their activism toward sweeping changes for humane treatment of patients and drastic changes to the physical environment within mental institutions. Prior to this change, architects of hospitals had designed for structure, not human elements. After this societal shift, psychologists began to generate substantial data regarding the social needs of individuals and their corresponding behavior in order to provide input into the design process. Although limited in its initial impact, the architectural and political world took notice; the work was meaningful and began to take hold (Dyck, 1997).

By the time the United States emerged from World War II, pivotal changes in society influenced the materialization of formalized environment-behavior studies. A seismic shift came in the form of the GI Bill, which opened the door for thousands of veterans to become first generation college graduates. Low interest loans for both mortgages and small-businesses provided a gateway for many to realize the “American Dream”. Rapidly developing technologies provided the opportunity for households to have appliances, tools, and cost efficient transportation that alleviated some of the time constraints of everyday life. It also led to the growth of personal lives, leisure time, and the introduction of a widespread middle class.

Changes to the social and physical landscape of the 1950's and 1960's prompted significant growth and exploration within the social sciences. Psychology, ecology, sociology, anthropology, geography, and design exploded with opportunity; their common threads began to pull the sciences together into a multi-disciplinary approach, coined Environment-Behavior studies (EB). The drive to further understand the balance, influence, and co-existence of the environment and human behavior came into being in large part because of the pioneering work of five key scientists: Roger Barker, Edward Hall, Robert Sommer, Kevin Lynch, and Christopher Alexander (Bechtel, 1997).

Barker was one of the first to attempt to develop an ecological perspective inside the discipline of psychology. He and his colleague, Herbert Wright, started the process of observing and recording the environmental behavior and actions of children at the Midwest Field Station, an observatory they founded in a small town west of Lawrence, Kansas where they both were professors (University of Kansas). The two social scientists brought psychological studies out of the traditional laboratory and into the real world. Their work paved the way for observational design (Barker, 1990).

Anthropologist Edward Hall contributed to the sciences the notion of social distance and personal space. His work launched the description and initial understanding of 1) Personal Space: a individual's personal territory that is with them at all times, 2) Primary Territory: the primary place of retreat for its occupants, where occupants have a strong sense of ownership and invasion of this territory is often prohibited by law, for example, one's place of residence,

3) Secondary Territory: space that cannot be personalized to the extent that primary territory can be because they are not considered permanent and cannot be continuously occupied, for example offices or work space, and 4) Public Territory: territories that function based on formal regulations, the use of the space is restricted by laws, codes, customs, and regulations. Examples would include parks, restaurants and shopping malls (Stewart-Pollack & Menconi, 2005). Sommer also built on the work of Hall in his book entitled *Personal Space: The Behavioral Basis of Design* (Sommer, 1974). His work sought to explain what personal space is, and how people go about protecting this space.

The work of Kevin Lynch focused on dissecting the way in which “urbanites” perceive, take in, and arrange spatial information (Lynch, 1964). His research engaged urban planners and designers in the process of thinking about how to make city planning “legible” for their occupants as well as for the visitor, so both parties are able to easily orient and navigate themselves in the urban setting. He identified three components of any urban image: 1) identity, 2) structure, and 3) meaning, and further introduced “image elements” (paths, edges, districts, nodes, and landmarks) that are repetitively established to denote urban space. His work produced certain guiding principles in which urban designers could engage in order to improve the quality of life and experience for the cities’ inhabitants and visitors.

Christopher Alexander focused his architectural expertise and interest on the design and construction of buildings from the end user’s perspective. He pushed to demystify the work of designing in an effort to empower the end users

to design and build for themselves, their personal needs, and desires (Alexander, 1977). Furthermore, his work on pattern language emphasized that a pattern is essentially a way of approaching and solving a design problem; the more problems one has, the more patterns he needs to develop. The more patterns that are developed, the richer the design dialogue becomes and the greater the opportunity for creative order.

The efforts of these five environment-behavior forefathers provided intellectual space where their multi-disciplinary efforts could be woven together to create a unique approach for examining the human experience as a function of the physical environment in which they inhabited. In addition to the significant impact of a changing societal landscape, their collective body of work also paved the way for a developing a focus on the worker and the work environment. J. Douglas Porteous has also been an under recognized yet powerful influence on workplace study as a result of his efforts around cognitive mapping. His work can be viewed as some of the early stepping-stones to elementary OD, OB, and EB processes and concepts. He helped to champion the importance of understanding how information is managed within the human experience and expressed in human behavior by applying the method in which information from the environment is collected, processed through the brain (cognition), and output as demonstrable behavior (Porteous, 1977).

A review of some of the historical influencers, both societal and scientific, helps to identify the conceptual elements of Organization Development (OD), Organizational Behavior (OB) and Environment-Behavior (EB) and demonstrates

how they intersect. Although each of the three areas has distinct approaches to theory, research, and reporting on the human experience, they all clearly share foundational and academic characteristics that translate into the contemporary workplace. All three provide a complimentary and layered application to work environment design and modern workplace theory. Attribute items like workplace assessments, workflow analysis, recruitment and retention, company culture, training and development, the physical environment, and employee job satisfaction all draw from the OD, OB, EB disciplines. Their domain work presents a unique opportunity to further dissect the characteristics of financially successful businesses that are steadfast in their commitment to promoting excellent employee work environments.

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the OD, OB, and EB attributes of highly successful employee-centric companies to identify patterned attributes. The research examines the presence of statistically related attributes to establish a cross industry workplace index. The index can be used alone or with other assessment tools to measure current workplace characteristics leading to recommendations for environment-behavior changes that endorse the traits of successful, employee-centric workplaces.

Chapter Two

METHODS

The methods of this research are organized in this chapter as follows:

- (a) Exploratory Research
 - (i) Fortune 500 Companies
 - (ii) Top 100 Best Places to Work
 - (iii) Survey of Organizational Excellence
 - (iv) Covey's 7 Habits Benchmark
- (b) Developing the Survey Instrument
- (c) Finalizing the Questionnaire
- (d) Data Collection and Management

Exploratory Research

Numerous surveys are used in business settings to measure aspects of the workplace. In general, data are obtained to assist the employer in one of three general categories: 1) Culture and Leadership, 2) Products and Services and/or, 3) Competitiveness and Efficiencies. The application of survey data has been a powerful management tool providing useful information that can lead to key corporate decisions and strategic alignment of the workforce and services. Despite the availability of workplace survey instruments, to date no index exists related to the workplace attributes of companies that have been identified as highly successful corporations and are deemed to have the qualities to create an excellent workplace for its employees. Accordingly, the purpose of this thesis is to identify cross-industry attributes of highly successful employers in order to create an attribute index that is concise, easy to administer, and can be applied in a variety of workplace settings, including multiple industries and varying company sizes.

The index will assist employers in identifying the strengths and weaknesses of their

current work environment as benchmarked to the attributes of highly successful, employee-centric companies.

Many employers are amenable to utilizing surveys to assess business operations and workforce perceptions if there is a tangible connection and direction from the data that speak to the company's fiscal bottom line. Logic would indicate that there is substantial goodwill that comes from creating a workplace and work environment that is great for the employees. However, in the grand scheme of maintaining a profitable business, employee-centered elements in the workplace are often associated with substantial costs and need to be vetted as good for overall business, or the capital investment may not be worth the return. Therefore, in acknowledging that return on investment (ROI) is important when looking at workplace attributes, this research focused on fiscally successful, employee-centric companies.

In American corporations, there are multiple financial indicators that point to a company's stability and financial status. To identify financially thriving companies for this thesis, the Fortune 500 listing was employed. The Fortune 500 is an annual listing published by Fortune magazine that lists the top 500 U.S. privately held and public corporations as ranked by their gross revenue after adjustments made by Fortune to exclude the impact of excise taxes. Although there are other financial listings used in the business industry, the Fortune 500 listing has endured since 1955, in part because of the unbiased revenue based criteria, which is considered to be less volatile than other competitor indexes. The top 500 listing was cross referenced to Fortune magazine's Top 100 Places to

Work. Companies that are at least seven years old with more than 1,000 U.S. employees were eligible to participate. An extensive survey and culture audit was used to select the top 100 employers. The survey included items related to employee attitudes about management's credibility, job satisfaction, and camaraderie. The culture audit included questions related to pay and benefit programs and open-ended questions about hiring practices, diversity efforts, internal communication, training programs, and recognition programs. Thirteen companies representing a wide variety of industries, including retail, food and beverage, hotel/real estate, insurance, financial, information technology, and telecommunications were listed on both the Fortune 500 and Top 100 Places to Work from 2006-2010 and were selected for review.

In addition to the Fortune listings, two other surveys were reviewed: 1) The University of Texas' Survey of Organizational Excellence and 2) Franklin Covey's Seven Habits Benchmark. The Survey of Organizational Excellence (SOE) has been used to assess the perceptions of thousands of individuals, primarily in government agencies, to capture opinions and needs related to aspects of the total work environment. Because government workplaces are largely service based, the survey emphasis is focused on promoting excellence through employee engagement and accountability. The survey has three primary environmental foci: the vital role every employee must play, continuous focus on more effective and efficient ways of getting work accomplished, and candor among all employees toward building a quality organization. The survey focuses on five core workplace dimensions (work, accommodations, organization, information, and personal).

There are 20 corresponding constructs that focus on the environment behavior attributes. They are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: ‘Survey of Organizational Excellence’ Dimension and Construct Items

DIMENSION	Work	Accommodations	Organization	Information	Personal
CONSTRUCT	Supervisor	Fair Pay	Change Oriented	Internal	Job Satisfaction
CONSTRUCT	Fairness	Work Setting	Goal Oriented	Availability	Time and Stress
CONSTRUCT	Team	Benefits	Holographic	External	Burnout
CONSTRUCT	Diversity	Employee Development	Strategic		Empowerment
CONSTRUCT			Quality		

Franklin Covey’s Seven Habits Benchmark is a multi-dimensional tool often referred to as a 360 degree assessment that reports from multiple perspectives including, self, peers, direct reports, and boss. The categories that are covered correspond with Franklin Covey’s Seven Habits of Highly Successful People, which stems from work that began in the 1980’s and has developed through research and thousands of corresponding surveys and interviews. The dimensions are referred to as the habits of successful behavior. The constructs encapsulate the meaning, behavior, and actions associated with the corresponding dimensions. Both items are listed in Table 2.

Table 2: 'Seven Habits Benchmark' Dimension and Construct Items

Dimension (Called Habit)	Construct
1) Be Proactive	Take initiative in life by realizing your decisions (and how they align with life's principles) are the primary determining factor for effectiveness in your life. Taking responsibility for your choices and the subsequent consequences that follow.
2) Begin With the End in Mind	Self-discover and clarify your deeply important character values and life goals. Envisioning the ideal characteristics for each of your various roles and relationships in life.
3) Put First Things First	Planning, prioritizing, and executing your week's tasks based on importance rather than urgency. Evaluating if your efforts exemplify your desired character values, propel you towards goals, and enrich the roles and relationships elaborated in Habit 2.
4) Think Win-Win	Genuinely striving for mutually beneficial solutions or agreements in your relationships. Valuing and respecting people by understanding a "win" for all is ultimately a better long-term resolution than if only one person in the situation had gotten their way.
5) Seek First to Understand Then to Be Understood	Using empathetic listening to be genuinely influenced by a person, which compels them to reciprocate the listening, take an open mind to being influenced by you, which creates an atmosphere of caring, respect, and positive problem solving.
6) Synergize	Combining the strengths of people through positive teamwork, so as to achieve goals no one person could have done alone. How to yield the most prolific performance out of a group of people through encouraging meaningful contribution, and modeling inspirational and supportive leadership.
7) Sharpen the Saw	The balancing and renewal of your resources, energy, and health to create a sustainable long-term effective lifestyle. Allow yourself to grow by maintaining a balanced program in the four areas of your life: physical, social/emotional, mental, and spiritual.

Developing the Survey Instrument

Attributes identified in Fortune 500 and 100 Best Places to Work companies and complimentary components from the Survey of Organizational Excellence and Franklin Covey's Seven Habits Benchmark were organized into thematic listings. From the thematic listings of over 110 key workplace attributes, survey items were developed to represent the different themes of the work environment. The objective in developing the survey instrument was to capture agreement levels on statements related to successful workplace attributes using a six-point Likert scale to identify items that were statistically correlated. The scale was as follows: 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Somewhat Disagree, 5=Disagree, 6=Strongly Disagree. Demographic information that would assist in data analysis was also included. After the initial construction of the instrument, a preliminary draft of the instrument was reviewed by a cross-section of working adults. The outcome of the pre-test resulted in revisions and re-ordering of a small number of the survey items.

Finalizing the Survey Instrument

A list of 48 survey items including six demographic questions and two open-ended questions were used to finalize the survey. Forty of the survey items used a six-point Likert scale that included the following response options: 'Strongly Agree, Agree, Somewhat Agree, Somewhat Disagree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree'. The introduction included an informed consent statement, brief instructions on the

mechanics of completing the survey, and a short introduction about the research focus on employment attributes that were consistent with Fortune 500 and Top 100 Best Places to Work companies.

Data Collection

Online survey development software called Survey Monkey was used to transfer the survey instrument into an electronic format. The electronic format provided the opportunity to use web-based survey distribution and obtained and retained information anonymously and without geographic limitations. The data are stored on the SurveyMonkey site utilizing a secure socket layer (SSL), which means that the traffic between the user's (respondent's) browser and the SurveyMonkey website is encrypted. Additionally, the data are stored in a format that is compatible with IBM's SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software that can be used for statistical analysis.

The survey was distributed through multiple channels, including formal professional networks (e.g. Human Resources Association of Mid-Missouri and LinkedIn) and informal professional networks (e.g. Chamber of Commerce Leadership Columbia Alumni, Facebook, University of Missouri Alumni, WorldatWork Alumni, and email distribution lists). Due to the web-based nature of the survey's distribution, it is difficult to know how many individuals received the request to participate versus the number of individuals who actually filled out part or all of the survey. The survey took approximately 10-15 minutes to

complete. Each electronic page of the survey had radio dial buttons that the respondent could “click” on in order to submit their answer to each item. Additionally, each page had an indicator of the percentage of the total survey the respondent had completed with each answer. The main objective with the widespread survey distribution was to balance time constraints for the data collection period and to obtain a convenience sample of at least 200 responses from varying industries in order to provide for a large enough sampling to complete a statistically valid analysis. At the close of the two week data collection period a total of 223 individuals had completed at least a portion of the survey; (n=207) individuals or 92.8 percent of the respondents had completed the survey in its entirety. Copies of the survey instrument and informed consent are included in the Appendix.

Participants

To provide a framework for conceptualizing the survey respondents’ demographic characteristics, the following sample description provides a very generalized view of the data. A specific breakdown of all demographic characteristics is detailed at length in the Analysis chapter.

Of the 200+ individuals who responded, well over half worked in For-Profit Organizations and almost half worked for companies that operated in Single States. The organizations the respondents worked for had been in business on average about 80 years, employing an average base of just below 10,500 people. The average tenure of the respondent was just over 10 years, and a

quarter of them worked in Banking/Finance/Insurance/Real Estate industries, which was the largest industry segment represented in the survey responses.

Not-For-Profit Organizations employed just below a quarter of the sample, as did companies that had a presence in Multiple States and ones that were represented Internationally. At the 25th percentile, companies had been in business approximately 18 years, employing an average of 50 people, with respondents who had worked at the company for three years. Collectively, more than a quarter of the respondents were split between working in Education and working in Retail/Sales/Wholesaler/Distributor businesses.

The smallest number of respondents worked for National Companies and Government Agencies. The remaining types of industry that individuals worked for varied between 10 percent of the respondents Pharmaceutical/Medical and Healthcare, followed by a tie of just under eight percent representation for individuals working in Manufacturing and Government/Military Services. Necessities, Charity/Foundations, and Construction were all represented at less than three percent of the total survey respondent population.

Chapter Three

ANALYSIS

The findings of this research are organized in this chapter as follows:

- (a) A demographic profile of the sample
- (b) Descriptive characteristics of each of the 'Place to Work' survey items (appendix – summary in thesis text)
- (c) 'Place to Work' survey items examined by demographic characteristics
- (d) The results of the principal components analysis – index construction
 - (i) Survey items identified with each factor – factor loadings, items excluded
- (e) Factor Grouping
 - (i) Factor Groupings examined across entire sample
 - (ii) Factor Groupings examined by demographic characteristics
- (f) 'Place to Work' Index constructs and dimensions
 - (i) Constructs and dimensions examined across entire sample
 - (ii) Constructs and dimensions examined by demographic characteristics
- (g) 'Place to Work' Index examined using Multi Attribute Unit Analysis (MAUT)

Demographic Profile

Type of Company/Organization: The most frequently reported response for this survey item (n=213) was *For-Profit Organization* accounting for 66.4 percent of the respondents (n=141), followed by *Not-for-Profit Organization* with 21.0 percent of the sample (n=45), and *State or Federal Government Agency* with 12.6 percent of the respondents (n=27).

Type of Industry: The most frequently reported response for this survey item was *Banking/Finance/Insurance/Real Estate Industry* accounting for 24.9 percent of the respondents (n=55); followed by *Education* with 14.9 percent (n=33); *Other* category with 14.5 percent (n=32);

Retail/Sales/Wholesaler/Distributor with 11.3 percent (n=25),
Pharmaceuticals/Medical/Healthcare with 10.4 percent (n=23), *Manufacturing*
and *Government/Military Services* tied with 7.7 percent (n=17 each), *Necessities*
(e.g., Transportation, Agriculture, Energy) with 2.7 percent (n=6), and
Charity/Foundations and *Construction* tied with 1.8 percent (n=4 each).

Organizational Operating Area: The most frequently reported response for this survey item (n=220) was *Single-State Operation* accounting for 44.1 percent of the respondents (n=96), followed by *Multi-State Operation* with 23.6 percent (n=52), *International* with 20.5 percent (n=45), and *National* (all states) with 11.8 percent (n=26).

Number of Years The Company/Organization Has Been In Business: The mean response was 81.87 years in business. The 25th percentile was 18 years, the 50th percentile was reported at 40 years, and the 75th percentile was 73.5 years in operation.

Number of Employees Working For The Company/Organization: The mean response was 10,327 employees. The 25th percentile was 50 employees, the 50th percentile was reported at 300 employees, and the 75th percentile was 2,300 employees.

Number of Years Working For The Company/Organization: The mean response was 10.2 years. The 25th percentile was 3 years, the 50th percentile was reported at 7.5 years, and the 75th percentile was 15 years.

Descriptive Characteristics of ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items for Sample

The final version of the survey instrument included 48 survey items. For each item, a sample mean, standard deviation, and number of respondents who completed the item is presented in Table 3. The scale was ordered in the following manner: 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Somewhat Disagree, 5=Disagree, 6=Strongly Disagree. The survey items are also ordered from lowest mean score (level of agreement was strongest) to highest mean score (level of agreement was lowest). Tables 4 through 20 partition the responses based on the following demographics: 1) Type of Company (Not for Profit, For Profit, Government Agency, 2) Type of Industry, and 3) Operating Territory (Single State, Multi-State, National, International). Each Table has an introductory section to explain the items that had the highest level of agreement and lowest level of agreement. The Tables are intended to illustrate the variations of response based on demographic characteristics.

Table 3: Sample Mean Ordered Responses for 'Place to Work' Survey Items

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Proud of Product	1.82	0.86	211
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.86	1.05	211
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.88	0.87	208
Trustworthy People	1.95	0.95	219
Executive Integrity	2	1.08	219
Loyalty to Company	2.03	1.05	208
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.08	0.99	207
Stable Company	2.1	1.1	211
Personalized Workspace	2.25	1.14	204
Safe and Secure	2.25	0.98	208
Feels Respected	2.26	1.17	212
Benefits for Security	2.33	1.2	214
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.35	0.96	208
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.37	1.12	208
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.41	1.08	210
Respect for Each Other	2.44	1.19	209
Treated Fairly	2.45	1.19	214
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.46	1.2	217
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.46	1.36	207
Equipment and Training Provided	2.47	1.26	214
Melting Pot	2.48	1.21	209
Philanthropic Activities	2.48	1.37	208
Community Service Activities	2.49	1.36	207
Understand Business Goals	2.5	1.13	219
Pride in Team Contributions	2.51	1.17	209
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.52	1.23	211
Employees are Happy	2.54	1.18	207
Competitive Pay	2.55	1.34	211
Physically Attractive	2.55	1.37	208
Job Security	2.56	1.22	209
Feels Empowered	2.57	1.17	217
Faith in Management	2.57	1.38	203
Cares About Individual	2.64	1.32	211
Extra Effort Rewarded	2.73	1.34	211
Individuality is Valued	2.74	1.22	208
People and Resources Coordinated	2.79	1.1	213
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.8	1.34	215
Fun at Work	2.86	1.37	207
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3.07	1.39	210
Employee Satisfaction Measured	3.09	1.47	210

Survey Items Examined By Type of Industry

Banking/Finance/Insurance/Real Estate Industry: Individuals (n=53-55) working in this industry tied for **highest agreement level** on the following statements, *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=1.56/S.D.=0.68) and *You feel a sense of loyalty to your coworkers* (Mean=1.56/S.D.=0.73). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statement, *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=2.82/S.D.=1.42), followed by the second lowest agreement level on the statement, *An employee's individuality is valued at your company/organization* (Mean=2.64/S.D.=1.14). The statements that had the highest level of agreement are related to the employee's feelings toward the job and others. The statements that had the lowest level of agreement were related to the organization's value of the employee. All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Banking/Finance/Insurance/Real Estate Industry 'Place to Work' Survey Items
Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Proud of Product	1.56	0.68	55
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.56	0.73	55
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.6	0.8	55
Trustworthy People	1.65	0.82	55
Executive Integrity	1.67	0.92	55
Stable Company	1.67	1.03	55
Clearly Defined Business Mission	1.67	0.8	54
Loyalty to Company	1.74	0.93	54
Safe and Secure	1.82	0.77	55
Feels Respected	1.85	0.89	55
Philanthropic Activities	1.85	1.15	54
Benefits for Security	1.87	1.05	55
Community Service Activities	1.89	1.27	55
Personalized Workspace	1.96	0.83	53
Competitive Pay	2	1.07	55
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.05	0.97	55
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.07	1.03	55
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.07	0.84	54
Respect for Each Other	2.13	1.01	55
Faith in Management	2.17	1.2	53
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.18	0.96	55
Job Security	2.18	1.12	55
Treated Fairly	2.2	0.84	55
Cares About Individual	2.22	1.11	55
Employees are Happy	2.22	0.96	54
Understand Business Goals	2.25	0.88	55
Pride in Team Contributions	2.25	1.1	55
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.25	1.22	53
Physically Attractive	2.25	1.3	55
Equipment and Training Provided	2.27	1.17	55
Extra Effort Rewarded	2.33	1.24	55
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.35	1.25	55
Feels Empowered	2.47	1.21	55
Melting Pot	2.49	1.08	55
Fun at Work	2.49	1.41	55
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.6	1.22	55
Economic Success Shared Equitably	2.6	1.28	55
People and Resources Coordinated	2.62	1	55
Individuality is Valued	2.64	1.14	55
Employee Satisfaction Measured	2.82	1.42	55

Charity: This industry reported the **highest overall agreement level** on the statement: *Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment* (Mean=1/S.D.=0) followed by *Your company/organization truly cares about you as an individual* (Mean=1.25/S.D.=0.5). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statement, *Your company/organization offers competitive pay (e.g. salary, profit sharing, 401(k), bonuses)* (Mean=2.5/S.D.=1), followed by a tie for the second lowest agreement level on the statements referring to the workplace being physically attractive and aesthetically pleasing and the organization's participation in philanthropic activities (Mean=2.25/S.D.=1). The sample size for this industry was low (n=3-4), but the top two highest agreement levels and bottom statement were indicative of what has been commonly associated with Charity organizations, that they are welcoming of individuals from varied backgrounds and demographics, they are caring organizations, but the pay is not very good. All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 5.

**Table 5 : Charity ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for
Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score**

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
No Discrimination or Harassment	1	0	4
Cares About Individual	1.25	0.5	4
Continuing Education and Professional Development	1.25	0.5	4
Equipment and Training Provided	1.25	0.5	4
Feels Empowered	1.25	0.5	4
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	1.25	0.5	4
Personalized Workspace	1.25	0.5	4
Pride in Team Contributions	1.25	0.5	4
Proud of Product	1.25	0.5	4
Safe and Secure	1.25	0.5	4
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.25	0.5	4
Benefits for Security	1.5	1	4
Community Service Activities	1.5	0.57	4
Employees are Happy	1.5	0.57	4
Executive Integrity	1.5	0.57	4
Faith in Management	1.5	0.57	4
Feels Respected	1.5	0.57	4
Individuality is Valued	1.5	0.57	4
Pride in Individual Contributions	1.5	0.57	4
Respect for Each Other	1.5	0.57	4
Well Implemented Business Mission	1.5	0.57	4
Management Fosters Teamwork	1.67	0.57	3
Clear Understanding of Roles	1.75	0.95	4
Clearly Defined Business Mission	1.75	0.95	4
Economic Success Shared Equitably	1.75	0.5	4
Extra Effort Rewarded	1.75	0.95	4
Fun at Work	1.75	0.95	4
Loyalty to Company	1.75	0.95	4
Stable Company	1.75	0.5	4
Treated Fairly	1.75	0.95	4
Understand Business Goals	1.75	0.95	4
Employee Satisfaction Measured	2	0.81	4
Job Security	2	1.15	4
Overall Loyalty to Company	2	0.81	4
Trustworthy People	2	1.41	4
Melting Pot	2.25	0.95	4
People and Resources Coordinated	2.25	0.95	4
Philanthropic Activities	2.25	1.5	4
Physically Attractive	2.25	1.5	4
Competitive Pay	2.5	1	4

Construction: This industry (n=3-4) had the **highest overall agreement level** on the statement, *Employees are treated fairly at your company/organization* (Mean=1.5/S.D.=1), followed by a three way tie on the statements *Company executives, in general, exhibit integrity in the operation of the company/organization* (Mean=1.75/S.D.=0.5), *At your company/organization employees feel empowered to do their job well* (Mean=1.75/S.D.=0.95), and *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=1.75/S.D.=0.5) They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statement *Your company/organization is strongly committed to employee and company participation in community service activities* (Mean=3.25/S.D.=1.25), followed by a tie on the second lowest agreement level on the statements referring to the workplace being physically attractive and aesthetically pleasing and the absence of favoritism in hiring and promotions (Mean=3.25/S.D.=1.25). All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: Construction Industry 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Treated Fairly	1.5	1	4
Executive Integrity	1.75	0.5	4
Feels Empowered	1.75	0.5	4
Proud of Product	1.75	0.5	4
No Discrimination or Harassment	2	0	4
Loyalty to Company	2	0	4
Clear Understanding of Roles	2	0	4
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2	0	4
Employees are Happy	2	0	4
Job Security	2	0.81	4
Personalized Workspace	2	1	3
Faith in Management	2	0	4
Equipment and Training Provided	2.25	0.5	4
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.25	0.5	4
Feels Respected	2.25	0.5	4
Stable Company	2.25	0.5	4
Respect for Each Other	2.25	0.5	4
Fun at Work	2.25	0.5	4
Pride in Team Contributions	2.25	0.5	4
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.25	0.5	4
Individuality is Valued	2.25	0.5	4
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	2.25	0.5	4
Safe and Secure	2.25	0.5	4
Trustworthy People	2.5	0.57	4
Understand Business Goals	2.5	1	4
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.5	0.57	4
Cares About Individual	2.5	0.57	4
Competitive Pay	2.5	1	4
Extra Effort Rewarded	2.5	1.29	4
Economic Success Shared Equitably	2.5	1	4
Employee Satisfaction Measured	2.5	1.73	4
Melting Pot	2.5	0.57	4
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.5	1.29	4
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.5	0.57	4
Benefits for Security	2.75	0.95	4
People and Resources Coordinated	2.75	0.95	4
Philanthropic Activities	2.75	0.5	4
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	3	0.81	4
Physically Attractive	3	0.81	4
Community Service Activities	3.25	1.25	4

Government/Military Services: This industry (n=11) had the **highest overall agreement level** on the statement: *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=2/S.D.=0.89) followed by, *Overall your company/organization employs trustworthy people* (Mean=2.18/S.D.=0.87). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statement *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=2.82/S.D.=1.42), followed by a tie for the second lowest agreement level on the statements, *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* (Mean=4.27/S.D.=1.19) and *Your company/organization is strongly committed to employee and company participation in philanthropic activities* (Mean=4.27/S.D.=1.55). The top two and bottom two statements were indicative of what has been commonly associated with Military services, the individuals are proud of their service to our country and there is a belief that the servicemen and women are trustworthy. However, military service is traditionally not associated with employee-centric activities like satisfaction surveys for the enlisted personnel, and because it is not a profit driven organization shared economic success would lack applicability. All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 7.

Table 7: Government/Military Services ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Proud of Product	2	0.89	11
Trustworthy People	2.18	0.87	11
No Discrimination or Harassment	2.27	1.27	11
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	2.27	1.1	11
Loyalty to Company	2.45	1.12	11
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.45	1.21	11
Stable Company	2.55	1.44	11
Executive Integrity	2.64	1.02	11
Personalized Workspace	2.64	1.12	11
Melting Pot	2.73	1.9	11
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.91	1.13	11
Understand Business Goals	3	1.18	11
Benefits for Security	3	1.18	11
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	3.09	1.51	11
Feels Respected	3.09	1.75	11
Job Security	3.09	1.37	11
Equipment and Training Provided	3.18	1.72	11
Safe and Secure	3.18	1.16	11
Overall Loyalty to Company	3.27	1.67	11
Competitive Pay	3.27	1.61	11
Pride in Team Contributions	3.27	1.27	11
Well Implemented Business Mission	3.27	1.27	11
Treated Fairly	3.36	1.2	11
Respect for Each Other	3.36	1.62	11
Individuality is Valued	3.36	1.43	11
Employees are Happy	3.36	1.2	11
Management Fosters Teamwork	3.45	1.63	11
Clear Understanding of Roles	3.55	1.29	11
Feels Empowered	3.64	1.02	11
Physically Attractive	3.64	1.43	11
Cares About Individual	3.73	1.27	11
Continuing Education and Professional Development	3.82	1.94	11
Community Service Activities	3.82	1.4	11
Fun at Work	3.91	1.64	11
Faith in Management	3.91	1.51	11
People and Resources Coordinated	4.09	1.22	11
Extra Effort Rewarded	4.09	1.51	11
Economic Success Shared Equitably	4.27	1.19	11
Philanthropic Activities	4.27	1.55	11
Employee Satisfaction Measured	4.45	1.29	11

Education: This industry made up almost 15 percent of the response rate (n=29-33). They were tied on the **highest overall agreement level** on the following survey statements: *Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment* (Mean=1.93/S.D.=1.08), and *You feel a sense of loyalty to your coworkers* (Mean=1.93/S.D.=1.09). The second highest level of agreement was tied between the following two survey statements: *Overall employees feel a sense of loyalty to the company/organization* (Mean=1.97/S.D.=0.94) and *My company/organization supports continuing education and professional development* (Mean=1.97/S.D.=1.12). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statement *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* (Mean=3.83/S.D.=1.20) followed the second lowest agreement level on the statement *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=3.63/S.D.=1.35). Based on the industry, a statement about continuing education in the highest level of overall agreement is in line with expectations placed on educators. Additionally, two of their top four high levels of agreement statements had to do with loyalty to the organization and loyalty to each other. It is also important to note that two of the three lowest agreement levels on response rate had to do with compensation. All survey items and corresponding statistics are listed in Table 8.

Table 8: Education 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.93	1.08	30
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.93	0.9	30
Loyalty to Company	1.97	0.94	29
Continuing Education and Professional Development	1.97	1.12	30
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2	0.69	30
Personalized Workspace	2	0.94	30
Trustworthy People	2.12	0.99	33
Proud of Product	2.17	1.08	30
Executive Integrity	2.18	1.07	33
Stable Company	2.3	1.14	30
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.4	0.96	30
Melting Pot	2.5	1.28	30
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.53	1.22	30
Benefits for Security	2.59	1.13	32
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.63	1.06	30
Understand Business Goals	2.64	1.08	33
Philanthropic Activities	2.67	1.42	30
Safe and Secure	2.67	1.02	30
Feels Respected	2.7	1.55	30
Community Service Activities	2.7	1.36	30
Pride in Team Contributions	2.73	1.31	30
Respect for Each Other	2.77	1.43	30
Job Security	2.83	1.31	30
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.93	1.36	30
Cares About Individual	2.93	1.36	30
Faith in Management	2.93	1.48	30
Treated Fairly	2.94	1.39	32
Feels Empowered	2.97	1.28	32
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.97	1.38	33
Individuality is Valued	2.97	1.37	30
Employees are Happy	2.97	1.49	30
Physically Attractive	3.03	1.65	30
Equipment and Training Provided	3.06	1.39	32
Extra Effort Rewarded	3.2	1.27	30
Fun at Work	3.24	1.38	29
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	3.28	1.37	32
People and Resources Coordinated	3.34	1.23	32
Competitive Pay	3.48	1.5	29
Employee Satisfaction Measured	3.63	1.35	30
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3.83	1.2	30

Manufacturing: This industry had a response rate between 15-17 individuals. They were tied on the **highest overall agreement level** on the following survey statements: *Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment* (Mean=1.94/S.D.=1.18), and *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=2.06/S.D.=0.99). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statement *At your company/organization, good work is appreciated and extra effort is rewarded* (Mean=3.38/S.D.=1.5) followed by a tie on the statements, *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=3.31/S.D.=1.44) and *At your company/organization, employees take pride in team contributions* (Mean=3.31/S.D.=1.49). Based on the production model of manufacturing services, it is worth noting that the second highest level of agreement was on a statement about *personal pride* in the work product, but the second lowest response rate was low level agreement on *pride in team* work products. All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 9.

**Table 9: Manufacturing ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics
for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score**

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.94	1.18	16
Proud of Product	2.06	0.99	16
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.19	1.27	16
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	2.19	1.04	16
Executive Integrity	2.24	1.09	17
Trustworthy People	2.29	1.04	17
Stable Company	2.44	1.03	16
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.53	1.4	15
Loyalty to Company	2.56	1.36	16
Melting Pot	2.56	1.45	16
Feels Respected	2.63	1.36	16
Faith in Management	2.71	1.59	14
Benefits for Security	2.75	1.73	16
Competitive Pay	2.75	1.52	16
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.75	1.34	16
Safe and Secure	2.75	1.39	16
Personalized Workspace	2.79	1.42	14
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.81	1.47	16
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.81	1.6	16
Understand Business Goals	2.88	1.61	17
Treated Fairly	2.88	1.85	16
Equipment and Training Provided	2.94	1.61	16
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.94	1.28	16
People and Resources Coordinated	3	1.31	16
Respect for Each Other	3	1.54	16
Individuality is Valued	3	1.51	15
Employees are Happy	3	1.5	16
Community Service Activities	3.06	1.65	16
Physically Attractive	3.07	1.62	15
Feel Empowered	3.12	1.16	17
Cares About Individual	3.13	1.66	16
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3.13	1.66	16
Philanthropic Activities	3.13	1.58	16
Job Security	3.19	1.16	16
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	3.25	1.43	16
Fun at Work	3.27	1.48	15
Overall Loyalty to Company	3.29	1.57	17
Employee Satisfaction Measured	3.31	1.44	16
Pride in Team Contributions	3.31	1.49	16
Extra Effort Rewarded	3.38	1.5	16

Necessities: This industry (n=6) had a response rate of 2.7 percent of the total survey respondents. They had the **highest overall agreement level** on the following survey statement: *Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment* (Mean=1.67/S.D.=0.81), followed by a tie on statements, *Your company/organization is strongly committed to employee and company participation in philanthropic activities* (Mean=2/S.D.=1.26) and *You feel a sense of loyalty to my company/organization* (Mean=2/S.D.=0.63). They also tied on the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statements, *There is an absence of favoritism in hiring and promotions at your company/organization* (Mean=3.50/S.D.=1.37) and *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* (Mean=3.50/S.D.=1.32). All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 10.

Table 10 : Necessities 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.67	0.81	6
Loyalty to Company	2	0.63	6
Philanthropic Activities	2	1.26	6
Benefits for Security	2.17	0.75	6
Equipment and Training Provided	2.17	1.16	6
Stable Company	2.17	0.75	6
Respect for Each Other	2.17	0.98	6
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.33	0.81	6
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.33	1.21	6
Safe and Secure	2.33	0.81	6
Proud of Product	2.4	1.14	5
Understand Business Goals	2.5	0.54	6
Treated Fairly	2.5	0.54	6
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.5	0.54	6
Melting Pot	2.5	1.04	6
Pride in Team Contributions	2.5	1.04	6
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.5	0.83	6
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.5	1.04	6
Personalized Workspace	2.5	0.83	6
Trustworthy People	2.67	1.5	6
People and Resources Coordinated	2.67	0.81	6
Feels Respected	2.67	1.03	6
Employee Satisfaction Measured	2.67	0.81	6
Individuality is Valued	2.67	0.51	6
Community Service Activities	2.67	2.06	6
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.67	1.03	6
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	2.67	1.86	6
Employees are Happy	2.67	0.81	6
Physically Attractive	2.67	0.81	6
Faith in Management	2.67	1.21	6
Executive Integrity	2.83	1.32	6
Feels Empowered	3	1.09	6
Management Fosters Teamwork	3	0.89	6
Fun at Work	3	1.54	6
Job Security	3	0.89	6
Cares About Individual	3.17	1.32	6
Competitive Pay	3.17	1.6	6
Extra Effort Rewarded	3.17	1.16	6
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	3.5	1.37	6
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3.5	1.51	6

Pharmaceutical/Medical/Healthcare: This industry had more than 10 percent of the overall response rates (n=20-23). They had the **highest overall agreement level** on the following survey statement, *Overall your company/organization employs trustworthy people* (Mean=1.61/S.D.=0.65) followed by *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=1.64/S.D.=0.65) . They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statements *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=2.86/S.D.=1.49), followed by *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* Mean=2.76/S.D.=1.26). Of all the reported industries, only the medical industry and military services shared the top two agreement statements as being the employment of trustworthy people who are proud of the product they deliver. All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 11.

**Table 11: Pharmaceutical/Medical/Healthcare ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items
Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score**

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Trustworthy People	1.61	0.65	23
Proud of Product	1.64	0.65	22
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.73	0.76	22
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.9	0.55	20
Executive Integrity	1.91	0.99	23
Treated Fairly	1.95	0.78	22
Equipment and Training Provided	2.05	1.04	22
Feels Respected	2.05	0.84	22
Stable Company	2.05	0.99	22
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.05	0.84	22
Respect for Each Other	2.09	0.75	22
Loyalty to Company	2.09	1.19	22
Feels Empowered	2.13	0.86	23
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.19	0.75	21
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.22	0.9	23
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.23	0.92	22
Safe and Secure	2.24	0.76	21
Understand Business Goals	2.26	1.13	23
Extra Effort Rewarded	2.27	0.82	22
Employees are Happy	2.29	0.84	21
Physically Attractive	2.29	1.23	21
Benefits for Security	2.32	1.04	22
Cares About Individual	2.32	0.99	22
Competitive Pay	2.32	1.12	22
Melting Pot	2.33	1.06	21
People and Resources Coordinated	2.36	0.65	22
Pride in Team Contributions	2.36	0.84	22
Individuality is Valued	2.38	0.92	21
Personalized Workspace	2.38	1.16	21
Faith in Management	2.38	1.32	21
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.4	1.09	20
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.41	1.05	22
Job Security	2.43	1.12	21
Philanthropic Activities	2.48	1.12	21
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.52	1.07	21
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.52	1.36	21
Community Service Activities	2.65	1.08	20
Fun at Work	2.67	1.06	21
Economic Success Shared Equitably	2.76	1.26	21
Employee Satisfaction Measured	2.86	1.49	22

Retail/Sales/Wholesaler/Distributor: This industry had more than 11 percent of the overall response rates (n=21-24). They had the **highest overall agreement level** on the following survey statement, *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=1.73/S.D.=0.7) followed by *Company executives, in general, exhibit integrity in the operation of the company/organization* (Mean=1.79/S.D.=1.02), They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statements *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* (Mean=3.10/S.D.=1.44), and *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=3.10/S.D.=1.61). Retail, et. al was the only industry that reported Executive Integrity in its top two affirmed level of agreement statements. All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 12.

**Table 12: Retail/Sales/Wholesaler/Distributor ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items
Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score**

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Proud of Product	1.73	0.7	22
Executive Integrity	1.79	1.02	24
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.81	0.81	21
Trustworthy People	1.88	0.79	24
Stable Company	1.95	0.8	21
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.95	0.68	20
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.04	0.85	24
Safe and Secure	2.05	0.78	19
Loyalty to Company	2.15	1.13	20
Equipment and Training Provided	2.23	0.75	22
Benefits for Security	2.27	1.2	22
Feels Respected	2.27	0.93	22
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.3	0.87	23
Melting Pot	2.3	1.17	20
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.32	0.89	22
Competitive Pay	2.32	1.04	22
Feel Empowered	2.35	0.88	23
Treated Fairly	2.35	0.88	23
Respect for Each Other	2.38	0.92	21
Job Security	2.4	1.09	20
Pride in Team Contributions	2.45	0.94	20
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.45	1.19	20
Employees are Happy	2.45	0.88	20
Physically Attractive	2.45	0.99	20
Extra Effort Rewarded	2.48	0.92	21
Understand Business Goals	2.5	1.21	24
Cares About Individual	2.5	1.01	22
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.5	0.82	20
Philanthropic Activities	2.5	1.27	20
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.5	0.88	20
Fun at Work	2.55	0.99	20
Community Service Activities	2.55	1.19	20
People and Resources Coordinated	2.59	0.66	22
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.6	1.14	20
Personalized Workspace	2.65	1.53	20
Individuality is Valued	2.7	1.17	20
Faith in Management	2.75	1.25	20
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.85	1.66	20
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3.1	1.44	21
Employee Satisfaction Measured	3.1	1.61	20

Technology: This industry(n=11) had a three-way tie on the **highest overall agreement level** on the statements, *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=2/S.D.=0.63), *You feel a sense of loyalty to your coworkers* (Mean=1/S.D.=1), and *As an employee you feel respected by the people at your company* (Mean=2/S.D.=0.63). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statement, *Your company/organization truly cares about you as an individual* (Mean=3.36/S.D.=1.02) followed by *There is an absence of favoritism in hiring and promotions at your company/organization* (Mean=3.27/S.D.=1.73). The technology respondents felt respected by the people at work and had a corresponding sense of loyalty to their coworkers, but they did not have comparatively high levels of confirmation that their employer cared about them as an individual. All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 13.

Table 13: Technology ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Feels Respected	2	0.63	11
Proud of Product	2	0.63	11
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	2	1	11
Loyalty to Company	2.18	0.75	11
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.18	0.87	11
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.27	0.9	11
Trustworthy People	2.36	1.02	11
Executive Integrity	2.45	0.82	11
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.45	0.93	11
Community Service Activities	2.45	1.21	11
Employees are Happy	2.45	0.82	11
Safe and Secure	2.45	0.82	11
Faith in Management	2.45	0.82	11
Competitive Pay	2.55	1.36	11
Stable Company	2.55	1.36	11
Melting Pot	2.55	1.29	11
Pride in Team Contributions	2.6	1.07	10
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.64	1.5	11
No Discrimination or Harassment	2.64	1.62	11
Respect for Each Other	2.64	1.02	11
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.64	0.67	11
Treated Fairly	2.73	1.42	11
Employee Satisfaction Measured	2.73	1.34	11
Job Security	2.73	1.67	11
Physically Attractive	2.73	1.1	11
Feels Empowered	2.82	0.87	11
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.82	0.98	11
Philanthropic Activities	2.82	1.4	11
Personalized Workspace	2.82	1.47	11
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.91	1.13	11
Understand Business Goals	3	1.34	11
Benefits for Security	3	1.67	11
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3	1.26	11
Individuality is Valued	3	0.89	11
Equipment and Training Provided	3.09	1.04	11
People and Resources Coordinated	3.1	1.19	10
Extra Effort Rewarded	3.18	1.6	11
Fun at Work	3.18	1.4	11
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	3.27	1.73	11
Cares About Individual	3.36	1.02	11

Organizational Operating Area: The most frequently reported type of *Organizational Operating Area* among the sample of 220 who completed this survey item was the Single-State Operation with 44.1 percent of the respondents (n=97), followed by the Multi-State Operation with 23.6 percent (n=52), International with 20.5 percent (n=45), and National (all states) with 11.8 percent (n=26). All four operational areas (single, multi, national, and international) reported pride in product in their top two agreement levels.

Single-State Operations: The highest reported level of agreement among the sample of Single-State operations (n=90-97) who completed this survey was the item *You feel a sense of loyalty to your coworkers* (Mean=1.92/S.D.=0.87), and *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=2/S.D.=0.95). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on the statements *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* (Mean=3.47/S.D.=1.37), followed by *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=3.41/S.D.=1.46). All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Single-State Operations 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.92	0.87	91
Proud of Product	2	0.95	93
Trustworthy People	2.07	0.98	96
No Discrimination or Harassment	2.13	1.15	92
Loyalty to Company	2.2	1.06	90
Executive Integrity	2.24	1.28	96
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.29	1.07	91
Personalized Workspace	2.39	1.09	90
Stable Company	2.4	1.15	92
Safe and Secure	2.4	1.01	91
Feels Respected	2.49	1.21	93
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.5	1.11	92
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.51	1.00	91
Understand Business Goals	2.59	1.19	96
Pride in Team Contributions	2.6	1.13	92
Benefits for Security	2.64	1.18	95
Respect for Each Other	2.65	1.24	91
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.66	1.45	91
Equipment and Training Provided	2.67	1.38	95
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.68	1.18	91
Physically Attractive	2.68	1.46	91
Treated Fairly	2.72	1.25	94
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.74	1.21	94
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.74	1.29	92
Feels Empowered	2.76	1.29	94
Job Security	2.78	1.28	91
Melting Pot	2.8	1.17	91
Employees are Happy	2.81	1.23	91
Community Service Activities	2.82	1.39	91
Philanthropic Activities	2.84	1.49	92
Cares About Individual	2.89	1.37	92
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.97	1.37	95
Faith in Management	2.98	1.53	90
People and Resources Coordinated	3.06	1.13	95
Individuality is Valued	3.08	1.34	91
Fun at Work	3.12	1.36	91
Competitive Pay	3.13	1.40	92
Extra Effort Rewarded	3.13	1.31	92
Employee Satisfaction Measured	3.41	1.46	92
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3.47	1.37	92

Multi-State Operations: The highest reported level of agreement among the sample of Multi-State operations (n=49-52) who completed this survey was the item *Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment* (Mean=1.52/S.D.=0.67), and like the Single-State response, *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=1.69/S.D.=0.65). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=3.14/S.D.=1.37), followed by *Your company/organization promotes an environment of fun at work* (Mean=2.78/S.D.=1.29). Individuals working in Multi-State organizations were the only respondents that as a group indicated a low level of agreement on having fun at work. All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 15.

Table 15: Multi-State Operations 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.52	0.67	50
Proud of Product	1.69	0.65	49
Trustworthy People	1.75	0.9	52
Executive Integrity	1.75	0.76	52
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.76	0.83	49
Loyalty to Company	1.88	1.1	50
Stable Company	1.94	1.05	50
Benefits for Security	1.96	0.94	50
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2	0.83	50
Safe and Secure	2.02	0.75	49
Personalized Workspace	2.04	1.04	49
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.06	0.8	52
Treated Fairly	2.1	0.7	50
Feels Respected	2.1	0.97	50
Competitive Pay	2.12	1.02	50
Philanthropic Activities	2.14	1.01	50
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.16	0.73	50
Physically Attractive	2.16	1.03	50
Equipment and Training Provided	2.18	0.96	50
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.18	0.8	50
Respect for Each Other	2.22	0.96	49
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.26	0.85	50
Understand Business Goals	2.27	0.88	52
Faith in Management	2.27	1.08	48
Feels Empowered	2.29	0.89	52
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.29	1.3	49
Employees are Happy	2.29	0.95	49
Job Security	2.32	0.99	50
Community Service Activities	2.33	1.32	49
Cares About Individual	2.36	1.1	50
Extra Effort Rewarded	2.38	1.08	50
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.44	0.95	50
Melting Pot	2.46	1.16	50
Pride in Team Contributions	2.46	1.03	50
People and Resources Coordinated	2.52	0.9	50
Individuality is Valued	2.56	0.88	50
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.58	1.19	50
Economic Success Shared Equitably	2.69	1.29	49
Fun at Work	2.78	1.29	50
Employee Satisfaction Measured	3.14	1.37	50

National Operations: The highest reported level of agreement among the sample of National operations (n=24-26) had two items around individual loyalty, *You feel a sense of loyalty to your company/organization* (Mean=1.46/S.D.=0.64), *You feel a sense of loyalty to your coworkers* (Mean=1.50/S.D.=0.81), and one item on personal pride: *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=1.5/S.D.=0.76). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on statement areas that had not been previously reported in the bottom 2 in other data cuts, *Your work environment is physically attractive and aesthetically pleasing* (Mean=2.35/S.D.=1.23) and *At your company/organization people and resources are coordinated in an effective manner* (Mean=2.23/S.D.=1.03). All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 16.

Table 16: National Operations 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.46	0.64	26
Proud of Product	1.5	0.76	26
Loyalty to Company	1.5	0.81	26
Executive Integrity	1.54	0.85	26
Well Implemented Business Mission	1.54	0.7	26
Overall Loyalty to Company	1.62	0.85	26
Community Service Activities	1.64	1.07	25
Trustworthy People	1.65	0.89	26
Clearly Defined Business Mission	1.68	0.74	25
Stable Company	1.69	0.78	26
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.69	1.08	26
Respect for Each Other	1.69	0.83	26
Faith in Management	1.71	0.95	24
Feels Respected	1.73	0.82	26
Employees are Happy	1.73	0.72	26
Personalized Workspace	1.75	1.42	24
Management Fosters Teamwork	1.77	0.86	26
Philanthropic Activities	1.79	1.1	24
Pride in Team Contributions	1.8	1	25
Cares About Individual	1.81	1.02	26
Fun at Work	1.84	1.14	25
Extra Effort Rewarded	1.85	1.12	26
Individuality is Valued	1.85	0.78	26
Feels Empowered	1.88	0.9	26
Employee Satisfaction Measured	1.88	1.03	26
Melting Pot	1.88	1.1	26
Benefits for Security	1.92	1.29	26
Competitive Pay	1.92	1.26	26
Pride in Individual Contributions	1.96	0.82	26
Clear Understanding of Roles	2	0.93	26
Safe and Secure	2.04	0.95	26
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.08	1.09	26
Treated Fairly	2.12	1.3	26
Economic Success Shared Equitably	2.12	0.86	26
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.12	0.97	25
Job Security	2.12	1.17	26
Equipment and Training Provided	2.16	0.94	25
Understand Business Goals	2.23	0.95	26
People and Resources Coordinated	2.23	1.03	26
Physically Attractive	2.35	1.23	26

International Operations: The highest reported level of agreement among the sample of International operations (n=40-44) was the item *Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment* (Mean=1.79/S.D.=1.07), followed by *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=1.81/S.D.=0.86). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on statement *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* (Mean=3.21/S.D.=1.47) followed by the survey item *There is an absence of favoritism in hiring and promotions at your company/organization* (Mean=3.12/S.D.=1.45). All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 17.

Table 17: International Operations ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.79	1.07	42
Proud of Product	1.81	0.86	42
Stable Company	1.93	1.09	42
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2	1.03	40
Executive Integrity	2.07	0.92	44
Trustworthy People	2.09	0.91	44
Melting Pot	2.17	1.26	41
Loyalty to Company	2.2	1.03	41
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	2.2	0.95	41
Competitive Pay	2.24	1.14	42
Feels Respected	2.31	1.35	42
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.33	1.22	40
Safe and Secure	2.34	1.13	41
Benefits for Security	2.36	1.3	42
Philanthropic Activities	2.44	1.36	41
Community Service Activities	2.44	1.24	41
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.46	1.41	41
Treated Fairly	2.49	1.31	43
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.5	1.1	40
Personalized Workspace	2.5	1.08	40
Faith in Management	2.55	1.26	40
Equipment and Training Provided	2.58	1.38	43
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.62	1.44	42
Job Security	2.63	1.28	41
Understand Business Goals	2.73	1.31	44
Respect for Each Other	2.74	1.32	42
Employees are Happy	2.78	1.25	40
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.8	1.24	41
Pride in Team Contributions	2.8	1.38	41
Individuality is Valued	2.8	1.24	40
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.84	1.38	44
People and Resources Coordinated	2.88	1.1	41
Extra Effort Rewarded	2.88	1.46	42
Feels Empowered	2.93	1.12	44
Physically Attractive	2.93	1.52	40
Cares About Individual	2.95	1.37	42
Fun at Work	3	1.39	40
Employee Satisfaction Measured	3.07	1.5	41
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	3.12	1.45	43
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3.21	1.47	42

Type of Company/Organization: The most frequently reported response for this survey item was *For-Profit Organization* accounting for 66.4 percent of the respondents (n=141), followed by *Not-for-Profit Organization* with 21.0 percent of the sample (n=45), and *State or Federal Government Agency* with 12.6 percent of the respondents (n=27). All three types of organizations (profit, not-for-profit and government) reported lowest in sharing of success and caring about employee satisfaction.

For-Profit Company/Organization: The highest reported level of agreement among the sample of For-Profit companies (n=132-141) was the item *As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides* (Mean=1.68/S.D.=0.67) followed by *You feel a sense of loyalty to your coworkers* (Mean=1.81/S.D.=0.76). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=2.84/S.D.=1.39) followed by the survey item *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* (Mean=2.82/S.D.=1.30). All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 18.

Table 18: For-Profit ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Proud of Product	1.68	0.67	135
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.81	0.76	133
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.83	1.06	135
Executive Integrity	1.84	1.01	141
Trustworthy People	1.89	0.9	141
Stable Company	1.93	0.99	135
Loyalty to Company	1.95	0.99	133
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.04	1.01	132
Safe and Secure	2.06	0.83	133
Respect	2.12	0.96	136
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.2	0.84	133
Benefits for Security	2.24	1.2	137
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.24	1.06	133
Treated Fairly	2.26	1.15	137
Competitive Pay	2.27	1.17	136
Equipment and Training Provided	2.28	1.07	137
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.28	0.89	134
Respect for Each Other	2.28	1.04	133
Faith in Management	2.29	1.18	129
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.29	1.11	139
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.31	1.07	136
Philanthropic Activities	2.32	1.27	132
Personalized Workspace	2.33	1.16	129
Employees are Happy	2.36	1.04	132
Physically Attractive	2.37	1.23	133
Community Service Activities	2.37	1.33	133
Pride in Team Contributions	2.38	1.07	133
Understand Business Goals	2.38	1.09	141
Job Security	2.4	1.19	134
Melting Pot	2.41	1.16	134
Feel Empowered	2.42	0.99	139
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.45	1.32	132
Cares About Individual	2.47	1.23	135
Extra Effort Rewarded	2.51	1.22	135
People and Resources Coordinated	2.57	0.94	136
Individuality is Valued	2.63	1.13	133
Fun at Work	2.63	1.27	132
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.7	1.24	138
Economic Success Shared Equitably	2.82	1.3	134
Employee Satisfaction Measured	2.84	1.39	134

Not-For-Profit Company/Organization: The highest reported level of agreement among the sample of Not-For-Profit companies (n=43-45) was tied on the items *Overall, your company/organization employs trustworthy people.* (Mean=1.91/S.D.=1.04) followed by *Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment* (Mean=1.9/S.D.=.98). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=3.45/S.D.=1.56) followed by the survey item *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* (Mean=3.36/S.D.=1.44). All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 19.

**Table 19: Not-For-Profit 'Place to Work' Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics
for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score**

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
Trustworthy People	1.91	1.04	45
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.91	0.98	44
Proud of Product	1.93	1.04	44
Personalized Workspace	1.93	0.99	44
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	1.95	0.98	44
Loyalty to Company	2.09	1.13	44
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.14	0.95	44
Executive Integrity	2.16	1.08	45
Respect	2.27	1.33	44
Safe and Secure	2.34	1.2	44
Benefits for Security	2.39	1.28	44
Physically Attractive	2.39	1.36	44
Philanthropic Activities	2.39	1.36	44
Community Service Activities	2.42	1.29	43
Stable Company	2.45	1.37	44
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.45	1.17	44
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.48	1.3	44
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.5	1.02	44
Respect for Each Other	2.55	1.4	44
Overall Loyalty to Company	2.58	1.21	45
Melting Pot	2.59	1.14	44
Feel Empowered	2.62	1.49	45
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.64	1.41	44
Equipment and Training Provided	2.64	1.44	44
Treated Fairly	2.64	1.2	44
Pride in Team Contributions	2.64	1.38	44
Cares About Individual	2.66	1.46	44
Understand Business Goals	2.73	1.17	45
Job Security	2.73	1.16	44
Individuality is Valued	2.75	1.34	44
Employees are Happy	2.75	1.44	44
Faith in Management	2.77	1.52	43
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.79	1.52	43
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.8	1.5	44
Competitive Pay	2.89	1.46	44
Extra Effort Rewarded	3.02	1.5	44
People and Resources Coordinated	3.05	1.2	44
Fun at Work	3.2	1.56	44
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3.36	1.44	44
Employee Satisfaction Measured	3.45	1.56	44

State or Federal Government Agency: The highest reported level of agreement among the sample of State or Federal Agencies (n=25-27) was on the item *Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment* (Mean=1.96/S.D.=1.18), followed by *You feel a sense of loyalty to your coworkers* (Mean=2.12/S.D.=1.17). They reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** on *Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization* (Mean=4.04/S.D.=1.31), followed by the survey item *At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience for employees* (Mean=3.81/S.D.=1.44) All survey items and corresponding statistics are presented in Table 20.

Table 20: State or Federal Government Agency ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items
Descriptive Characteristics for Sample Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	(n)
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.96	1.18	26
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	2.12	1.17	26
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.31	0.97	26
Trustworthy People	2.33	1.03	27
Proud of Product	2.35	1.12	26
Stable Company	2.38	1.13	26
Loyalty to Company	2.4	1.15	25
Personalized Workspace	2.42	1.13	26
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.5	1.74	26
Executive Integrity	2.63	1.27	27
Benefits for Security	2.63	1.18	27
Melting Pot	2.69	1.56	26
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.77	1.24	26
Understand Business Goals	2.81	1.17	27
Pride in Team Contributions	2.88	1.27	26
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.88	1.17	26
Safe and Secure	2.88	0.99	26
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.92	1.26	26
Respect	3	1.54	26
Job Security	3.04	1.39	26
Employees are Happy	3.08	1.19	26
Treated Fairly	3.11	1.21	27
Equipment and Training Provided	3.11	1.6	27
Respect for Each Other	3.12	1.39	26
Overall Loyalty to Company	3.15	1.4	27
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	3.15	1.48	27
Management Fosters Teamwork	3.19	1.29	26
Competitive Pay	3.23	1.53	26
Individuality is Valued	3.23	1.42	26
Community Service Activities	3.27	1.45	26
Feel Empowered	3.3	1.17	27
Cares About Individual	3.38	1.38	26
Extra Effort Rewarded	3.42	1.47	26
Philanthropic Activities	3.46	1.58	26
Fun at Work	3.46	1.33	26
People and Resources Coordinated	3.48	1.31	27
Faith in Management	3.62	1.62	26
Physically Attractive	3.69	1.49	26
Employee Satisfaction Measured	3.81	1.44	26
Economic Success Shared Equitably	4.04	1.31	26

Principal Component Analysis Results

The survey items were analyzed using principal component analysis extraction and a Varimax rotation method with Kaiser normalization. The rotation converged in 10 iterations and the rotated factor matrix established seven factors for consideration. The survey items and corresponding factor loadings are presented in Table 21. This method was used to statistically examine if any of the 48 survey items were correlated with one another. By further grouping the correlated items, the attributes could be re-examined for their thematic properties.

Table 21: 'Place to Work' Survey Items and Factor Loadings

Survey Item	Factor Loadings						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Trustworthy People	.232	.105	.242	.505	.405	-.012	.361
Executive Integrity	.374	.123	.146	.699	.345	.174	.063
Understand Business Goals	.332	.195	.159	.141	.740	.168	.071
Feels Empowered	.716	.161	.088	.172	.404	.023	.140
Overall Employees are Loyal to Company	.614	.187	.211	.372	.284	.117	.173
Treated Fairly	.665	.174	.325	.301	.139	.112	.046
Benefits for Security	.338	.289	.652	.093	-.003	.078	.202
People and Resources Coordinated	.597	.247	.329	.155	.408	-.115	.121
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	.585	-.046	.305	.253	.013	.056	-.069
Equipment and Training Provided	.626	.205	.364	.121	.244	-.289	.081
Management Fosters Teamwork	.784	.205	.154	.154	.233	.095	.069
Feels Respected	.667	.203	.194	.380	.091	.187	.226
Proud of Product	.562	.150	.177	.498	.052	.033	.210
Cares About Individual	.711	.227	.322	.341	.036	.198	.035
Competitive Pay	.369	.258	.703	-.076	-.010	-.017	.224
Stable Company	.159	.184	.712	.237	.189	.133	-.115
No Discrimination or Harassment	.370	.089	.415	.131	.156	.608	-.124
Extra Effort Rewarded	.701	.347	.309	.146	.167	.186	.128
Respect for Each Other	.711	.196	.237	.073	.171	.319	.194
Economic Success Shared Equitably	.578	.434	.361	.196	.147	.002	-.003
Personal Loyalty to Company	.468	.341	.168	.601	-.068	.185	.140
Clear Understanding of Roles	.620	.067	.160	.121	.485	.135	.170
Employee Satisfaction Measured	.485	.494	.118	.052	.280	.146	-.029
Philanthropic Activities	.168	.615	.230	.075	-.019	.289	.357
Melting Pot	.248	.307	.111	.005	.196	.650	.213
Fun at Work	.713	.357	.098	.059	-.005	.245	.146
Pride in Team Contributions	.703	.299	.115	.074	.182	.157	.304
Well Implemented Business Mission	.381	.669	.168	.314	.330	.097	-.047
Continuing Education and Professional Dev	.373	.605	.177	.144	.068	.046	-.072
Individuality is Valued	.708	.266	.214	.241	-.042	.301	-.001
Community Service Activities	.247	.714	.169	.015	-.103	.158	.349
Pride in Individual Contributions	.688	.331	.049	.116	.227	.119	.155
Clearly Defined Business Mission	.139	.732	.150	.184	.284	.157	-.018
Employees are Happy	.645	.198	.220	.398	.083	.210	.201
Job Security	.168	.070	.692	.368	.182	.284	.047
Safe and Secure	.250	.135	.546	.135	.408	.198	.305
Physically Attractive	.323	.239	.261	.363	-.067	-.272	.377
Faith in Management	.516	.319	.340	.484	.202	.166	-.021
Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers	.179	.052	.062	.150	.164	.203	.754
Personalized Workspace	.145	.272	.091	.215	.001	.548	.206

Retention and Removal of Factor Items

For the purposes of this analysis, in order to be retained as a viable survey item, the Eigenvalue of each item was required to be at least 1.0 because it provided the presence of a strong statistical correlation. Additionally, survey items that had a bi-modal factor score result, or items that had a factor loading that was greater than or equal to .100 between the highest and second highest factor, and factors that contained only one survey item were removed. This resulted in factors five and seven being eliminated. The removed factors contained the following survey items: *Understanding Business Goals (Factor Four)*, *Faith in Management (Factor One)*, *Proud of Product (Factor One)*, *Employee Satisfaction Measured (Factor Two)*, *Physically Attractive (Single Factor Survey Item)*, and *Sense of Loyalty to Co-Workers (Single Factor Survey Item)*. The remaining survey items were then grouped into corresponding factors as presented in Table 22.

Table 22: 'Place to Work' Factor Groupings

Factor 1	Loadings
Feels Empowered	0.716
Overall Employees are Loyal to Company	0.614
Treated Fairly	0.665
People and Resources Coordinated	0.597
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	0.585
Equipment and Training Provided	0.626
Management Fosters Teamwork	0.784
Feels Respected	0.667
Cares About Individual	0.711
Extra Effort Rewarded	0.701
Respect for Each Other	0.711
Economic Success Shared Equitably	0.578
Clear Understanding of Roles	0.62
Fun at Work	0.713
Pride in Team Contributions	0.703
Individuality is Valued	0.708
Pride in Individual Contributions	0.688
Employees are Happy	0.645
Factor 2	
Philanthropic Activities	0.615
Well Implemented Business Mission	0.669
Continuing Education and Professional Development	0.605
Community Service Activities	0.714
Clearly Defined Business Mission	0.732
Factor 3	
Benefits for Security	0.652
Competitive Pay	0.703
Stable Company	0.712
Job Security	0.692
Safe and Secure	0.546
Factor 4	
Trustworthy People	0.505
Executive Integrity	0.699
Personal Loyalty to Company	0.601
Factor 5	
No Discrimination or Harassment	0.608
Melting Pot	0.65
Personalized Workspace	0.548

Factor Groupings Examined Across Sample

The survey scale was ordered in the following manner: 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Somewhat Agree, 4=Somewhat Disagree, 5=Disagree, 6=Strongly Disagree. The results reported in the profiles that follow are grouped according to factor correlation to provide a view of strongest level of agreement (lowest mean score) and lowest level agreement (highest mean score) by respondent demographics.

Demographic Profile

Type of Industry: The Industry that most frequently reported the **highest overall level of agreement** for all factors combined, resulting in 26 of 34 survey items was *Charity Organizations*. *Government/Military Services* reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** for 24 of 34 survey items. Factor survey items with the highest and the lowest overall levels of agreement and corresponding type of Company/Organization are presented in Table 23.

Table 23: Highest and Lowest Agreement Levels by Type of Industry

Factor 1	Highest Agreement	Mean	Lowest Agreement	Mean
Feels Empowered	Charity	1.25	Gov't/Military	3.64
Overall Employees are Loyal to Company	Charity	2	Manufacturing	3.29
Treated Fairly	Construction	1.5	Gov't/Military	3.36
People and Resources Coordinated	Charity	2.25	Gov't/Military	4.09
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	Charity	1.25	Education	3.28
Equipment and Training Provided	Charity	1.25	Gov't/Military	3.18
Management Fosters Teamwork	Charity	1.67	Gov't/Military	3.45
Feels Respected	Charity	1.5	Gov't/Military	3.09
Cares about Individual	Charity	1.25	Gov't/Military	3.73
Extra Effort Rewarded	Charity	1.75	Gov't/Military	4.09
Respect for Each Other	Charity	1.5	Gov't/Military	3.36
Economic Success Shared Equitably	Charity	1.75	Gov't/Military	4.27
Clear Understanding of Roles	Charity	1.75	Gov't/Military	3.55
Fun at Work	Charity	1.75	Gov't/Military	3.91
Pride in Team Contributions	Charity	1.25	Gov't/Military	3.27
Individuality is Valued	Charity	1.5	Gov't/Military	3.36
Pride in Individual Contributions	Charity	1.5	Gov't/Military	2.91
Employees are Happy	Charity	1.5	Gov't/Military	3.36
Factor 2				
Philanthropic Activities	Banking	1.85	Gov't/Military	4.27
Well Implemented Business Mission	Charity	1.5	Gov't/Military	3.27
Continuing Ed. & Professional Dev.	Charity	1.25	Gov't/Military	3.82
Community Service Activities	Charity	1.5	Gov't/Military	3.82
Clearly Defined Business Mission	Banking	1.67	Gov't/Military	2.45
Factor 3				
Benefits for Security	Charity	1.5	Gov't/Mil & Tech	3
Competitive Pay	Banking	2	Education	3.48
Stable Company	Banking	1.67	Technology	2.55
Job Security	Charity/Const	2	Manufacturing	3.19
Safe and Secure	Charity	1.25	Gov't/Mil & Tech	3.18
Factor 4				
Trustworthy People	Medical	1.61	Necessities	2.67
Executive Integrity	Charity	1.5	Necessities	2.83
Personal Loyalty to Company	Banking	1.74	Manufacturing	2.56
Factor 5				
No Discrimination or Harassment	Charity	1	Technology	2.64
Melting Pot	Charity	2.25	Gov't/Mil & Tech	2.73
Personalized Workspace	Charity	1.25	Technology	2.82

Type of Company/Organization: The Type of Organization that most frequently reported the **highest overall level of agreement** for all factors combined, resulting in 33 of 34 survey items was *State or Federal Government Agencies*. *For Profit Organizations* reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** for 33 of 34 survey items. Factor survey items with the highest and the lowest overall levels of agreement and corresponding type of Company/Organization are presented in Table 24.

Table 24: Highest and Lowest Agreement Levels by Type of Co/Organization

Factor 1	Highest Agreement	Mean	Lowest Agreement	Mean
Feels Empowered	For Profit	2.42	Gov't Agency	3.30
Overall Employees are Loyal to Company	For Profit	2.29	Gov't Agency	3.15
Treated Fairly	For Profit	2.26	Gov't Agency	3.11
People and Resources Coordinated	For Profit	2.57	Gov't Agency	3.48
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	For Profit	2.7	Gov't Agency	3.15
Equipment and Training Provided	For Profit	2.28	Gov't Agency	3.11
Management Fosters Teamwork	For Profit	2.31	Gov't Agency	3.19
Feels Respected	For Profit	2.12	Gov't Agency	3
Cares About Individual	For Profit	2.47	Gov't Agency	3.38
Extra Effort Rewarded	For Profit	2.51	Gov't Agency	3.42
Respect for Each Other	For Profit	2.28	Gov't Agency	3.12
Economic Success Shared Equitably	For Profit	2.82	Gov't Agency	4.04
Clear Understanding of Roles	For Profit	2.28	Gov't Agency	2.77
Fun at Work	For Profit	2.63	Gov't Agency	3.46
Pride in Team Contributions	For Profit	2.38	Gov't Agency	2.88
Individuality is Valued	For Profit	2.63	Gov't Agency	3.23
Pride in Individual Contributions	For Profit	2.20	Gov't Agency	2.88
Employees are Happy	For Profit	2.36	Gov't Agency	3.08
Factor 2				
Philanthropic Activities	For Profit	2.32	Gov't Agency	3.46
Well Implemented Business Mission	For Profit	2.24	Gov't Agency	2.92
Continuing Education and Professional	For Profit	2.45	Gov't Agency	2.50
Community Service Activities	For Profit	2.37	Gov't Agency	3.27
Clearly Defined Business Mission	For Profit	2.04	Gov't Agency	2.31
Factor 3				
Benefits for Security	For Profit	2.24	Gov't Agency	2.63
Competitive Pay	For Profit	2.27	Gov't Agency	3.23
Stable Company	For Profit	1.93	Not-for-Profit	2.45
Job Security	For Profit	2.40	Gov't Agency	3.04
Safe and Secure	For Profit	2.06	Gov't Agency	2.88
Factor 4				
Trustworthy People	For Profit	1.89	Gov't Agency	2.33
Executive Integrity	For Profit	1.84	Gov't Agency	2.63
Personal Loyalty to Company	For Profit	1.93	Gov't Agency	2.40
Factor 5				
No Discrimination or Harassment	For Profit	1.83	Gov't Agency	1.96
Melting Pot	For Profit	2.41	Gov't Agency	2.69
Personalized Workspace	Not-for-Profit	1.93	Gov't Agency	2.42

Organizational Operating Territory: Organizational Operating Territory:

The Territory that most frequently reported the **highest overall level of agreement** for all factors combined, resulting in 32 of 34 survey items was *National Operating Territory*. *Single State* reported the **lowest overall level of agreement** for 25 of 34 survey items. *National* and *Multi-State* respondents did not report the lowest on any survey items. Factor survey items with the highest and the lowest overall levels of agreement and corresponding type by Operating Territory are presented in Table 25.

Table 25: Highest and Lowest Agreement Levels by Operating Territory

Factor 1	Highest Agreement	Mean	Lowest Agreement	Mean
Feels Empowered	National	1.88	International	2.93
Overall Employees Loyal to Company	National	1.62	International	2.84
Treated Fairly	Multi-State	2.10	Single State	2.72
People and Resources Coordinated	National	2.23	Single State	3.06
No Favoritism in Hiring or	National	2.08	International	3.12
Equipment and Training Provided	National	2.16	Single State	2.67
Management Fosters Teamwork	National	1.77	Single State	2.74
Feels Respected	National	1.73	Single State	2.49
Cares About Individual	National	1.81	International	2.95
Extra Effort Rewarded	National	1.85	Single State	3.13
Respect for Each Other	National	1.69	International	2.74
Economic Success Shared Equitably	National	2.12	Single State	3.47
Clear Understanding of Roles	National	2	International	2.80
Fun at Work	National	1.84	Single State	3.12
Pride in Team Contributions	National	1.8	International	2.80
Individuality is Valued	National	1.85	Single State	3.08
Pride in Individual Contributions	National	1.96	Single State	2.51
Employees are Happy	National	1.73	Single State	2.81
Factor 2				
Philanthropic Activities	National	1.79	Single State	2.84
Well Implemented Business Mission	National	1.54	Single State	2.68
Continuing Education and	National	2.12	Single State	2.66
Community Service Activities	National	1.64	Single State	2.82
Clearly Defined Business Mission	National	1.68	Single State	2.29
Factor 3				
Benefits for Security	National	1.92	Single State	2.64
Competitive Pay	National	1.92	Single State	3.13
Stable Company	National	1.69	Single State	2.40
Job Security	National	2.12	Single State	2.78
Safe and Secure	National	2.04	Single State	2.40
Factor 4				
Trustworthy People	National	1.65	International	2.09
Executive Integrity	National	1.54	Single State	2.24
Personal Loyalty to Company	National	1.5	Single State	2.20
Factor 5				
No Discrimination or Harassment	Multi-State	1.52	Single State	2.13
Melting Pot	National	1.88	Single State	2.80
Personalized Workspace	National	1.75	International	2.50

Factor Groupings Examined Across Entire Sample

Factor One:

Of the 19 survey items in Factor One, the item *Feels Respected* had the overall highest agreement level (2.26), followed by *Pride in Individual Contributions* (2.35). *Economic Success is Shared Equitably* had the lowest agreement level (3.07), followed by *Fun at Work* (2.86). Factor items ordered by mean score are presented in Table 26.

Table 26: Factor 1 ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics Ordered by Item Mean Score

Factor 1 - Survey Item	Mean	Std. Dev	(n)
Feels Respected	2.26	1.17	212
Pride in Individual Contributions	2.35	0.96	208
Clear Understanding of Roles	2.41	1.08	210
Respect for Each Other	2.44	1.19	209
Treated Fairly	2.45	1.19	214
Overall Employees are Loyal to Company	2.46	1.2	217
Equipment and Training Provided	2.47	1.26	214
Pride in Team Contributions	2.51	1.17	209
Management Fosters Teamwork	2.52	1.23	211
Employees are Happy	2.54	1.18	207
Feels Empowered	2.57	1.17	217
Cares about Individual	2.64	1.32	211
Extra Effort Rewarded	2.73	1.34	211
Individuality is Valued	2.74	1.22	208
People and Resources Coordinated	2.79	1.1	213
No Favoritism in Hiring or Promotion	2.8	1.34	215
Fun at Work	2.86	1.37	207
Economic Success Shared Equitably	3.07	1.39	210

Factor Two:

Of the five items that make up Factor Two, the item *Clearly Defined Business Mission* had the highest agreement level (2.03) and *Community Service Activities* had the lowest agreement level (2.49). Factor items ordered by mean score are presented in Table 27.

Table 27: Factor 2 ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics Ordered by Item Mean Score

Factor 2 - Survey Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	(n)
Clearly Defined Business Mission	2.03	1.05	208
Well Implemented Business Mission	2.37	1.12	208
Continuing Education and Professional Development	2.46	1.36	207
Philanthropic Activities	2.48	1.37	208
Community Service Activities	2.49	1.36	207

Factor Three:

Of the five items that make up Factor Three, the survey item *Stable Company* had the highest agreement level (2.10), and *Job Security* had the lowest agreement level (2.56), and). Factor items ordered by mean score are presented in Table 28.

Table 28: Factor 3 ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics Ordered by Survey Item Mean Score

Factor 3 - Survey Item	Mean	Std. Dev	(n)
Stable Company	2.1	1.1	211
Safe and Secure	2.25	0.98	208
Benefits for Security	2.33	1.2	214
Competitive Pay	2.55	1.34	211
Job Security	2.56	1.22	209

Factor Four:

Of the three items that make up Factor Four, the item *Trustworthy People* had the highest agreement level (1.88), and *Executive Integrity* had the lowest agreement level (2.00). Factor items ordered by mean score are presented in Table 29.

Table 29: Factor 4 ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics Ordered by Item Mean Score

Factor 4 - Survey Item	Mean	Std. Dev.	(n)
Trustworthy People	1.88	0.87	208
Personal Loyalty to Company	1.95	0.95	219
Executive Integrity	2	1.08	219

Factor Five:

Of the three items that make up Factor Five, the item *No Discrimination or Harassment* had the highest level of agreement (1.86) and *Melting Pot* had the lowest level of agreement (2.48). Factor items ranked by mean score are presented in Table 30.

Table 30: Factor Five ‘Place to Work’ Survey Items Descriptive Characteristics
Ordered by Item Mean Score

Factor 5 - Survey Item	Mean	Std. Dev	(n)
No Discrimination or Harassment	1.86	1.055	211
Personalized Workspace	2.25	1.141	204
Melting Pot	2.48	1.217	209

‘Place to Work’ Index Construction

The five Factors and corresponding survey items were further examined and grouped into overarching business tenets that constitute the ‘Place to Work’ Index. The index items (Dimensions) and definitions (Constructs) are arranged, described, and presented in Table 31.

Table 31: ‘Place to Work’ Dimensions and Constructs (SIRCA)

Dimension	Construct
<u>S</u> ecurity (Factor 3)	Ensuring the company’s financial strength and the presence of security and stability in both the physical (office/workplace) and business environment (pay, policies, practices)
<u>I</u> ntegrity (Factor 4)	Behaving with integrity, building cooperative work systems by placing faith and trust in each other
<u>R</u> eciprocity (Factor 1)	Valuing and nurturing the mutual benefit of a balanced Employer/Employee relationship
<u>C</u> itizenship (Factor 2)	Dedicated to doing the right thing in business dealings, in the work environment, and in the community
<u>A</u> uthenticity (Factor 5)	Maximizing human interest, fortifying diverse environments where empathy, solidarity, and tolerance is practiced and individuality is acknowledged

‘Place to Work’ Index Examined by Demographic Characteristics: For Type of Industry, *Charity* had the overall highest agreement level on all dimension items except Integrity, where *Banking* ranked highest. For Type of Company or Organization *For Profit Companies* ranked highest on overall agreement level on all five dimensions and *National* ranked highest on all five dimensions for Operating Territory.

For Type of Industry, *Government/Military Services* had the lowest overall agreement level on dimension items for Security, Reciprocity, and Citizenship; *Necessities* ranked lowest on the Integrity dimension and *Technology* ranked lowest on the Authenticity dimension. For Type of Company or Organization, *State or Federal Government Agency* ranked lowest on overall agreement level on all five dimensions, and *Single State* ranked lowest on all five dimensions for Operating Territory. Index dimensions and corresponding overall mean reporting for demographics are presented in Tables 32 and 33.

**Table 32: Highest Overall Agreement Level for Dimensions by Company
Demographic Characteristics**

Dimension (SIRCA)	Type of Industry	Company/Organization	Operating Territory
S ecurity Factor 3	Charity	For-Profit	National
I ntegrity Factor 4	Banking	For-Profit	National
R eciprocity Factor 1	Charity	For-Profit	National
C itizenship Factor 2	Charity	For-Profit	National
A uthenticity Factor 5	Charity	For-Profit	National

**Table 33: Lowest Overall Agreement Level for Dimensions by Company
Demographic Characteristics**

Dimension (SIRCA)	Type of Industry	Company/Organization	Operating Territory
S ecurity Factor 3	Government/Military Services	State or Federal Government Agency	Single State
I ntegrity Factor 4	Necessities	State or Federal Government Agency	Single State
R eciprocity Factor 1	Government/Military Services	State or Federal Government Agency	Single State
C itizenship Factor 2	Government/Military Services	State or Federal Government Agency	Single State
A uthenticity Factor 5	Technology	State or Federal Government Agency	Single State

Multi-Attribute Utility Technology (MAUT) Results

Using a binary pattern transformation to inspect all five Factors as though they were one binary variable, the MAUT examines the 'Place to Work' Index through the combination of mean factor scores that were assessed as a function of the relationship within all five Factors. Using this method, over 30 statistical patterns were established for analysis where a "0" score represented a reported mean value lower than the sample mean value and demonstrated a stronger overall agreement level on the statements than the mean response, and a "1" score represented a reported mean value equal to or greater than the sample mean, indicating a lower overall agreement level with regard to the statements. This partitioning system permitted an examination of those factors on which the sample reported 'LOW' (1) confirmation in light of those on which they reported 'HIGH' (0) confirmation. Moreover, the use of the MAUT permitted an examination of the five Factors as they occurred concomitantly.

For the entire sample, 30 percent of the respondents did not indicate a statistical pattern using the MAUT analysis. Of the 155 remaining that did indicate a pattern, the most frequently reported pattern included all five 'Place to Work' Index factors. All factors: *Security, Integrity, Reciprocity, Citizenship, Authenticity (SIRCA)* were present 13.6 percent of the time (n=30).

The second most frequently reported pattern was the single factor *Integrity*. Among all of the factors, this factor emerged as the single most important factor 11.4 percent of the time (n=25). The remaining frequency counts where a pattern is established are reported at less than five percent.

Chapter Four

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The intent of this thesis project was to identify shared environment-behavior characteristics of fiscally successful, employee-centric companies, and discover patterned attributes. The research examined the occurrence of statistically related attributes and established a 'Place to Work' Index that can be used in conjunction with other indexes to further EB work and environment studies. The motivation for creating the index was three fold; 1) To pattern like qualities of both Fortune 500 and 100 Best Places to Work companies in order to identify core EB traits that can be replicated, 2) To suggest that a commitment to employee centered workplaces can provide a fiscal return on investment for companies, 3) To develop a concise, easy-to-administer instrument that can be used in numerous settings including multiple industries and varying company sizes. This research project presented a unique opportunity to further dissect the characteristics of financially successful businesses that are steadfast in their commitment to promoting excellent employee work environments. It further provides a "jumping off" point for additional research and refinement of the ideas presented in this paper.

Discussion and Limitations of the Study

The avenues pursued to procure a relevant number of working adults to take the survey accomplished the goal of obtaining a statistically significant sample. As a result of the mass electronic communication means that were employed (e.g., E-mail distribution lists, posting on social media and networking sites, etc.) it is difficult to know the exact number of individuals the survey request reached. What is known is that during a two-week period when the electronic survey window was open, over 200 individuals from varied demographics representing a wide range of industry operations completed the survey in its entirety. A larger sample would have increased the reliability of the results and would have been desirable. If not limited by time and resource constraints, a larger sample size could have been obtained by adding a traditional pencil and paper solicitation method and by sending out additional follow up reminder E-mails and electronic postings. The end result, however, provided a convenience sample that was sufficiently large to perform meaningful statistical analyses.

The data sample derived from a variety of business and organizational settings and sizes provided a unique opportunity to evaluate correlated attributes common to the workplaces of Fortune 500 and 100 Best Place to Work companies. The strength of sampling in this manner was the diverse nature of the respondents it yielded; a liability was that the respondents were not asked to provide specific business identifying information. Had this level of detail been available, it would have provided a more focused comparison and contrast at the

organization-specific level. For example, 'Type of Industry' demographics like Pharmaceutical/Medical/Healthcare were grouped together in an effort to keep options for selection at a reasonable level. The limitation was that it is not possible to distinguish the type of specific job a respondent held (e.g. Doctor, Scientist, Certified Nursing Assistant, Nutritionists, etc.). Knowing more about the area of work in which these individuals participated would have provided an additional level of detail and analysis; however, it would also have provided an additional level of complexity that was deemed less pertinent to this thesis.

With the exception of the respondents who worked in a Government or Military setting, all responses were at the level of Strongly Agree to Somewhat Agree. Those in the Government/Military, omitted any Strongly Agree statements. Rather, their responses ranged from Agree to Somewhat Disagree. If there were more detailed demographic information on the type of Government/Military setting, the data could have been dissected at a deeper level. Understanding whether the individuals worked in a specific branch of the armed forces or as a civil servant in a specific agency (e.g. IRS, Department of Defense, Health and Human Services, etc.) would have proved beneficial to the analysis. However, the limited demographic complexity was intended to ensure that survey participation would not become so onerous that it would discourage individuals from participating and completing the survey in its entirety.

The effort to keep the survey manageable in length and detail proved useful in that it yielded a very high participant completion rate. Of the 223

individuals that started the survey, 92.8 percent of them (n=207) completed the survey in its entirety, indicating that ease of use by grouping the demographics appeared to outweigh the potential benefit of having additional detail available for review. Even with the ease of use and high completion rate on the initial 48 item survey, the intent of the research was to analyze specific attributes to further synthesize the EB qualities into a concise, easy to administer tool that could be used by an array of organizations in conjunction with other measures or surveys. In order to achieve this type of usability, the data required additional extrapolation. By using Principal Component Analysis extraction and a Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization the data elements were factored to provide further delineation and identify subsets of attributes.

The statement attributes grouped together in each factor were subsequently examined for their interrelatedness. This process was completed through an additional review of the research material used to build the survey. Specifically, it was important to understand how the correlated statements came together as business themes stemming from successful business practices. Therefore, a further review of the 13 companies that had consecutive years as both Fortune 500 and 100 Best Places to Work listings, and a re-review of the historical research on the work environment elements that have created business successes were completed. This final review and analysis focused on the thematic business tenets that were evident in the factored statements. From the additional review Definitions (Constructs) were established for each Factor and subsequent Index titles

(Dimensions) were associated with each Construct. The Factors were ordered (SIRCA-Security, Integrity, Reciprocity, Citizenship, Authenticity) to provide the user a logical way to easily recall the applicable Dimensions.

The Factors were also investigated using Multi Attribute Utility Technology (MAUT). This examination used the mean factor scores to assess the Index as a function of the relationships within all five Factors. The analysis further confirmed that the most frequently reported pattern included all five Place to Work Index Factors, reinforcing the relational interplay of the five Dimensions. This thesis did not seek to categorize the SIRCA Dimensions in order of importance, but it is of interest to note that in addition to all five Factors presenting as the most frequently reported pattern, Integrity was the second most reported Dimension which denotes that there is a natural primary ordering of the Dimension elements; certainly a clear direction for future research.

It is recognized that funneling over 110 original EB workplace attributes into five overarching business tenets inevitably loses some of the richness, depth, and precision of the original research. Although it is difficult for a researcher to not include, and further explore, all aspects of the data elements the intent of this thesis guided the process to provide a compact, easily defined, and easily administered index. The companies that were studied and the research that was reviewed had a massive number of elements and data points that constitute the successful, employee-centric business endeavors, making it inconceivable to

capture and report on all of the qualities that make up their complete recipes for success.

For the purposes of this research the EB attributes were limited to the qualities that were present simultaneously in all of the companies that were studied and reinforced in the environment-behavior, organization development, and organizational behavior literature. The disadvantage of employing this method is that additional detailed aspects of important business attributes were not explored; the benefit is that the five Factors are direct outcomes of shared business qualities that are supported by the original attributes. Further, the SIRCA Constructs and Dimensions are conceptually easy to explain to a wide audience, are applicable to work environments regardless of type, and provide ease of administration in using the Index. Additionally, the Place to Work Index (SIRCA), offers a succinct touchstone for organizations by providing guiding principles that are easy to refer to when discussing business provisions and decisions, workplace strategies, and employment issues; It provides a simple litmus test for management decisions (e.g. Do the proposed changes to compensation for current employees meet the criteria of the Index?). It should be reiterated that the Place to Work Index (SIRCA) is not just the creation of the author, but rather a reflection of the like-business principles that are in place at the top performing companies and applicable management practices.

There are two additional limitations to this study that further research may address. One area is that although the MAUT shows a prominent pattern of the

presence of all five Factors, the study did not take the Index and the underlying statements and pattern it for the perceived level of importance. Meaning, the survey was geared to take the attributes that are consistently present within the selected highly successful companies and look for confirmation of the relationship between them. If there had been a good possibility that a large sample of respondents would have completed a more in-depth and lengthy survey, it would have been advantageous to not only have the statements confirmed for their relationship value, but to also have the statements confirmed by the respondent's opinion on personal level of importance. For example, the statement, "Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment", would have corresponding levels of importance on a six point Likert scale from which to choose (e.g. Very Important, Important, Somewhat Important, etc.) This personal preference response would have allowed for the business attributes to be ranked in order of importance and analyzed from that perspective.

The second limitation and a subsequent area of review is how to employ SIRCA tenets in the workplace in a manner that is cognizant of human behavior and EB pitfalls that can occur in highly employee-centric work environments. For example, studies have shown that humans tend to incorporate and assimilate new and initially highly appreciated activities or experiences into routine expectations in very short order. People tend to have a three-month window wherein change has an impact (e.g. promotion, raise, extra paid time off); once the change is

assimilated, it no longer serves as a key motivator. (Harvard Business Review, 2012). Accordingly, the Recency Effect, similarly referred to as, “What have you done for me lately?,” becomes paramount to the discussion and strategies around employing the Place to Work Index (SIRCA), as does the propensity to have employee-centric work environments that have an EB vulnerability to the eventual presence of an entitlement mentality that can poison the employee well of motivation, leaving a key ingredient of business success at risk.

Providing organizations with an in-depth understanding of how to be more aware and purposeful in the manner in which they provide and manage the benefits associated with an employee-centric work environment will go a long way in maximizing a culture of empowerment, motivation, commitment, and appreciation. Investing in an employee-centric workplace without having guidelines regarding how to manage expectations, reinforce values, convey rules of engagement, and emphasize personal accountability has the potential to be time, money, and effort misspent; the initiative will not generate the desired return on investment for the business operation. A CEO or management team that is wanting to provide an evolutionary work environment and a profitable return on the effort would greatly benefit from an awareness of the EB principles of motivation, empowerment and accountability, and a corresponding plan of action that supports the implementation of Place to Work Construct and Dimensions.

Conclusions

When looking at the evolution of environment behavior studies we see a myriad of applications in the workplace, from the physical setting (e.g. lighting, temperature, layout, noise) to work processes (e.g. technology, work flow, decision making, process improvement) to social cues (e.g. teambuilding, hierarchy, cultural intelligence, workplace norms) and psychological components (e.g. autonomy, intrinsic value, stressors, motivators). EB influences every aspect of modern business.

Sustainability in a constantly changing work world has become the holy grail of modern business. In order to thrive and survive, an organization must be profitable; recruiting and retaining productive, motivated talent is one of the keys to continued innovation and capital preservation. The findings of this research demonstrate that there are certain attributes common to highly successful businesses that have a statistically significant relation to one another. Specifically, five factors were identified and pursued as important workplace attributes for consistently successful businesses. This is not to say that a business cannot be profitable or have longevity if it does not share these attributes. Unfortunately, many companies have experienced substantial financial success in the midst of providing deplorable working conditions, unethical business dealings, or sub-par work experiences for the employee. This research however, is motivated by the opportunity to emphasize a win-win business proposition for both the company and the employees.

When profitability stems from a work environment that is both desirable and motivating to the individual, the possibilities are limitless and the residual effects on society are significant. Employees flourish when the company's leaders help them focus on what matters most to them, not only at work, but in all aspects of their lives - at home, in their communities, and in their pursuit of well-being. Organizations that emphasize the value of an individual's authenticity, and encourage employees to freely choose to devote their energy to work and personal lives in a manner that is congruent with their deeply held values, create a business environment where the outcome is a workforce of committed people who drive toward achieving superior performance (Friedman & Lobel, 2003). To this end, the 'Place to Work' Index identifies the qualities that provide for this class of workplace and work experience.

Each SIRCA attribute provides a point of reference that the business can be managed to. For illustrative purposes, this document includes individual constructs and dimensions and subsequently provides a high level overview of a few of the supporting components that are "in play" in organizations that illustrate a commitment to the SIRCA attributes.

Security: *Ensuring the company's financial strength and the presence of security and stability in both the physical (office/workplace) and business environment (pay, policies, practices).* The organization demonstrates integrity and commitment to its employees, the products and services, and customers through the manner in which they manage their financial strength and demonstrate financial flexibility. Diversification of assets, mitigation of risks, along

with sound corporate governance, strategic planning and innovation provide the necessary risk/reward balance. Attention is paid to the physical work environment; efforts are made to offer physical space that promotes productivity, safety and security, while acknowledging individuality and endorsing both creativity and pragmatism. Pay, policies and business practices are deliberately designed and enacted to continually support and reinforce the company's mission, expectations, and commonly held values.

Integrity: *Behaving with integrity, building cooperative work systems by placing faith and trust in each other.* The ownership for this tenet begins and ends with the executive team; the most important manifestation is leading by example. The message of integrity is conveyed through the manner in which business and strategic decisions are made, behavior is observed, and information is disseminated within the organization. Interdependence, cooperation, and non-contentious partnerships are a mandatory component of both team and individual success. Employees are aware of the natural conflict, or “rub” that is inherent between operational business units; they understand differing roles and responsibilities naturally create opposing perspectives that are “good for business” when the interactions are managed to capitalize on both divergent perspectives and commonalities. Based on the organization's cultural norms and expectations “Rules of Engagement” are defined and managed to in meetings, projects, and work. Emphasis is placed on providing opportunities for employees to know each other on a personal level and respect each other from a skill set perspective; building camaraderie between people manifests as loyalty and support toward

one another when work situations are difficult or needs/desires are in conflict with one another.

Reciprocity: *Valuing and nurturing the mutual benefit of a balanced Employer/Employee relationship.* Efforts are focused on the interdependency of the employer-to-employee relationship and the employee-to-business affiliation. Relationships are managed in a fair and complimentary manner; all parties are cognizant of the value of a stable workforce and of stable employment. There is a deliberate absence of the Big Me/Little You hierarchical management style. Expecting an honest day's work and effort for a competitive wage/benefit is key to the mutually beneficial union; entitlement mentality on either side is not tolerated. Company leaders make a concentrated effort to stay in touch with the work on the front line, to provide resources to continually develop talent, and to ensure that employees understand the breadth and depth of the responsibilities of leaders within the company. The employer and employees mutually share in the successes and failures of business decisions, progress toward goals, and in the achievement of milestones; there is an expectation that everyone will go the extra mile when the workload demands it, but the employer steadies the demands by ensuring that there are work/life balance opportunities and expectations in place. Decisions are made with the interests of both parties ever present.

Citizenship: *Dedicated to doing the right thing in business dealings, in the work environment, and in the community.* There is a fundamental expectation that business dealings are conducted in a manner that conveys both dignity and respect; that all employees treat those they come in contact with in a manner that

demonstrates commitment to the company, colleagues, customers, and the community. Every member of the organization strives to take care of their workday in an ethical and productive manner, to care for the communities they serve, and the people with whom they do business. The organization subscribes to do right by each other, to help those in need, and to look for win-win opportunities wherever possible.

Authenticity: *Maximizing human interest, fortifying diverse environments where empathy, solidarity, and tolerance is practiced and individuality is acknowledged.* The organization does not seek to create multiple reiterations of the same type of employee, but rather to capitalize on the benefits of miscellany. There is an understanding that tolerance of opposing viewpoints or personal traits is not an affront to one's personal value system; people do not have to compromise their own beliefs in order to co-exist in a professional and supportive environment with individuals who subscribe to a different way of seeing the world. The organization allows for personality to be present in the work space and in the workplace. There is a concentrated effort to incorporate human interest and motivation into the work environment by encouraging employees to be genuine and true to themselves. The employer seeks to maximize individual strengths and minimize the emphasis on areas that the individual is not strong suited toward.

Future Research

In summary, the focus of this research was the examination of numerous EB workplace attributes evident in Fortune 500 and 100 Best Place to Work Companies for the purposes of establishing an easy to administer, applicable, workplace index. The analysis of participant responses permitted statistical extrapolation of correlated attributes, and yielded a concise 'Place to Work' Index that can be used in conjunction with other EB instruments. The results of this study indicate that attributes of highly successful, employee-centric work environments have correlated, overarching business tenets that should be explored through further research. The Index attributes (SIRCA) Security, Integrity, Reciprocity, Citizenship, and Authenticity could be further examined from multiple EB perspectives; each dimension provides a supplemental opportunity for individual research and further exploration.

An additional area of particular interest for future research would be examining 'Place to Work' employee preferences with Organizational System preference. Specifically, the process could include surveying a random sample of working adults to determine their environment-behavior preference as it relates to Organizational Regime/Style (open, random, closed, synchronous) and further tie their Organizational preference to the 'Place to Work' Index. This would be accomplished through individual ranking of the Index construct/dimensions in order of personal importance or value. The subsequent analysis would match organizational preference to the ordered index components in an effort to

establish whether a statistical correlation exists between the preferred organizational style a person employs and the order of importance they place on the five components of the index. If a statistical correlation were present, it would provide an opportunity to work with organizations/companies through subsequent surveys of their workforce to establish organizational system preference within their employee base. Once the demographics of organizational system preferences are established, it would further provide a glide path for discussion and education around the predominant organizational system(s) operating within their workforce and applying the corresponding Index preferences to describe strengths (importance) and areas of workplace dimensions that have a less natural level of importance based on the dominant organizational system in place at their company.

Another additional area would be 'Place to Work' employee preferences benchmarked against actual 'Place to Work' Index activities occurring in the work environment. A third area would be 'Place to Work' preferences by level/type of employee (e.g. executive, management, professional, front line, etc), and 'Place to Work' examined through the lens of workplace performance and motivation. Lastly, the SIRCA attributes could be examined for application within other organizational domains (e.g. family systems, team sports, academic relationships, diversity initiatives, etc).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, J. (1965). Inequity in Social Exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* , 335-343.

Alderfer, C. (1969). An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Needs. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* , 142-175.

Alumni Harvard Business School. (1999, April). Retrieved October 2011, from Harvard Business School Bulletin:
<http://www.alumni.hbs.edu/bulletin/1999/april/spirit3.html>

Anchor, S. (2012). Positive Intelligence. *Harvard Business Journal* , 100-102.

Anderson, L. (2002). *Benton MacKaye: Conservationist, Planner, and Creator of the Appalachian Trail* . Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Barker, R. (1990). Recollections of the Midwest Psychological Field Station. *Environment and Behavior* , 503-513.

Bechtel, R. B. (1997). *Environment and Behavior: An Introduction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bootzin, R. L., Loftus, E., Zajonc, R. & Hall, E. (1983). *Psychology Today: An Introduction*. New York: Random House. Fifth Edition.

Bradberry, T. & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional Intelligence 2.0*. San Diego: TalentSmart.

Bradford, D. L. & Burke, W.W. (2005). *Reinventing Organization Development: New Approach to Change in Organizations*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

Burnes, B. (2004). Kurt Lewin and The Planned Approach to Change: A Re-Appraisal. *Journal of Management Studies* , 977-1002.

Burnes, B. (2004). *Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organisational Dynamics (4th ed)*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall.

Carson, R. (1962). *Silent Spring*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Cooke, B. (1999). Writing the Left out of Management Theory: The Historiography of the Management of Change . *Organization* , 81-105.

Cornell University. (2011). Retrieved October 2011, from
<http://www.ilr.cornell.edu>: www.ilr.cornell.edu/LaborRelations

- Covey, S. M., Covey, S. R., & Merrill, R. R. (2006). *The Speed of Trust*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Covey, S. R. (1992). *Principle-Centered Leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Covey, S. R. (2009). *The 7 Habits of Highly Successful People*. New York: Rosetta Books.
- Cummings, T. G. (1989). *Organization Development and Change (4th ed.)*. St Paul: West Publishing.
- Druker, P. F. (2002). *The Effective Executive*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Dyck, J. (1997). *Faith Under Test: Alternative Service During World War II in the U.S. and Canada*. Moundridge: Gospel Publishers.
- Earley, P. & Masakowski, E. (2004). Cultural Intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 1-8.
- French, W. (1982). The Emergence and Early History of Organization Development. *Group Organizational Dynamics*, 261-278.
- Gingerich, M. (1949). *Service for Peace: A History of Mennonite Civilian Public Service*. Goshen: Mennonite Central Committee.
- Great Place To Work:Our Approach*. (2010). Retrieved 2010-2011, from Great Place To Work Institute: <http://greatplacetowork.com>
- Heil G., Bennis, W. & Stephens, D.C., (2000). *Douglas McGregor Revisited: Managing the Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: John Wiley.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the Nature of Man*. Cleveland: World Publishing Co.
- <http://guides.library.cornell.edu/organizationalbehavior>. (2011, September). Retrieved September 2011, from Cornell University: <http://www.ilr.cornell.edu>
- Institute For Organizational Excellence*. (2010). Retrieved November 2010, from University of Texas at Austin: <http://www.utexas.edu/research/cswr/survey>
- Kaplan, S. & Kaplan, R. (1978). *Humanscape:Environments for People*. Belmont: Duxbury.
- Lewin, K. (1946). Action Research and Minority Problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 34-36.

- Locke, E. A. & Latham, G.P. (1984). *Goal Setting: A Motivational Technique That Works!* Engelwood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Locke, E. A.(1968). Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* , 157-189.
- Lundberg, C. (2000). Organizational Development as Facilitating the Surfacing and Modification of Social Rules. *Research in Organizational Change and Development* , 41-58.
- Maslow Summary*. (2011, July). Retrieved July 2011, from Sonoma State University: http://www.sonoma.edu/users/d/daniels/maslow_summary.html
- Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and Personality (2nd ed.)*. New York: Harper & Row.
- McGregor, D. (1957). The Human Side of Enterprise. *Proceedings of the Fifth Anniversary Convocation of the School of Industrial Management*. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Moore, G. T., Tuttle, D.P., Howell, S.C (1985). *Environmental Design Research Directions: Process and Prospects*. New York: Praeger.
- Newstrom, J.W. & Davis, K.A. (2007). *Organizational Behavior: Human Behavior at Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ore, A. (1835). *The Philosophy of Manufactures*. London: William Clowes & Sons.
- Porteous, J. (1977). *Environment and Behavior: Planning and Everyday Urban Life*, Boston: Addison-Wesley.
- Sommer, R. (1969). *Personal Space: The Behavioral Basis of Design*. Engelwood Cliffs: New Jersey.
- Spector, P. E. (2008). *Industrial and Organizational Behavior (5th ed)*. Hoboken: Wiley.
- Spreitzer, G. & Porath, C. (2012). Creating Sustainable Performance. *Harvard Business Journal* , 93-99.
- Stewart-Pollack, J. & Menconi, R. (2005). *Designing for Privacy and Related Needs*. New York: Fairchild Publications, Inc.

Tay, L. & Diener, E. (2011). Needs and Subjective Well-Being Around the World. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* , 354-365.

The Drucker Institute. (2011). Retrieved August 2011, from The Drucker Institute Claremont Graduate University: <http://www.druckerinstitute.com>

Transcendentalism. (2011). Retrieved August 2011, from Websters Online Dictionary: <http://www.websters-online-dictionary.org/definitions>

Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. New York: Jon Wiley & Sons.

Wartzman, R. (2012). *What Would Drucker Do Now?* New York: The McGraw Hill Companies.

White, L. (1967). The Historical Roots of Our Ecological Crisis. *Science* , 1-7.

APPENDIX

Letter of Informed Consent

Title of Project: Workplace Attributes - Employee Opinions

Principal Student Investigator: Amanda Andrade, MEd
Email: andraderesearch@yahoo.com
2101 W. Broadway PMB 263 Columbia, MO 65203

Advisor: Ronald Phillips, ArchD
Department of Architectural Studies
Office: 142A Stanley Hall
Email: phillipsr@missouri.edu
Phone: 573-882-4575

1. Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to study the attributes that are important to an individual in their work environment.
2. Procedures to be followed: You will be asked to complete a brief survey questionnaire.
3. Discomforts and Risks: There are no risks in participating in this research beyond those experienced in everyday life.
4. Duration/Time: The survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.
5. Statement of Anonymity: Your participation in this research is anonymous. The data will be stored in a protected electronic format. The University of Missouri's Office of Research, the Institutional Review Board and the Office for Human Research Protections in the Department of Health and Human Services may review records related to this research study. In the event of a publication or presentation resulting from the research, no personally identifiable information will be available. Data will only be accessed by the student researcher and the faculty advisor listed above.
6. Right to Ask Questions: Please contact the researcher listed above or Ronn Phillips, ArchD (Academic Advisor) at 573-882-4575 with questions or concerns about this research. If you have any questions, concerns, problems about your rights as a research participant or would like to offer input, please contact the University of Missouri Institutional Review Board at 573-882-9585 or by mail at 483 McReynolds, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211.
7. Voluntary Participation: Your decision to participate in this research is voluntary. You can stop at any time. You do not have to answer any questions you do not want to

answer. Refusal to take part in or withdrawing from this study will involve no penalty or loss of benefits you would receive otherwise. You must be 18 years of age or older to consent to take part in this research study. Your completion and submission of the survey will be deemed as your consent to participate in the study.

Introduction

The survey items below have been compiled as part of a doctoral research project investigating characteristics of companies that have consistently made the lists for Fortune 500 and Top 100 Best Places to Work. The research focuses on employment attributes at these types of companies/organizations and what is important to employees as they perform their job.

The survey responses will be used to better understand attributes that are important to individuals in their respective work environments. We value your opinion and appreciate your participation.

Workplace Attributes Survey

1) Which of the following best describes your company/organization?

a.	For-profit organization
b.	Not-for-profit organization
c.	State or Federal Government Agency
d.	Other _____ (specify)

2) Which of the following best describes the type of company/organization in which you work?

e.	Banking/Finance/Insurance
f.	Charity/Foundation
g.	Construction
h.	Government Services
i.	Education
j.	Manufacturing
k.	Necessities (e.g., Agriculture, Transportation, Energy)
l.	Pharmaceutical/Medical
m.	Retail/ Sales
n.	Technology
o.	Other _____ (specify)

3) **Approximately how many years has your company/organization been in business?**
 (specify)

4) **Approximately how many employees work at your company/organization?**
 (specify)

5) **How many years have you been employed in your company/organization?**
 (specify)

6) **Your company/organization operates in which of the following territories?**

a.	Single State
b.	Multi-state
c.	National (all States)
d.	International

7) **Overall, your company/organization employs trustworthy people.**

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

8) **Company executives, in general, exhibit integrity in the operation of your company/organization.**

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

9) **At your company/organization employees understand the long and short term business goals.**

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

10) **At your company/organization, employees feel empowered to do their job well.**

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

11) Overall, employees feel a strong sense of loyalty to your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

12) Employees are treated fairly at your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

13) The compensation and benefit programs at your company provide for the security and care of their employees.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

14) At your company/organization, people and resources are coordinated in an effective and efficient manner.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

15) There is an absence of favoritism in hiring and promotions at your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

16) Employees at your company/organization are provided with the equipment, resources and training they need to do their job.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

17) Management fosters and encourages an environment of teamwork throughout your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

18) As an employee, you feel respected by the people at your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

19) As an employee, you are proud of the product/service your company/organization provides.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

20) Your company/organization truly cares about you as an individual.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

21) Your company/organization offers competitive pay (e.g., salary, profit-sharing, 401(k), bonuses).

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

22) You believe that you work for a stable company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

23) Your company/organization makes a genuine effort to have a workplace that is free from discrimination and harassment.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

24) At your company/organization, good work is appreciated and extra effort is rewarded.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

25) Respect for each other is a core component at your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

26) Economic success is shared equitably throughout your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

27) You feel a sense of loyalty to your company/organization and to your coworkers.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

28) Employees have a clear understanding of their role in your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

29) At your workplace, employee satisfaction is regularly measured because your company/organization wants to foster a satisfying work experience employees.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

30) Your company/organization is strongly committed to employee and company participation in philanthropic activities and community service.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

31) Your employer strives to be a diverse workforce; a “melting pot” of people and ideas.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

32) Your company/organization promotes an environment of fun at work.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

33) At your company/organization, employees take pride in their team contributions.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

34) Your company/organization has a clearly defined and well implemented business mission (i.e., we continuously manage to our core mission)

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

35) Your company/organization supports continuing education and professional development.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

36) An employee's individuality is valued at your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

37) Your company/organization is strongly committed to employee and company participation in community service activities.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

38) At your company/organization, employees take pride in their individual contributions.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

39) You company/organization has a clearly defined business mission.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

40) You feel a personal sense of loyalty to your co-workers.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

41) Overall, most employees are happy to be working at your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

42) You believe that your job is secure.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

43) The work environment at your company/organization is both safe and secure.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

44) Your work environment is physically attractive and aesthetically pleasing.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

45) At our company/organization, employees are allowed to personalize their work space/work area.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

46) You have faith in the people who are managing your company/organization.

STRONGLY AGREE AGREE SOMEWHAT AGREE SOMEWHAT DISAGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

47) The single greatest asset of your company/organization is:

<hr/> <hr/> <p style="text-align: right;">(specify)</p>

48) The single greatest liability of your company/organization is:

<hr/> <hr/> <p style="text-align: right;">(specify)</p>

Thank you for your time and thoughtful participation